

DRAFT

SAN DIEGO COUNTY REGIONAL AIRPORT AUTHORITY SPECIAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE/SPECIAL BOARD MEETING MINUTES Thursday, May 18, 2006 SHERATON SAN DIEGO HOTEL AND MARINA, HARBOR ISLAND

CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Patricia Tennyson, Senior Vice President of Katz & Associates, called the meeting of the Special Advisory Committee to the San Diego County Regional Airport Authority to order at 9:35 a.m. The meeting was held on Thursday, May 18, 2006 at the Sheraton San Diego Hotel and Marina, West Tower, Fairbanks Room, 1590 Harbor Island Drive, San Diego, CA 92101.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

ROLL CALL

Committee Members Present:

Frank Adams	FedEx Representative
Rick Alexander	East County EDC
Capt. Mike Allen	Chief of Staff of Navy Region Southwest Replacement for Capt. Daniel P. King
Brad Barnum	Alternative for Jim Ryan
Kelley Brown	SDIA Airline Representative
John Chalker	Founder, ASAP21
Oris Dunham	Airport Industry Consultant
Bill Figgy	Alternate for Pedro Orso-Delgado
Col. Gregory Goodman	Alternate for Col. Brooker
Brian Gray	Director of External Affairs, San Diego Taxpayers Association
Mike Hicks	Alternate for Gary Gallegos
Curtis Holmes	Transport Workers Union
Gary Knight	North County EDC
Kirk Lanz	South County EDC
Richard Miller	San Diego Chapter Sierra Club
Gail K. Naughton	Dean, SDSU College of Business Administration
Pedro Orso-Delgado	District 11 Director, CalTrans
James Panknin, Jr.	Santee Representative-Community Leaders Forum, MCAS Miramar
VADM Raymond Peet, USN (ret.)	Member of Board of Overseers, UCSD
RADM Paul Spear, USN (ret.)	Former Commissioner, Port of San Diego
Leon Williams	Former Chairman, MTS

Regional Airport Authority Representatives Present:

Thella Bowens, President/CEO
Peggy L. Cooper, Strategic Planning Coordinator
Ted Sexton, Vice President of Operations
Keith Wilschetz, Director, Airport System Planning
Greg Wellman, Vice President, Ricondo & Associates
Joe Huy, Director, Ricondo & Associates

The January and March Airport Advisory Committee meeting minutes were approved by Committee members.

Chairman's Report

Chairman James Panknin explained the Airport Advisory Committee was the first group to have a chance to discuss and provide comments on the Airport Site Selection Analysis. He requested that members provide their recommendations regarding the Airport Site Selection Program at today's meeting. He will present a summary of the committee members' recommendations at the Authority Board meeting on June 5.

NEW BUSINESS:

1. Mr. Greg Wellman, Vice President of Ricondo & Associates, stated the Airport Site Selection Analysis was the most comprehensive site selection study ever conducted in San Diego and presented a summary of the findings from the analysis on the potential airport sites. He explained the analysis of the potential sites for a future airport included the following five fundamental tests of technical feasibility: market potential, financial, aeronautical, environmental, and military viability. He then reviewed the summary comparison chart that used the technical feasibility tests to compare each of the final potential airport sites. This included the Campo Boulevard site, Imperial Desert site, NAS North Island-SDIA site, MCB Camp Pendleton site and the MCAS Miramar site.
 - Mr. James Panknin asked about the financial costs of making Miramar a civilian-only site. He observed the Site Selection Cost Analysis does not include the costs of relocating the military from Miramar and requested they be included in the analysis.
 - Mr. Wellman stated Miramar as a civilian-only airport would require the same amount of facility development if Miramar were used for joint-use because some of the existing facilities could be utilized for the future airport. However, he explained the analysis does not include the total costs for making Miramar a civilian-only airport. The scenario they studied included continued activity at Miramar by the military. In the analysis, the team assessed the facilities at the military sites that would need to be relocated. These relocation costs ranged from \$200 million to \$2 billion. Also the team proposed lease payments to the military as compensation for use of the land, which provide the military a revenue stream of up to \$35 million a year.
 - VADM Raymond Peet explained that 15-20 years ago Pete Wilson asked Miramar to conduct a study on the costs to move the military from Miramar. The cost estimate was approximately \$1 billion.
 - Mr. Oris Dunham asked if Mr. Wellman's \$2 billion estimate was the maximum amount for military relocation from Miramar or if it could be a larger figure. If we do relocate the military, he feels we need to give the military additional money to build the facilities they need. He also asked if anyone has approached the military with a figure of \$5 billion to see if that would satisfy their needs with relocation.

