

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA



**ASSOCIATION of  
GOVERNMENTS**

**Main Office**

818 West Seventh Street

12th Floor

Los Angeles, California

90017-3435

t (213) 236-1800

f (213) 236-1825

[www.scag.ca.gov](http://www.scag.ca.gov)

**Officers**

President

Jon Edney, El Centro

First Vice President

Larry McCallon, Highland

Second Vice President

Pam O'Connor, Santa Monica

Immediate Past President

Richard Dixon, Lake Forest

**Executive/Administration  
Committee Chair**

Jon Edney, El Centro

**Policy Committee Chairs**

Community, Economic and  
Human Development  
Carl Morehouse, Ventura

Energy & Environment  
Keith Hanks, Azusa

Transportation  
Mike Ten, South Pasadena

Meeting of the

# AVIATION TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

**Thursday, April 22, 2010**

**10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.**

**Southern California Association of  
Governments**

**Policy Conference Room B**

**818 W Seventh Ave., 12<sup>th</sup> Floor**

**Los Angeles, CA 90017**

**213.236.1800**

If members of the public wish to review the attachments or have any questions on any of the agenda items, please contact Michael Armstrong at 213.236.1914 or [armstron@scag.ca.gov](mailto:armstron@scag.ca.gov)

Agendas and Minutes for the Aviation Technical Advisory Committee are also available at:

<http://www.scag.ca.gov/aviation/index.htm>

SCAG, in accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), will accommodate persons who require a modification of accommodation in order to participate in this meeting. If you require such assistance, please contact SCAG at (213) 236-1868 at least 72 hours in advance of the meeting to enable SCAG to make reasonable arrangements. To request documents related to this document in an alternative format, please contact (213) 236-1868.

# AVIATION TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

## **AGENDA**

PAGE # Time

*“Any item listed on the agenda (action or information may be acted upon at the discretion of the Committee”*

1.0 **CALL TO ORDER** Chris Kunze, ATAC Chair

2.0 **WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS** Chris Kunze, ATAC Chair

3.0 **PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD**

Members of the public desiring to speak on an agenda item or items not on the agenda, but within the purview of this committee, must notify the Chair and fill out a speaker’s card prior to speaking. Comments will be limited to three minutes and the Chair may limit the total time for comments to 20 minutes.

4.0 **CONSENT CALENDAR**

4.1 Approval of Meeting Minutes from February 25, 2010

4.2 ATAC Membership List and Contact Information Attachment

5.0 **PROJECT REVIEW**

None

6.0 **INFORMATION ITEMS**

6.1 Overview of Aviation and Airport Planning in the San Diego County Region Keith Wilschetz, Director of Planning San Diego County Regional Airport Authority 3 20 min.

6.2 Proposed Establishment of Long Beach Class C Airspace Area and Revision to Long Beach Class C Airspace Area Attachment Jack Kenton, Co-Chair Southern California Airspace Users Working Group 4 20 min.

6.3 Update on FAA Reauthorization Attachment Jeff Dunn SCAG Staff 8 15 min.

# AVIATION TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

## **AGENDA**

---

ITEM		PAGE #	Time
<b>6.0</b>	<b><u>INFORMATION ITEMS (CONT'D)</u></b>		
6.4	<u>Santa Monica Airport Health Impact Assessment</u>	<b>Bob Trimborn, Director Santa Monica Airport</b>	<b>10 min.</b>
6.5	<u>Regional Aviation Activity 2007-2009</u>	<b>Mike Armstrong</b>	<b>10 min.</b>
<b>7.0</b>	<b><u>ACTION ITEMS</u></b>		
7.1	<u>ATAC Recommendation on Methodology For Developing Updated Regional General Aviation Demand Forecasts for 2012 RTP Attachment</u>	<b>Mike Armstrong SCAG Staff</b>	<b>30 min.</b>
<b>8.0</b>	<b><u>AVIATION LEGISLATION REPORT</u></b>	<b>Mike Armstrong SCAG Staff</b>	<b>10 min.</b>
<b>9.0</b>	<b><u>MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS/ ANNOUNCEMENTS</u></b>		
<b>10.0</b>	<b><u>FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS</u></b>		
	Any committee members of staff desiring to place Items on a future agenda may make such a request. Comments should be limited to three minutes.		
<b>11.0</b>	<b><u>SET NEXT MEETING LOCATION</u></b>		
<b>12.0</b>	<b><u>ADJOURNMENT</u></b>		

---

Aviation Technical Advisory Committee  
February 25, 2010  
*Minutes*

---

**THE FOLLOWING MINUTES ARE A SUMMARY OF THE MINUTES OF THE AVIATION TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE. AN AUDIO CASSETTE TAPE OF THE ACTUAL MEETING IS AVAILABLE FOR LISTENING IN SCAG'S OFFICE.**

The Aviation Technical Advisory Committee of the Southern California Association of Governments held its meeting at John Wayne Airport, Eddie Martin Airport Administration Building, 3160 Airway Avenue, Costa Mesa CA. The meeting was called to order by Mr. Chris Kunze, ATAC Chair and Advisor, Long Beach Airport.

**ATAC Members Present:**

Gary Gosliga	March Inland Point Airport Authority
Chanelle B. Hawken	San Diego County Regional Airport Authority
Bill Ingraham	San Bernardino International Airport
Chris Kunze	Long Beach Airport
Rod Probst	Fullerton Municipal Airport
Kari Rigoni	John Wayne Airport (JWA)
Eileen Schoetzow	Los Angeles World Airports (LAWA) – Planning
Richard Smith	Los Angeles County Airports
Robert Trimborn	Santa Monica Airport

**Others Present:**

James Bryant	TSA/LAX
Dan Burkhart	NBAA
Michael Cook	Process Improvement Consulting
Keith Downs	Mead & Hunt, Inc.
Robert Holden	Los Angeles World Airports (LAWA)
Anthony Macias	AECOM
Doug Sachman	AECOM
Larry Serafini	John Wayne Airport (JWA)
Jagjit Singh	Ch2m Hill
F.G. 'Rick' Trummer	Ch2m Hill
Courtney Wiercioch	John Wayne Airport (JWA)
Mike Armstrong	SCAG
Mike Jones	SCAG

---

Aviation Technical Advisory Committee  
February 25, 2010  
*Minutes*

---

**1.0 CALL TO ORDER**

Chris Kunze, Chair, called the meeting to order.

**2.0 PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD**

There were no public comments.

**3.0 REVIEW and PRIORTIZE AGENDA ITEMS**

**4.0 CONSENT CALENDAR**

4.1 Approval Item

4.1.1 Minutes of February 25, 2009 Meeting

The minutes were approved with the following corrections made by Chris Kunze:

- 1) On Page 5, paragraph 2 – Change legal firm name to “McDermott, Will, and Emery”
- 2) On Page 5, paragraph 3 – Revise last sentence to delete last part. Revise sentence to read: “The Authority wants to re-commission a new Part 150 update.”

4.2 ATAC Membership List and Contact Information

The membership list was approved with the following corrections:

- 1) Per Chris Kunze, his title should be “Staff Advisor” (not “Manager”)
- 2) Per Bill Ingraham, the number listed as his fax number is actually his cell number. He does not have a fax number.

**5.0 PROJECT REVIEW - None**

**6.0 INFORMATION ITEMS**

6.1 Update on Proposed VNY Phase-Out of 77-85 dB Aircraft

Mike Armstrong remarked that the next day at 10:00 o’clock, the L.A. City Council would take up proposed ordinance for Van Nuys Airport that was originally approved by the LAWA Board of Airport Commissioners in May 2009. The ordinance is to

---

Aviation Technical Advisory Committee  
February 25, 2010  
*Minutes*

---

phase out the noisiest Stage 2 jets starting with 85 DB aircraft or noisier, and finally phasing our aircraft noisier than 77 DB by the year 2016.