- Mr. Wellman stated according to the analysis the military component at Miramar would cost \$239 million which includes keeping the Marines and their facilities functional if they need to be relocated. He stated the Authority has not discussed the costs for relocation with the military, but would like to collaborate with the military on a joint-use scenario and enhance the capabilities of the Marines for the future.
 - Col. Gregory Goodman stated the consultants and the Authority need to be careful what figures are associated with the relocation costs for the military. He explained the military has spent approximately \$2 billion in upgrades to existing facilities at the Miramar Air Station since moving there in 1996.
- Mr. John Chalker explained he has reviewed the results from the most recent inventory and research conducted every year on all the military bases in the United States and overseas. He explained these studies assign a total replacement cost value for all the facilities on the base. The most recent inventory uses figures from the 2004 fiscal year and assigned a total replacement cost of \$2 billion for the Marine Corps Air Station Miramar.
 - Mr. Wellman stated the \$239 million figure is related to the joint-use concept at Miramar and specific facilities that would be affected by a joint-use airport. This figure does not include the amount for full relocation of the Marine Corp base somewhere else.
- Mr. Brian Gray explained he feels there is a serious disconnect between Ricondo & Associates' analysis of the military feasibility and the military's analysis of the same concept. He asked if there was a plan in place of how to rectify those differences.
 - Mr. Wellman stated they did not receive a specific report from the Marine Corps or Navy regarding an evaluation of joint-use concepts. He explained the Airport Site Selection Analysis is part of the civilian decision making process. If the Authority chooses a joint-use concept at Miramar as its preferred concept, the next step is to prepare a master plan and formally request joint-use at Miramar from the military.
 - Mr. Keith Wilschetz, Director, Airport System Planning, explained the Authority did not have access to the details of the analysis from the military and over the next few months those issues need to be addressed and reconciled with them.
 - Capt. Mike Allen explained the military received detailed, written proposals from the Authority a few days ago. He stated throughout this airport site selection process the military has tried to be as helpful as possible to the Authority. He explained it is inaccurate to suggest that the Authority did not have access to the military because the consultants observed operations at the bases and reviewed military log books. The military has done the best they can to communicate their belief that the joint-use of any military site is incompatible and unacceptable with all military operations.

- VADM Peet explained the Department of the Navy includes the Marine Corps. When the Secretary of the Navy issued a letter stating the joint-use concepts are incompatible with military operations, he responded for the Navy and the Marine Corps.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

- Mr. Tom Delahanty, a resident of Point Loma, explained he is a member of two citizen groups who are studying the Airport Site Selection issue to ensure they make the best decision for future generations of citizens of San Diego. He stated Miramar is the best location for a future airport because it will ensure jobs for the citizens of San Diego for the future. He understands the military has issues with the use of Miramar, but it is possible in 10-15 years the Marines will not need a base at Miramar. He believes everyone needs to work together to accomplish the goal of finding a new airport site.
- Mr. William A. Jordan, a retired Colonel in the Air Force Reserves and a professor of economics at York University, explained stage 4 aircraft will be operating by the time a new airport is built in 15-20 years. This aircraft will decrease the problems of high noise levels. Also he explained the Authority would be eliminating non-stop service into San Diego for the majority of passengers coming here if they chose the new airport site at Imperial Desert or another remote site. Passengers would need to take a 100 mile train ride to get to and from the downtown area.

COMMITTEE MEMBER COMMENTS:

- Mr. Panknin stated he feels we are currently involved in a national airspace traffic management issue. He feels Lindbergh was left out of the Airport Site Selection Analysis and that Lindbergh and the existing airport facilities should be analyzed and considered as an alternative. He believes Lindbergh and Miramar are the only feasible options. He provided his assessment of SDIA using the five fundamental tests of technical feasibility. He concluded Lindbergh is the most financially viable and the most feasible option for a future airport site. He feels it would be best for the committee to discuss the ballot language at the July meeting to advise the Authority Board in August.
- VADM Peet explained he believes we do not necessarily need a new airport and that Lindbergh will not be as constrained in the future as has been portrayed. He has issues with the explanations of why SDIA cannot be used as a future airport such as the increased passenger loading numbers and the projections of number of landings. He feels it is important to take under consideration the military presence in San Diego since they contribute to at least one-fourth of the economy of San Diego. He believes if there is a new airport at Miramar the Navy would most likely move the aircraft carriers out of San Diego.