LAWA can apparently do this since the original ordinance was adopted pre-1990 ANCA (Airport Noise Capacity Act), and was never acted on. The FAA has acknowledged the grandfathering in of the ordinance. The EIR for the proposed ordinance finds that the ordinance would result in retirement of some of the older, noisier jets; the retrofitting of some of the jets to make them quieter; and the remainder would be relocated to other airports including LAX, Bob Hope, Chino, Camarillo, and Fox Field. There would be air quality impacts associated with this relocation since some of the aircraft would relocate to different air basins that have nonattainment status, including: the Mojave Desert Air Basin and the South Central Coast Air Basin (that includes Ventura County).

Bob Holden of LAWA commented that they really don't know what's going to happen or have a sense of how the LA Council will act on this. The diversion airports were identified in the EIR process through a list of criteria as to why an aircraft would go from Van Nuys to whatever airport, including runway length, the availability of jet fuel, and existing noise restrictions that might prevent those kinds of operations. They also surveyed a number of aircraft operators in Van Nuys who would be affected by the phase-out, who responded that these are the airports that if they chose to divert that they would probably go to. Instead of diverting, many in the existing jet fleet will retrofit their aircraft to meet Stage 3 noise standards. Others may retire those aircraft and buy new ones. Some will divert--estimates are about three diversions per week.

Bob Trimborn asked how the process is going to work if the ordinance is adopted? Mr. Holden replied that if the ordinance is adopted by City Council, approved by the Mayor, and then survives anticipated third-party litigation, and any potential FAA-enforcement actions—any Stage 2 aircraft that falls within decibel levels (and these are certificated noise levels, not actual measurable noise) would not be allowed to operate in Van Nuys starting in 2011, because the anticipated ordinance was going to start in 2009 but analysis shows that there are no aircraft under that decibel level except for 727s and they've already been hush kitted to meet Stage 3 standards. So during the first two years of the phase out, no aircraft will be affected. Aircraft would start being affected in 2011, and that will be at Stage 3 decibels. If we an aircraft that is operating at Van Nuys that falls under a specific aircraft type whatever the age, it could be the source of an enforcement action by the City Attorney if they continue to operate at the Airport, and then they would be subject to potential fines and be banned by the airport.

Bob Trimborn asked if someone is flying cross country from Chicago to Van Nuys, and lands at 10:00 o'clock at night in a non-compliant aircraft, and sits there on the ramp until the morning, is that person going to be fined? How does it work?

---

Aviation Technical Advisory Committee  
February 25, 2010  
*Minutes*

---

Mr. Holden replied that they would document the case and submit a case to the City Attorney's office, and the City Attorney would actually do the enforcement—just like they do with the existing curfew at Van Nuys Airport. Van Nuys has an existing partial curfew that only affects departures. Arrivals are welcome at any time. But they do get occasional curfew violations and when our operations division in Van Nuys documents that an aircraft is in violation of the curfew, the case is written up and sent to the City Attorney, and the City Attorney does the enforcement—either sends an enforcement letter or actually begins the process of assessing fines.

Dan Burkhart asked assuming this ordinance passes, when do you anticipate implementation? The older implementation date was to start in January of 2009. Bob Holden replied the 85 decibel level doesn't affect any airplanes. The actual implementation level would start in 2011 at the 83 decibel level where there is some aircraft that would be captured under that decibel level. Chris Kunze added that the rule itself would be retroactive to 2009. You're just saying that it wouldn't have an impact? Mr. Holden replied it wouldn't have an impact because there are no aircraft covered under that decibel level. They've all be hush kitted to meet Stage 3 standards. There is only one based 727 aircraft that this would apply to, and it is hardly ever flown. It will be 2011 before the first level will kick in and aircraft will fall under the requirements of the ordinance.

Bob Trimborn asked if there would be any grandfathering in of any existing aircraft, to which Mr. Holden replied no.

Chris Kunze asked if LAWA they had received any shots across the bow from the FAA or any user groups or tenants? My Holden replied not from the FAA. In effect, the FAA acknowledged grandfathering under ANCA because the ordinance was not adopted in 1990. It was just proposed, and there was no action taken on the ordinance until the Board of Commissioners readopted the original resolution in 2006 and that started the process. They went back to the Board with some proposed amendments to the ordinance, exempting Stage 3 & 4 aircraft, and a few other exemptions like for historic aircraft, medical, emergency, and military aircraft. Privately owned military aircraft are exempted to a certain date, and then they will have to leave—such as some privately owned T38's.

Mike Armstrong asked how the ordinance could be grandfathered in, even though it was just proposed. Mr. Holden responded that is the language of ANCA and Pt. 161 regulations with respect to grandfathering. If you're dealing with a Stage 2 restriction, if the ordinance or restriction was proposed prior to the enactment of ANCA on Stage 2 aircraft, then it's grandfathered in. If it's a Stage 3 aircraft, it would have to have been adopted prior to ANCA. It's a fine point, but that's the wording of the law.

Chris Kunze asked if even with Stage 3, if you were in litigation at the time on the issue, then however that works out is exempt? Mr. Holden replied that is correct. Of

---

Aviation Technical Advisory Committee  
February 25, 2010  
*Minutes*

---

course the FAA in acknowledging the ANCA grandfathering would say that we still have to comply with Part 16 in grant assurances as well.

Bob Trimborn asked what about war birds like B-24's and 17's and 25's? Mr. Holden responded they would be allowed to fly in Van Nuys. We don't want to get rid of these classic war birds, they are exempt. If you drive Van Nuys Airport, you would see that it's a veritable aviation museum with classic war birds all over the Airport. They don't want to get rid of them because they don't make that much noise—not like a Lear 24 taking off. When they get complaints about those airplanes, it's not from arrivals and departures at Van Nuys, it's from people far away who are just flying around.

Dan Burkhart asked if he actually sees this being implemented retroactively as it is written? Mr. Holden replied that it would be effective, but there are no planes that would fall under the requirement. Even if there were, they would not fine anybody for something they did before enactment of the ordinance. The only aircraft would be Boeing 727's and they have all been hush kitted because they are over 175,000 pounds.

Dan Burkhart responded that if you start the implementation, let's say the new ordinance is effective tomorrow, then the timing of all this would be pushed back starting tomorrow. Mr. Holden replied that it would still start at 2009, our lawyers said that there's nothing wrong with that, because the universe of aircraft is there to be regulated. The FAA knew of this issue and still said we are grandfathered.

Chris Kunze asked Mr. Holden if he had a sense of the 77 dB, when you get to that in 2016, he said there would be three diversions per week—but are there any based aircraft now that would have to leave. Mr. Holden replied that he didn't have the figures for based aircraft right now, he did I have a number of operations that would—some Falcon 20's, and some of the Lears as well. Most of the effects come in 2014.

Dan Burkhart said that the NBAA has objected to this ordinance in writing. The recommending committee and also the City Council has the latest correspondence from them.

Rob Probst remarked that the beauty of having a 3000 foot runway at Fullerton Airport is that they don't have to deal with jets.

## 6.2 Overview of John Wayne Airport Construction Projects

Larry Serafini, John Wayne Airport started his presentation with some history of the project before getting into what is going on right now. Demand at JWA is starting to climb back up after falling off for a few years, which is why a expansion of terminal is needed. The original Settlement Agreement was amended to allow for the construction. There are a set of goals for the project, which include keeping costs per enplaned passenger the same as at the beginning. The new terminal (Terminal C) will have the

---

Aviation Technical Advisory Committee  
February 25, 2010  
*Minutes*

---

same look and feel as terminals A and B, even though some standards have been upgraded. At the beginning the total project cost was estimated at \$652 million over five years. After the economy tanked, costs came down to \$543 million. One Caltrans project is a seismic retrofit of the upper roadway, it is currently on hold because of the State's financial problems. Seismic safety factor to be used (1.5) goes beyond the State standard of 1.25.