- Mr. Gary Knight stated the North County EDC Board of Directors has not taken an official position on the potential airport sites. He is skeptical about the numbers and capacity constraints disclosed about Lindbergh and would like more specific information about Lindbergh.
- Mr. Kurt Lanz stated the South County EDC Board of Directors has not taken an official position on potential sites yet. He is concerned about ground access and transportation to the potential airport sites and would like to see this information disclosed in the analysis.
- Mr. Frank Adams stated he feels the Authority and the consultants did an excellent job on the Airport Site Selection Analysis to ensure everyone can make an informed decision. He believes Lindbergh offers limited opportunities for future expansion. He supports a joint-use airport at Miramar. He believes the proposed distant airport sites are not viable options and will not be compatible with the cargo industry. He stated we need to consider the travel needs of both the citizens of San Diego and the military. As an example of the current constraints at Lindbergh, he said the reconstruction of the single runway at Lindbergh, from June through November 2006, will cause considerable delays for cargo delivery to over 50,000 customers a day.
- Mr. Oris Dunham stated he opposes the Imperial Desert and Campo Sites and supports the possible joint-use at Miramar but feels military concerns are legitimate. He also supports further study of civilian only Miramar option and feels we should ask the military if they are willing to move if we build them new facilities. He explained we need to consider the best option for a future airport site for the citizens of San Diego as well as for the military. He believes it would not be effective to try to utilize Brown Field, Palomar Airport, or John Wayne Airport and that Lindbergh will run out of space at some point in the future. He suggests working with the military on this issue is the best strategy.
- Mr. John Chalker stated ASAP 21 has not taken an official position on potential sites. He is opposed to the Imperial and Campo Sites, supports the possible joint-use at Miramar as well as the use of any other airports. He also supports further study of the civilian only Miramar option. He believes the Airport Site Selection Analysis was a worth the money and time that was spent on it. He thinks it would be reasonable to consider moving Marines at Miramar somewhere within 100 miles, but is concerned about hurting the civilian and military relationship and feels the concerns of the military are legitimate. He urges everyone to keep the long-term vision for the future in mind when considering the future airport site and believes if we do not deal with the issues now they will keep coming back. He also supports the current Master Plan process at Lindbergh, which is to address the growing demands of passenger and air cargo including an expansion of gates and facilities for the next 10-15 years. He recognizes a decision must be made now about a future airport site in order to complete the process before Lindbergh is at full capacity.
- Mr. Curtis Holmes stated he supports joint-use at Miramar. He explained as someone who works at the airport, he understands in 25 years the space at the

current airport will be constrained. He feels we need to consider the future of the airport and that the military, airlines and the cargo companies need to work together on this issue. He also feels everyone's interests should be considered in the solution. Based on surveys and polls he believes people do not want to travel 60 -100 miles to get to the downtown area of San Diego from the airport.

- Capt. Mike Allen stated all the military sites are unavailable and should be taken off the list of potential sites. He feels the Airport Site Selection Analysis ignores the fatal flaws inherent in joint-use of a military site in terms of impacts to military operations, training and public safety. He believes it demonstrates a lack of understanding of the needs of the military and disregards the Authority's statutory mandate to consider and protect military airspace needs in San Diego. He also explained the conclusion on page 101 of the decision document incorrectly states the NAS North Island concept would not degrade safety or pose security risks or hamper the Dept of defense in training for and maintaining national defense readiness. He explained military responsiveness, security, and readiness and safety are all unacceptably compromised by the North Island concept.
- Col. Greg Goodman stated the Marine Corps opposes the use of any of the military installations in San Diego for a civilian joint-use airport. A joint-use airport at NAS North Island, MCB Camp Pendleton or MCAS Miramar would create unacceptable impacts to military operations. At Camp Pendleton, the military would need to re-arrange the radar approach from the southern end of the runway to the northern end which would require higher, non-standard radar approach altitudes. At Miramar, he explained the location of military facilities is driven by operations, and if the facilities were moved military training would be compromised. Also moving the facilities will create a Tier 1 health and safety risk for the residents of University City, Mira Mesa, Clairemont, and Tierrasanta. He stated the military has been conveying their position on the Airport Site Selection process since 2003.
- Mr. Richard Miller stated the San Diego Chapter of the Sierra Club opposes the future airport at the Campo Boulevard site. He believes the Sierra Club would also oppose the Imperial Desert site and NAS North Island site because they are not feasible. They are neutral about the MCB Camp Pendleton and MCAS Miramar site options. He is not convinced that Lindbergh could not continue to be the regional airport for San Diego and believes it has not been properly studied. He does not understand why the consultants added an all-civilian site at Miramar, but they did not apply those same assumptions to Lindbergh. He is reluctant to support joint-use at any of the military sites.
- RADM Paul Speer stated he feels Lindbergh needs to be examined with a fair and unbiased study. He believes the Airport Site Selection Analysis is biased against Lindbergh and that it needs to be reconsidered as an alternative. He believes there would be various problems associated with a joint-use scenario at Miramar due to the magnitude of the future airport if it is selected. He also explained airport delays can be kept to a minimum with proper management.