(Mr. Serafini gave a visual presentation showing how the project will be constructed and how the finished project will look). The object-based design/electronic model (as opposed to CAD) allowed object "clash detection" to see where objects clashed with each other—it identified over 1200 items that would have been change orders later on in the design process, so they could be corrected before they were change orders. A four dimensional model was developed, adding as time factor to see how the building would be built over time. The model also provided a complete list of materials that would be needed. This information was made available to contractors in the pre-bid phase so they could use it in their bids, which came in at 60% of estimates (the bad economy helped a lot).

Also structures were designed at a 1.5 safety factor rather than the normal 1.25 factor. This was because of the assumption that in the event of a major disaster the terminal would become a triage center that would house and provide emergency aid for a lot of people.

The new terminal building, the first parking structure and new central plant are currently under construction. The new central plant has co-generation facilities that uses waste heat from the exhaust stack and increases efficiencies from 40% to 85-90% for making chilled water (40% of load). One of the interesting facets the terminal and parking structures is a relatively new system used for lateral bracing called a buckling restrained brace, which braces the whole length of the steel member through a tube or sheath built around the steel member. This system can increase loads on steel members by more than five times.

Bob Trimborn asked how new TSA requirements for EDS equipment were being factored into the designs. Mr. Serafini responded that TSA frequently changes their minds and so they build general and see what happens, they try to go ahead and do the right thing the best they can without waiting for TSA to make up their minds. They have doubled their screening capacity for passengers twice without TSA input.

A question was asked about displacing FedEx and UPS cargo operations. Mr. Serafini responded that they weren't displaced, they still operate off the ramps, but their trailers were move. A lot of airside users have had to play musical chairs to accommodate construction and that will continue until 2012. They are currently evaluating three major proposals submitted by three major vendors. The game plan is to do existing gates, then Terminal C, and then A & B.

---

Aviation Technical Advisory Committee  
February 25, 2010  
*Minutes*

---

Chris Kunze asked why there is a separate commuter terminal (at the end of the terminal) rather than being integrated. Mr. Serafini responded that it is a tradition to have the commuters out at the end. Mr. Kunze then asked about the timing of the Phase II parking capacity. Mr. Serafini responded that it will be built as required by future demand. Mr. Kunze then asked about the CPE prior to and after the improvements. Mr. Serafini responded that it will go from about eight to eleven. Lastly Mr. Kunze asked if TSA is putting up any money. Mr. Serafini replied that they just negotiated an OTA for some of the baggage, about \$6 million. Lastly Mr. Kunze asked if they had CBP approval for customs processing. Mr. Serafini replied that they just go a letter back from Governor, and getting ready for international service April 6.

6.3 Status of Chino Airport Smart Growth Project and Aviation Demand Modeling Work For the 2012 RTP

Mike Armstrong brought the committee up to date on these two projects. He announced that SCAG was hoping to have an RFP out for the Chino Airport Smart Growth demonstration in the near future. SCAG management has taken an interest in this project and wants to make sure that touch all the political bases are touched. SCAG recently had some meetings with Gary Ovitt's office, and has a meeting scheduled with Mike Williams of San Bernardino County Department of Airports. So far everything's looking good—SCAG received an enthusiastic response on the part of Gary Ovitt's office, which wants to position the airport as an economic engine for the County to help revive its economy, and they see this project as fitting into this objective. ATAC has officially nominated Chino Airport to be the first demonstration project for an airport smart growth project, consistent with the template for SCAG's Compass Blueprint demonstration projects that SCAG has been doing for some time.

The Chino Airport Master Plan Update has recently been initiated, so the timing works out really well. SCAG received a copy of the scope of services for the Master Plan Update and revised the scope of work for the Smart Growth Demonstration Project to be fully compatible with that. The division of responsibilities works out really nice. The master plan consultant, Coffman and Associates intend to evaluate development scenarios within airport area, so this project is going to concentrate on off-Airport development scenarios that are consistent with the on-airport scenarios. There might be some overlap and duplication, but there is wording in the scope of work in the RFP to make sure that the consultants coordinate to eliminate to the extent possible any duplication of work.

The project will have some "gee-whiz" visualization techniques including before and after "photo-morphing" showing the different development configurations. Also, video fly-throughs where you can zoom in from outer space and go down streets etc. Other possible visualizations in a virtual 3-D format include the noise contours, imaginary surfaces, and safety areas that Coffman will generate as part of the master plan update.

---

## Aviation Technical Advisory Committee

February 25, 2010

### *Minutes*

---

One of the main objectives of the Smart Growth Demonstration Project is to respect the designated restricted areas including the noise contours and safety areas that have appropriate land uses within and around them. The project will conduct a GIS inventory of the all the land uses and master plan and zoning designations in the airport service area, using the SCAG regional GIS inventory. The project will identify other areas that should be restricted as environmentally sensitive areas.

Another objective is to develop land use configurations and arrangements and development types that support the airport to the extent possible and strengthen the airport in terms of the various roles that are envisioned for the airport by the master plan. If it's a distinct corporate aviation role, land uses around the airport to support corporate activity, maybe support the museums as part of an overall tourist attraction. These are the kinds of things that will be examined by the demonstration project.

The project will also develop a package of environmental "best practices", and there will be a separate ground access analysis that will look at the ground access impacts in and around the service area. A package of ground access improvements will be recommended by the project. The RFP should be issued within a week and the project will run about a year.

Fortunately, because there is a master plan update underway that is being guided by a Planning Advisory Committee (PAC) made up of local jurisdictions, including the cities of Chino and Ontario and San Bernardino County, the PAC can be used for technical input and guidance for this project as well as ATAC. Besides ATAC and the Chino Airport Master Plan PAC, presentations will also be made to the City of Chino.

So far the project is looking very promising. We hope that this will be a successful project and the first of many in the future for other airports in the region.

Dan Burkhart commented that as a member of master plan PAC Committee, he attended the first meeting, is there any reason why SCAG staff couldn't be involved in or at least attend those meetings? Mike Armstrong replied that they probably should. Mr. Burkhart remarked that it would give staff a better understanding (rather than just reading the document) of some of the thought processes and problems involved. Chino Airport particularly has huge on-airport opportunities--lots of land, lots of future opportunities—something most airports just don't have. Marrying that with supporting aviation particularly corporate from off-airport should be an important part of that. It's a good opportunity and has a special relationship with Ontario and what's happening over there. Mike Armstrong replied that in fact the issue came up with SCAG management re who's on the Planning Committee, what jurisdictions do we need to touch bases with. We didn't know that they had started meetings of the PAC. Mr. Burkhart responded that they started it and it's going to be an 18-month study, and from his experience on these things it will probably be two years before they are done. The second meeting of the PAC is going to be late April or May. Mike Armstrong replied

---

Aviation Technical Advisory Committee  
February 25, 2010  
*Minutes*

---

that the end date for the SCAG project will be June 30, 2011, so the timeline should be consistent. SCAG staff will talk to Mike Williams to find out about the next PAC meeting.

Mike Armstrong then described the other main aviation project that SCAG will be initiating in the near future, an RFP should be out in a week or two. This is an update to our regional aviation demand forecasts for the 2012 Regional Transportation Plan. SCAG used to do an RTP every three years, now it's every four years. The last RTP was completed in 2008, so the next one is for 2012. The major charge of developing a new aviation element for the RTP is to update the demand forecast, but also to develop what's called an airport ground access element that takes the forecast and identifies ground access chokepoints around the major commercial airports, and proposes ground access improvements for those chokepoints. This should be a very interesting project because there are some major challenges. Over the last couple of years the activity trend has been downward. Some airports like Ontario have lost as much as 30% or more of their passengers and operations. Of course, we expect growth to rebound sometime in the future, but the question is when and how much and how strong the rebound is going to be. It's difficult to predict because over the last several years the trend has just been downward.

Mr. Armstrong added there are other challenges that need to be addressed in developing the new forecasts, including future fuel prices and future security challenges and how that might affect future aviation demand. Also the ongoing restructuring in the aviation industry, airlines have cut back flights and consolidated at fortress hubs. So there's a lot of stuff going on that we're going to have to factor into our new demand forecasts, including are these short-term negative trends going to have long-term consequences? That's going to be up to the consultant for this project to figure out.

One thing that ATAC may be pleased about is that the new regional aviation plan probably will probably not include the SCAG high-speed rail (Maglev) system, it will be replaced by the proposed State high-speed rail system. A major component of the study will be an assessment of how access to particular airports by high speed rail will affect their demand and also how the diversion of short haul demand to the State high speed rail system in the Northern/Southern California travel demand corridor will affect short haul forecasts for all commercial airports, including ones in San Diego. We're going to include (as we did last time) San Diego International and Palomar Airports in our forecast as well as Oxnard and Imperial, so all commercial airports in Southern California will be included.

A question as asked about whether SCAG was currently involved with high speed rail. Mr. Armstrong replied that SCAG is a party to a Memorandum of Understanding with SANDAG, the San Diego Airport Authority, the State High Speed Rail Authority, SANBAG, RCTC and a few other agencies to evaluate the long-term southern extension for the State High-Speed Rail project. It's called the "Los Angeles to San

---

## Aviation Technical Advisory Committee

February 25, 2010

### *Minutes*

---

Diego by way of Inland Empire” segment. It’s not the core segment, but the long-term extension from LA to San Diego. SCAG is a party of the MOU to evaluate that, and SCAG is responsible for the aviation demand modeling, which will be done by this project. Whether that Southern extension will ever be constructed is uncertain, at least the core State high-speed rail project does have some initial funding.

Mr. Armstrong added that as part of this project they will also evaluate other major currently funded or planned ground access projects to commercial airport including light and heavy rail and high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) lane linkages and extension into airports that could help decentralize the system. Potential new “Flyways”/remote terminals will also be evaluated, similar to the existing facilities at Van Nuys and Union Station. SCAG recently completed a Regional Remote Terminal Study that took an initial look of the effectiveness of various flyways around the region in helping to decentralize demand to suburban airports.

To help guide the airport ground access work for the 2012 RTP, SCAG will form an ATAC subcommittee with representation by the County Transportation Commissions. This subcommittee will review and give guidance to the ground access work including the kind of projects we should be looking at as part as of the modeling work, to be included in the various scenarios that that we will be developing. Mr. Armstrong asked the members if any of them were interested in participating on this ground access subcommittee, to please let him know.

Eileen Schoetzow asked if the Crenshaw line and the Greenline extensions to LAX would be included in the projects to be evaluated. Mr. Armstrong replied yes, we can look at those projects. LAX will be constrained to 78.9 MAP so these projects wouldn’t affect the demand distribution to LAX, but they probably would affect the passenger mode split to the airport. Ms. Schoetzow responded that there has been a big push from LA to get the Crenshaw Line connected to LAX versus the Greenline, and LAWA is working on that, the Mayor is pushing to get that done soon. Mr. Armstrong replies that SCAG could certainly look at how these projects would impact mode split to LAX. For past RTPs SCAG has developed trip tables for passengers originating from various transportation analysis zones that go to each airport and the routes they take and how they get there. Trip tables have been developed by time of day, by mode split, and by vehicle type. The trip tables are input to our Regional Travel Demand Model to assess general transportation impacts. SCAG has also developed detailed operational forecasts to supply to the South Coast Air Quality Management District for their AQMPs (Air Quality Management Plans). There are two new AQMPs that are upcoming, to be developed in 2012 for ozone and PM2.5, the new particulate standards, so that information is going to be very crucial for developing an emissions budget for aviation that the district will use for those AQMPs.

Chris Kunze asked what the time horizon will be for? Is it 2035?

---

## Aviation Technical Advisory Committee

February 25, 2010

### *Minutes*

---

MIKE ARMSTRONG: It's going to be 2040 this time. And the modeling work will run through September 2011, which is when we need to produce a draft 2012 RTP. We're going to be looking at 2020, 2030, and 2040 (**note: it has recently been decided that the time horizon will again be 2035 for consistency with new AQMPs**).

Chris Kunze then asked if general aviation will be part of your forecast, will it be part of the RTP, and will the new aviation plan address airspace capacity issues? Mike Armstrong replied that Mike Jones will talk about general aviation later in the meeting, that new general aviation forecasts will hopefully be integrated into the 2012 RTP. Several years ago SCAG attempted to address airspace issues with a regional airspace study, but the study didn't tell us much. The study basically said that with some airspace restructuring and reconfiguration that it didn't appear to be a problem. That was about as far as it went. One of the issues that did come out of that study was that if LAX goes much beyond 78 MAP it does create problems for airports like Santa Monica, Hawthorne, and Van Nuys. The other issue is that there does appear to be conflicts between Santa Bernardino International and Ontario. That would need to be worked out, but the study didn't get into specifics about that. The LAX Settlement Agreement is good until 2015, what happens after that, who knows. LAX is now down to about 56 MAP. At one time LAX was 68 MAP but we expect it to eventually recover. They probably won't reach 78 MAP before 2015, but in the future they could renegotiate the Settlement Agreement.

#### 6.4 Status of Updated General Aviation Forecasts for the 2012 RTP

Mike Jones of SCAG gave an update on new general aviation forecasts that are planned to be initiated next fiscal year. A couple of years ago SCAG started to gather some information about GA operations and at airports in the region. Unfortunately, we weren't about to finish it the way we wanted.

What SCAG would like to do this year is to initiate a follow up to that previous effort and gather some more data, something similar to what we did before. We'll use maybe a shorter survey. What we really want to focus on is getting some operations and other critical data that we will identify, and we may need to get your input on that data—what you think is most critical. But most importantly, our management has provided us with some budget funding to obtain a consultant next year to do the GA forecast. We're looking to get them to do some kind of modeling. We haven't done any kind of general aviation forecast work since 2002. It may be something as simple as a regression model, but at least it will be a start. And potentially we can have it become something iterative where we can gather data every year until we do the next big GA forecast in a few years from now, or whenever we can get money again.

SCAG will probably start this process on July 1, 2010. That's when the fiscal year begins, so we'll be working on the scope of work before then. We'll probably come to

---

Aviation Technical Advisory Committee  
February 25, 2010  
*Minutes*

---

you—to ATAC—over the next couple of months and ask a couple of you to serve on the proposal review committee. And of course, it will have to be consistent with whatever work is done as part of the bigger RTP effort with commercial airports and we'll have the same timeline where everything will have to be done by the Spring of 2012.

Mike Armstrong added that we need to do more than a simple regression analysis, perhaps some kind of pilot “age cohort” analysis because we understand that a lot of the recreational pilots are getting old and retiring. The younger pilots are not replacing them, because there is not a lot of VA pilot training going on and the younger generation seems to be not as interested as the World War II and Korean War pilot generation, and it's expensive. We also need to look at recreation versus corporate. Corporate seems to be a growing part of the general aviation, particularly with the new generation of corporate and very light jets that may make that segment of the market more accessible to companies. Another issue we should look at is the ongoing downward trend at airports. Do you say that these downward trends are going to continue? Are they going to zero out or when are they going to stabilize? These are the kind of issues that we want to look at.