- Rick Alexander stated he supports a supplemental runway at Miramar and more specifically the southernmost runway in the proposal, and not impact military operations at Miramar. He feels strongly about not wanting the military to leave San Diego. He also believes we should maximize the capacity at Lindbergh as well as look at the best long term solution. He is opposed to using Brown Field or Palomar Airport as overload airports.
- Brian Gray stated the San Diego Taxpayers Association has not taken an official position on alternatives for the future airport sites, but feels the principles they identified have not been followed in the Airport Site Selection Analysis, and the analysis does not: optimize the current infrastructure, consider the military's perspective, disclose full costs for potential airport sites or consider the net economic impact of building a new airport. He feels the Advisory Committee needs to take a position on the Airport Site Selection Program and present it to the Airport Authority Board.
- Bill Figgy stated Caltrans has not taken an official position on the alternatives for the future airport sites, but it is ready to help resolve issues with the ground transportation for the new airport site. He believes all of the transportation components are part of the solution and we need to work with the military to reach the long term solution. He believes Lindbergh is not a first class facility at this time.
- Kelley Brown stated the airlines have not taken an official position on the alternatives for the future airport sites. He believes the Campo Boulevard and Imperial Desert sites are not feasible solutions given their distance from San Diego. He stated he appreciates the efforts of the staff and consultants on this project.
- Gail Naughton stated San Diego State University has not taken an official position on the alternatives for the future airport sites. She does believe SDSU may support a supplemental runway or civilian only airport at Miramar and has concerns about joint-use scenarios. She supports utilizing Lindbergh to its capacity, but also believes we need a truly international airport in order to continue to expand our bio-tech and high-tech industries in San Diego.
- Leon Williams stated he supports joint-use at Miramar, but believes the concerns of the military should not be ignored. He opposes Campo Boulevard, Imperial Desert and NAS North Island as potential airport sites. In 1969, he was a member of the San Diego City Council and they discussed a new airport. In the 1980s, when SANDAG confirmed San Diego needed to increase its contact with the Pacific Rim countries, the new airport concept came up again. In 1989, SANDAG recommended East Miramar and Brown Field as the only two feasible options for future airport sites. In 1990, when he was the Chairman of the San Diego Board of Supervisors, he recommended the development of East Miramar as a future airport site, but due to political agendas it was not approved. However, an admiral explained to him if Miramar was pursued it could work, but that the Mayor of San Diego would never say Miramar was available because it would imply the Navy was not interested in having aircraft carriers. He believes

we need to work together to make a decision in the best interest of the San Diego community and considers the military as part of that community. The Navy protects public safety, and we need economic viability in order to have something worth protecting. We need have the courage to figure out what we can do with the available space for a new airport. He feels we need to remove all personal agendas and make the best decision for the overall public welfare.

- Brad Barnum stated the AGC has not taken an official position on the alternatives for the future airport sites.

Summary of Committee Member Comments Regarding Site Selection:

- Two Committee members supported Lindbergh as an alternative for a future airport site.
- Five Committee members stated their organizations have not taken an official position on the potential airport sites at this time.
- Six Committee members supported joint-use at Miramar.
- Four Committee members opposed Imperial Desert and Campo Boulevard airport sites.
- Two members opposed the use of any military site as a future airport.

Note: Some Committee members did not comment on all topics.

ADJOURNMENT:

The Committee adjourned at 12:00 p.m. The next regular meeting will be held on Thursday, July 13, 2006 at 9:30 a.m. at the Sheraton San Diego Hotel & Marina, San Diego, CA 92101.

APPROVED BY A MOTION OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE THIS 13TH DAY OF JULY 2006.

ANGELA SHAFER-PAYNE
VICE PRESIDENT, STRATEGIC PLANNING

ATTEST:

TONY R. RUSSELL, DIRECTOR
CORPORATE SERVICES/
AUTHORITY CLERK