Chris Kunze commented that this process will be interesting. From what he has read, no one really knows the future of general aviation 10, 30 years out. Dan Burkhart remarked that State of Ohio years ago had an initiative where every single county had a GA Airport. Lorraine County near Cleveland is broke and wants the FAA to take the airport back that the FAA put a lot of money into. We see this as a terrible threat and precedent if it were to occur. In this state sponsors are also having trouble

Mr. Armstrong responded that going back to the Chino Airport project, economic assessment is going to be key not only for the master plan update, but also our demonstration project. The master plan update is going to use an IMPLAN input/output model. They're going to look at some non-aviation uses, the impact on employment and payroll, and the dollars that are generated to the economy. We're going to do something very similar off-airport. There will be some overlap between the two efforts because visitor spending spills over outside of the Airport, so we're going to coordinate on that. If it's a successful project, we could look at the different alternatives and how it impacts the economy, including tax revenues to local governments. And we could perhaps identify some lessons learned, how some economic strategies could be employed at other general aviation airports (including non-aviation uses) to help support them, and make them more valuable to local governments.

Rob Probst added that in Fullerton this past December, the City had an audit done on the airport: what's the best and highest use? They spent thousands of dollars doing this audit until the City Council realized that closing the airport is not a local decision but a national decision since they are a reliever for John Wayne. The Council is looking at

---

Aviation Technical Advisory Committee  
February 25, 2010  
*Minutes*

---

every dollar, and if they sell the airport or have it privatized and contribute the general fund they would do it without hesitation in light of hundreds of city layoffs. Fullerton Airport is the only GA airport left in Orange County, and there are only three airports left in the county.

Bob Trimborn added that Santa Monica is at a historically low 11,000 ops, and the only reason their head is above water is because of our non-aviation revenues. By 2015 they will be able to take other properties on the airport that can generate more cash for the airport and they will be able to transfer some money downtown since they won't have the grant assurances any more, and won't be a drain on the general fund. Mr. Burkhart responded that all the value of the airport isn't just in the general fund, there are things you can't measure. The question is, how can we protect these assets? Mr. Trimborn responded that the FAA is going to have to revisit the whole concept of non-aviation land use. Mr. Burkhart replied that the FAA is on a rampage right now about non-aviation uses of hangars. Mr. Probst said that he told his City Council that he'll put anything in a hangar right now, he's got empty cars in hangars and construction companies storing extra equipment. If the FAA comes down and I'll tell them one hand, I've got aeronautical use and on the other hand, I'm supposed to be self-sufficient. Which do you want? You can get a lot more for cars.

Rich Smith noted that they've got non-aviation use in all of their airports—not just in those surplus hangars...we've got hundreds of hangars at our airports and when you're seeing vacancy rates of aircraft at upwards of 25%, you want to do something with those amortized assets. There are areas of airports—not just hangars—that are absolutely perfect for non-aeronautical uses. They are negotiating to have DWP put a million-dollar water tank at Whitman Airport. There's just a lot of these things that should be looked at through the master planning process.

Gary Gosliga noted that DHL was a once in a lifetime opportunity at March Inland Port. They would like to open the door for non-aviation uses but it must be in the tenant agreement to allow for non-aviation uses, but only for a temporary period of time.

Dan Burkhart commented that corporate has potential but is not going to have the kind of growth that will solve all these problems. Chris Kunze responded that this is an opportunity with some of these studies that we are doing to focus on some of the viability issues. The FAA (without any rule-making) has the ability to allow non-aeronautical uses. They granted us a 25 year exemption for a business park that needed additional parking, and we had to show them that there was no demand now or looking reasonably ahead into the future. After the 25 years—which is coming up real soon—it has to go back into aeronautical use, but we can go back and make another argument again. There is some flexibility there if we can build a case.

Mike Armstrong commented that if our forecast is credible we could help make that case. In terms of developing an RFP—which is not going to go out until the next fiscal

---

Aviation Technical Advisory Committee  
February 25, 2010  
*Minutes*

---

year—we definitely want to work closely with ATAC. Maybe there is some companion or parallel studies that we might think about in terms of what are the implications of the forecast in terms of land use availability, under-utilized facilities, and excess capacity.

#### 6.5 GAO Report on Regional Aviation Planning

Mike Armstrong overviewed the recently-release GAO report on regional aviation planning. This is a very interesting report that was requested by the Transportation Subcommittee by the U.S. House of Representatives. The charge was: to what extent Aviation System planning can help capacity-constrained airports in the country, particularly in terms of finding and utilizing, or facilitating the utilization of alternate airports to capacity-constrained airports. It references another study was done by the FAA (Fact 2) that identifies three airports in this region that are supposedly capacity constrained if plan improvements don't happen and the NextGen strategies aren't implemented. They include LAX, Long Beach, and John Wayne. But it is based on a 2007 analysis of unconstrained demand with no capacity constraints. The assumption is that locally adopted ordinances like you have at John Wayne might be overturned in the future.

There were five regions that were profiled in the country. This is one of those regions. GAO staff came and interviewed Mike Jones and himself personally. Mr. Armstrong thought that they reflected what they had to say about aviation system planning very well, and were very fair.

In a nutshell, the report says that the FAA guidance for system planning is not very well followed by the FAA in terms of how system planning is actually used and supported by the FAA. The guidance underscores the importance of continuous system planning, but the FAA's actual AIP funding process is not structured to prioritize it, and the funding support has been pretty sporadic. The report points out that SCAG has not received any system planning grants since 2005 even though we are the largest MPO in the country and the largest system in terms of airports and operations. But we place such importance on it that we have continued to fund system planning out of our general funds—our comprehensive planning grants—because we realize it's very important to our Regional Council, our elected officials, and it's an important element in the Regional Transportation Plan, so we continue to fund it whether or not we have FAA support.

The guidance also encourages the FAA to give priority to improving projects that are consistent with the various regional system plans, but in reality, the various FAA regions typically do not reflect their funding decisions on airport project improvements. They don't reflect the system plans in their funding decisions, nor do airports reflect system planning in their airport capital improvement programs. The notable exception is the New England region where the FAA is actually taking a lead role in the regional

---

## Aviation Technical Advisory Committee

February 25, 2010

### *Minutes*

---

aviation system plan along with the major airports in the region of Boston-Logan. Because of that the FAA now works very closely with airports through the region to develop the capital improvement plans that are consistent with the regional aviation system plan. The Western-Pacific region supports aviation system planning sporadically. They sometimes fund it, but it is usually “receive and file”—they don’t use it at all.

Finally, the report makes a couple of very interesting recommendations that I think are very supportive of system planning, that:

- 1) The Secretary of Transportation should direct the FAA Administrator to develop an FAA review process to ensure that system plans are consistent with FAA system plans and system planning guidance, and provide technical support to regional aviation system planners.
- 2) The FAA use its statutory authority to give priority to funding airport projects that are consistent with the regional aviation system plan.

So those are very key recommendations—very different from the way business has been conducted by the FAA over the last decade, particularly in the FAA Western-Pacific Region. So whether or not the House of Representatives and its Transportation Subcommittee takes this report to heart and follows up on its recommendations we’ll just have to wait and see.

Chris Kunze noted that the Fact 2 FAA people also talked to Long Beach and John Wayne and took their comments and included them in the document in places where no one would ever see them, and what people do see are photos of these airports as among those in the US that need additional capacity. He also said he agree with the conclusions of the GAO report, especially the bottoms/up approach should be consistent with the top/down approach, nothing is going to happen if it isn’t realistic.

There was some further discussion of LAWA’s attitude re aviation system planning, noting that there are current explorations underway of privatizing Ontario and Van Nuys (which don’t pay for themselves), and the operating permit for Palmdale has been relinquished. There is also a proposal for a solar energy farm for the 17,700 acres that LAWA owns at Palmdale. Mr. Armstrong commented that one of the objectives of the next aviation system plan for the 2012 RTP should be how to get Ontario Airport off life support. Eileen Schoetzow noted that LAWA is planning for both local and rapid Gold Line service to Ontario Airport, with an air/rail transfer system, so that should help Ontario Airport.

#### 6.6 Preliminary Investigation – Disaster Recovery (Caltrans Division of Research and Innovation)

---

Aviation Technical Advisory Committee  
February 25, 2010  
*Minutes*

---

Mike Armstrong remarked that several weeks ago he received an interesting call from Colette Armao from the State Division of Aeronautics about the fact that they had requested an agency called Caltrans Division of Research and Innovation to do a preliminary investigation into the potential role of general aviation airports in a disaster response and recovery effort. Their initial focus was on the Bay Area since the AMBAG had requested something like this. She asked if this would be applicable to Southern California, and Mr. Armstrong replied of course.

Mr. Armstrong noted that he had participated in some USGS workshops as part of the “Great Southern California Shakeout” simulating a major event on the southern San Andreas. USGS is predicting a 37% probability of a magnitude 7.5 or greater earthquake in Southern California over the next 30 years, and a 67% probability of magnitude 6.7 or greater in the next 30 years. The recent earthquake in Haiti was 7.0. So basically there is about a 50% probability that we’re going to have an earthquake like the one they recently had in Haiti over the next 30 years. That’s a pretty high probability, and it’s not a matter of if but when.

Mr. Armstrong noted that recent simulations that USGS has done as part of the “Great Southern California Shakeout” indicate that there’s going to be major transportation and utility system failure. We’re going to see freeway collapses. We’re going to see breaks in water systems, food delivery systems. It will be very difficult to get around, very difficult to get food or water for a period of time—up to months. The USGS is also predicting thousands of injured. It’s going to be very difficult to get those injured people to hospitals—they’re going to be overburdened in many cases, and many hospitals are also forecast to suffer a lot of structural damage. It’s going to be very difficult to get the injured to the hospitals.

There certainly could be a very important role for airports in such an event in serving as emergency facilities and bringing in emergency service workers and supplies, and helping to evacuate the injured to available facilities outside the region. There used to be an Office of Emergency Response at the state level and they did some planning for general aviation airports. But typically, this was after the Northridge earthquake, an immediate flurry of interest that typically dies out over time.

The Preliminary Investigation showed that very few regions have incorporated general aviation airports in their disaster planning. The only two states that routinely do it are Florida and Minnesota. Florida, obviously because of the hurricanes, but why Minnesota does it, Mr. Armstrong had no idea (they don’t have earthquakes). California does not do it, although there is some guidance—the California Pilots Association (CPA) developed a handbook on disaster preparedness and how general aviation airports might fit into that.

Mr. Armstrong commented that SCAG will have a follow-up conference call with Colette and some other people next week—himself and Alan Thompson from SCAG

---

## Aviation Technical Advisory Committee

February 25, 2010

### *Minutes*

---

(he used to be an aviation planner; now he's involved in safety issues). Hopefully, there going to do some follow up work for general aviation airports. It's another potential non-aeronautical use for airports that to Mr. Armstrong was very obvious.

Dan Burkhart added that The Haiti catastrophe is an example of that. Business aviation, general aviation has been a huge contributor to relief activities over there. And if you go to web site: nbaa.org, you get several stories that we've had. Massive contributions of airplanes like G5's, G flight 50's, Caravans, lighter airplanes, fractionals, etc. All these companies and all these individuals have sent these airplanes to support this tragedy in the effort to help folks. So we would have to assume we would have the same kind of support in this stage should we have an earthquake, so that's another reason to have these airports available in the event that we do.

Mike Armstrong responded that he thought there should be a follow-up effort to identify the different capabilities at general aviation reports. What kind of facilities they have and ability to do emergency response and evacuation. He asked if anyone had any ideas about that let him know. Chris Kunze said that there will be a meeting in Sacramento on the March 10<sup>th</sup>, the TACA—the Technical Advisory Committee on Aeronautics of the California Transportation Commission. So if Aeronautics is looking at this and they have done this study, then normally this SEMS System --Standards for Emergency Management Systems, when there is a disaster, it automatically happens. For areas that were directly involved, they would be working with other counties and they would call in their airport people to learn about the status of the airports, but there could be some things that could really facilitate that in terms of maybe some manuals that everyone would have that would answer all the questions that people would have other than the current status of that facility. Mr. Kunze mentioned that he could bring that up and find out what the Aeronautics is doing with this information and maybe encourage them and report back at the next meeting. But it seems like they should be leading the effort to coordinate this, and then ATAC could play a part for this region.

#### 6.7 Revisions to Lead Ambient Air Monitoring Requirements

Chris Kunze announced that the EPA is proposing a change in the threshold requirements for lead monitoring, and they were taking comments until sometime last week. What they are proposing to do would have an impact on several airports in our region here: Van Nuys, Long Beach, John Wayne, Brackett, and Camarillo.

The standard that they listed in their notification is one ton per year in terms of lead emissions from a fixed source, and they are looking at certain airports as being from a fixed source, and they are looking at modifying that to half that amount: 0.5 which would include these other airports I just mentioned locally. We commented on that saying—and Bob Trimborn has been very helpful in terms of studies they have done, focusing on Santa Monica Airport. What EPA has done—and not because they

---

## Aviation Technical Advisory Committee

February 25, 2010

### *Minutes*

---

necessarily want to, they have been forced by some claims in court that required them to re-look at these standards. But for Long Beach, for example, they are using a cookie-cutter approach, looking at total estimated prop aircraft operations—and they use 2002 data. Long Beach had about a 30% drop in those types of operations since 2002, so we're saying without naming specific airports, they to take another look at that amount.

Mr. Kunze commented that at Long Beach Airport sales of avgas, the leaded gasoline, from 2002 to last year went down 49%, and that's what causing the lead emissions according to their assumptions which would take us out of that top 55 airports that need to have live monitoring done of lead. You can imagine going out to your neighborhood and saying, "we need to put lead poison monitors all around the airport here." There are a lot of other things that make their modeling assumptions inaccurate, they don't look at specifics of an airport. Again, Bob has done a lot of work there. They have one runway and they have homes right across the street—within 300-500 feet at the end of the runway. Also aircraft that go through configurations that produce the highest emissions and also things like taxi dwell times, they use 16 minutes. And there's certain airports have multiple runways and easy access to FBO's, so that's double the amount that is should be.

Long Beach has commented on that and Mr. Kunze was sure a lot of others did as well. They are hoping the worst case would be Air Quality Management District works with EPA, and they improve the modeling so they can look at some of these factors to make it more realistic for these airports. But having live monitoring—SCAQMD would probably not do it themselves. They would probably enact a rule that says the airports have to do it which would be very expensive and would not be good for community relations to do that even though we say it's not relevant here. Long Beach just spent a million dollars on an EIR in human health risk assessment. They just did all of that through modeling, and found out that we are way, way below these threshold levels and for many reasons that weren't considered in this over all model that EPA looked at old data.

Bob Trimborn added that they worked with the EPA last year. They came to Santa Monica Airport to do a lead modeling study of the airport—a follow up to our AQMD study they did a few years back. The good new is that even as constrained as the airport and how busy they have been in the past, the emissions from the airport just off the airport did not exceed national ambient standards for lead even with much tighter standards (ten-fold decrease in threshold standard). Aircraft are federally-regulated and the city has no control over fuel standards. So the local airport operator has no control over the emissions from these aircraft. Also, EPA took fuel samples delivered to the airport and found that lead content of the fuel exceeded ASTM standards by 20%. If they dropped the fuel content down to the ASTM standards there would be no exceedences, even on the airport. The public received this report fairly well.

---

Aviation Technical Advisory Committee  
February 25, 2010  
*Minutes*

---

8.0 AVIATION LEGISLATION REPORT

Mike Jones commented that there's nothing that is really that new that Phil Crimmins didn't cover at the last meeting. The legislative session ended last Friday (you can look at the attachments that we put on the table.) AB X-410 is an old bill which basically took \$4 million from the aeronautics fund. There's not too much that's new. Members can send any questions to us.

Dan Burkhart noted that there is a bill introduced on 2/19, which is ABA 2460. It's not directed at aviation, but if it's enacted it would do away with like-kind exchanges (1031 exchanges) on all heavy equipment—real estate and everything. They are looking for more tax money. So this bill encompasses a huge tax bill. The lifetime exchange would change the way you would be able to sell and buy an airplane like an exchange—to defer or exempt taxes. We think that business would effectively move these airplanes out of the state. We would then lose the use taxes and the other local taxes that we get. It's just something to aware of.

9.0 MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS/ANNOUNCEMENTS – None

10.0 FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

Chris Kunze noted that the TSA presentation by John McMullen had been deferred. I don't know where that original contact came from, but he did want to meet with GA airport operators and thought that ATAC might be a good medium. James Bryant responded that he was supposed to meet on that one day, and something came up, but he did meet Bob Trimborn and others. Mr. Bryant tried contacting him a week ago to see if he'd be interested in coming out here, but his schedule is filled up. We'll try to meet with him to see what his schedule is like for another time.

Richard Smith noted that the LA County consultant AECOM finished the Whiteman Airport master plan update that could be agendized for a future meeting. Mike Armstrong also said that they could put together some preliminary concepts for general aviation forecasting for the next meeting.

11.0 SET NEXT MEETING LOCATION

The next meeting in April will be at the SCAG offices in Downtown Los Angeles

## AVIATION TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE PHONE/FAX/E-MAIL LIST

Last Update: 4/15/2010

<b>MEMBERS:</b>						
<b>Last Name</b>	<b>First Name</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>	<b>Phone Number</b>	<b>Fax Number</b>	<b>E-Mail</b>
Arrellano	Yazmin	Director of Public Works	City of Brawley	(760) 344-9222	(760) 344-0907	<a href="mailto:yazmin.arellano@cityofbrawley.com">yazmin.arellano@cityofbrawley.com</a>
Birdsall	Stephen	Director of Airports	Imperial County	(760) 355-7944	(760) 355-2485	<a href="mailto:stephenbirdsall@imperialcounty.net">stephenbirdsall@imperialcounty.net</a>
Birk	Selena	Airport Manager	Van Nuys Airport	(818) 785-8838 x211	(818) 908-5963	<a href="mailto:sbirk@lawa.org">sbirk@lawa.org</a>
Blanchard	Bill	Planning Director	Cable Airport	(909) 518-4662	(909) 920-3608	<a href="mailto:bblbb@adelphia.net">bblbb@adelphia.net</a>
Dan	Burkhart	Director, Regional Programs	NBAA	(760) 749-6303	(760) 695-8755	<a href="mailto:dburkhart@nbaa.org">dburkhart@nbaa.org</a>
Castillo	Ruben		Blythe Airport	(760) 921-7812	(760) 921-7812	
Cobb	Bill	Airport Manager	Corona Municipal Airport	(909) 736-2289	(909) 279-3593	<a href="mailto:billc@ci.corona.ca.us">billc@ci.corona.ca.us</a>
Cox	Bill	Airport Manager	Chemehuevi Airport	(760) 858-5322	(760) 858-5400	<a href="mailto:tribe@sitlink.net">tribe@sitlink.net</a>
Crimmins	Phil		Caltrans Aeronautics	(916) 654-6223		<a href="mailto:Phillip.crimmins@dot.ca.gov">Phillip.crimmins@dot.ca.gov</a>
DeMel	Rick	Airport Manager	Yucca Valley Airport	(760) 360-9665	(619) 228-1234	<a href="#">no email yet</a>
Doiron	Leo	Airport Manager	Flabob Airport	(951) 683-2309	(909) 687-0113	<a href="mailto:leo_flabob@sbcglobal.net">leo_flabob@sbcglobal.net</a>
Dykas	Richard	Supervisor	FAA, Western Pacific Region	(310) 725-3613	(310) 297-0044	<a href="mailto:richard.dykas@faa.gov">richard.dykas@faa.gov</a>
Estrada	Luis	Airport Manager	Calexico International Airport	(760) 768-2175	(760) 357-0739	<a href="mailto:lestradas@yahoo.com">lestradas@yahoo.com</a>
Field	Rob	Airport Manager	Chiriaco Summit/French Valley Arpt	(951) 343-5493	(760) 863-5251	
Godown	Brett	Assistant Manager	Compton Airport	(310) 631-8140	(310) 762-9801	<a href="mailto:bgodown@americanairports.net">bgodown@americanairports.net</a>
Gosliga	Gary	Airport Director	March Joint Powers Authority	(951) 656-7000	(951) 653-5558	<a href="mailto:gosliga@marchjpa.com">gosliga@marchjpa.com</a>
Hardyment	Mark	Assistant Director	Bob Hope Airport	(818) 840-8840		<a href="mailto:mhardyment@bur.org">mhardyment@bur.org</a>
Ingraham	William	Aviation Director	San Bernardino Co. Airports/ SBIA	(909) 382-4100 X 251	(909) 382-4106	<a href="mailto:bingraham@sbdairport.com">bingraham@sbdairport.com</a>
Jenkins	James	Assistant Director	San Bernardino Co. Airports	(909) 387-8816		<a href="mailto:jjenkins@airports.sbcounty.gov">jjenkins@airports.sbcounty.gov</a>
Kirshner	Barry	Airport Owner	Agua Dulce Airpark	(661) 268-7648	(661)268-7662	<a href="mailto:Barry@aguadulceairpark.com">Barry@aguadulceairpark.com</a>
Klemm	Richard	Airport Manager	Brawley City	(760) 344-4581	(760) 344-4539	<a href="mailto:richardklemm@hotmail.com">richardklemm@hotmail.com</a>
Kunze	Christopher	Manager	Long Beach Airport	(562) 570-2605	(562) 570-2601	<a href="mailto:chkunze@ci.long-beach.ca.us">chkunze@ci.long-beach.ca.us</a>
Leblow	Loan	Asst. Airport Director	John Wayne Airport	(949) 252-5192	(949) 252-5178	<a href="mailto:lleblow@ocair.com">lleblow@ocair.com</a>
Lightner	Dick	General Manager	Big Bear City Airport	(909) 585-3219	(909) 585-2900	<a href="mailto:dick@bbv.net">dick@bbv.net</a>
Lin	Shelly	Airport Manager	City of Hawthorne Airport	(310) 970-7215	(310) 970-7075	<a href="mailto:hhairport@earthlink.net">hhairport@earthlink.net</a>
Lloyd	Stephen J.	Manager, Air Traffic Ops	FAA, Western Pacific Region	(310) 725-6530	(310) 725-6820	<a href="mailto:stephen.lloyd@faa.gov">stephen.lloyd@faa.gov</a>
McNamee	Todd	Director of Airports	County of Ventura, Department of Ai	(805) 388-4200	(805) 388-4366	<a href="mailto:todd.mcnamee@ventura.org">todd.mcnamee@ventura.org</a>
Moritz	Paul	Airport Manager	Catalina Island Airport	(310) 510-0143	(310) 510-3509	<a href="mailto:pmoritz@catalinaconservancy.org">pmoritz@catalinaconservancy.org</a>

## AVIATION TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE PHONE/FAX/E-MAIL LIST

Last Update: 4/15/2010

<b>MEMBERS: Page 2</b>						
<b>Last Name</b>	<b>First Name</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>	<b>Phone Number</b>	<b>Fax Number</b>	<b>E-Mail</b>
Neseth	Eric	Airport Manager	Salton Sea Airport	(562) 434-5594		
Perez	Paul G.	Regional Plng	Caltrans	(213) 897-1731	(213) 897-1337	<a href="mailto:paul_g_perez@dot.ca.gov">paul_g_perez@dot.ca.gov</a>
Powell	Jim		TDG	(808) 280-6047		<a href="mailto:jim@dgtraining.com">jim@dgtraining.com</a>
Propst	Rod	Airport Manager	Fullerton Municipal Airport	(714) 738-6323	(714) 738-3112	<a href="mailto:rodp@ci.fullerton.ca.us">rodp@ci.fullerton.ca.us</a>
Richardson	Park W.	Airport Manager	Hi Desert Airport	(760) 366-2281		
Rigoni	Kari	Airport Planner	John Wayne Airport	(949) 252-5284	(949) 252-5178	<a href="mailto:KRigoni@ocair.com">KRigoni@ocair.com</a>
Rivera	Jens	Airport Manager	Ontario Int'l. Airport	(909) 937-2710	(909) 937-2702	<a href="mailto:jrivera@lawa.org">jrivera@lawa.org</a>
Rowena	Mason	Airport Manager	Santa Paula Airport	(805) 933-1155	(805) 933-1155	<a href="mailto:rowenaszp@yahoo.com">rowenaszp@yahoo.com</a>
Santos	Barbara	Executive Director	Riverside County Airports	(951) 343-5493	(909) 688-6873	<a href="mailto:bsantos@rivcoeda.org">bsantos@rivcoeda.org</a>
Scanlan	Richard	Airport Manager	Rialto Muni/Art Scholl Memorial	(909) 820-2622	(909) 820-2598	<a href="mailto:rscanlan@rialtoca.gov">rscanlan@rialtoca.gov</a>
Schneider	Gerd	Airport Manager	Hesperia Airport	(760) 948-1177	(760) 948-1177	
Schoetzow	Schoetzow	City Planning Associate	LAWA	(424) 646-5190	(424) 646-5066	<a href="mailto:eschoetzow@lawa.org">eschoetzow@lawa.org</a>
Smith	Michael	President	Bermuda Dunes Airport	(760) 345-2558	(760) 345-4615	<a href="mailto:uddmike@aol.com">uddmike@aol.com</a>
Smith	Richard	Chief	LA County Aviation Division	(626) 300-4602	(626) 282-1365	<a href="mailto:rsmith@dpw.lacounty.gov">rsmith@dpw.lacounty.gov</a>
Smith	Tahirih	District 7	Caltrans	(213) 897-1347	(213) 897-1337	<a href="mailto:tahirih_n_smith@dot.ca.gov">tahirih_n_smith@dot.ca.gov</a>
Soderquist	Peter	Airport Director	Southern California Logistics	(760) 243-1900	(760) 243-1929	<a href="mailto:psoderquist@ci.victorville.ca.us">psoderquist@ci.victorville.ca.us</a>
Taylor	Bonnie	Transportation Assistant	FAA Western Pacific Region	(310) 725-3900	(310) 725-3999	<a href="mailto:bonnie.taylor@faa.gov">bonnie.taylor@faa.gov</a>
Toor	Paul	Director of Public Works	City of Banning	(909) 922-3130	(909) 922-3128	<a href="mailto:cobpw@earthlink.net">cobpw@earthlink.net</a>
Trimborn	Bob	Airport Manager	Santa Monica Airport	(310) 458-8591	(310) 391-9996	<a href="mailto:bob-trimborn@ci.santa-monica.ca.us">bob-trimborn@ci.santa-monica.ca.us</a>
Volk	Christopher	Army Representative	FAA, Western Pacific Region	(310) 725-3909	(310) 725-3915	<a href="mailto:christopher.volk@faa.gov">christopher.volk@faa.gov</a>
Williams	Mike	Director of Airports	County of San Bernardino, Department of Airports	(909) 387-8816	(909) 387-8815	<a href="mailto:mwilliams@airports.sbcounty.gov">mwilliams@airports.sbcounty.gov</a>
Zehr	Steve	Asst. Director of Aviation	Palm Springs International Airport	(760) 318-3800	(760) 318-3815	<a href="mailto:stevez@ci.palm-springs.ca.us">stevez@ci.palm-springs.ca.us</a>
Zucker	Marty	Business Manager	Zamperini Field Airport	(310) 784-7911	(310) 784-7930	

### SCAG STAFF:

Armstrong	Michael	Aviation Progam Mgr.	SCAG	(213) 236-1914	(213) 236-1963	<a href="mailto:armstron@scag.ca.gov">armstron@scag.ca.gov</a>
Jones	Mike	Associate Planner	SCAG	(213) 236-1978	(213) 236-1963	<a href="mailto:jonesm@scag.ca.gov">jonesm@scag.ca.gov</a>

for review of the denial under the part 67 medical standards. A denial of a special issuance certificate may be appealed to an appropriate United States court of appeals.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Susan S. Caron, Enforcement Division, AGC-300, 800 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20591; [susan.caron@faa.gov](mailto:susan.caron@faa.gov).

Issued in Washington, DC, on March 30, 2010.

**J. Randolph Babbitt,**  
*Administrator.*

[FR Doc. 2010-7658 Filed 4-2-10; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910-13-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Federal Highway Administration

#### Cancellation of Environmental Impact Statement: Clackamas County, OR

**AGENCIES:** Federal Highway Administration, Oregon Department of Transportation, and Clackamas County, Oregon.

**ACTION:** Cancellation of notice of intent for Harmony Road EIS.

**SUMMARY:** The FHWA is issuing this notice of cancellation to advise the public that we are no longer lead Federal Agency for preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the proposed Harmony Road project in Clackamas County, Oregon. This is formal cancellation of the notice of intent that was published in the **Federal Register**, Volume 72, Number 67, on Monday, April 9, 2007. The project is now cancelled; therefore, no further project activities will occur.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Michelle Eraut, Environmental Program Manager, Federal Highway Administration, 530 Center Street, NE., Suite 100, Salem, Oregon 97301, Telephone: (503) 587-4716.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The notice of intent to prepare an EIS was for proposed improvements to the transportation system in the SE Harmony Road corridor, from SE 82nd Avenue to State Highway 224 (approximately 1.5 miles). The notice of intent to prepare an EIS is rescinded.

**Authority:** 23 U.S.C. 315.

Issued on: March 26, 2010.

**Michelle Eraut,**  
*Environmental Program Manager, Salem, Oregon.*

[FR Doc. 2010-7589 Filed 4-2-10; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910-22-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Federal Aviation Administration

#### Proposed Establishment of Long Beach, CA, Class C Airspace Area and Revision of Santa Ana (John Wayne), CA, Class C Airspace Area; Public Meetings

**AGENCY:** Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

**ACTION:** Notice of public meetings.

**SUMMARY:** This notice announces two fact-finding informal airspace meetings to solicit information from airspace users and others, concerning a proposal to establish Class C airspace at Long Beach, CA, and revise the Santa Ana (John Wayne) Class C airspace area, CA. The purpose of these meetings is to provide interested parties an opportunity to present views, recommendations, and comments on the proposal. All comments received during these meetings will be considered prior to any issuance of a notice of proposed rulemaking.

**DATES:** The informal airspace meetings will be held on Tuesday, June 22, 2010, and Wednesday, June 23, 2010. Meetings will run from 6 p.m. until 9 p.m. Comments must be received on or before July 31, 2010.

**ADDRESSES:** The meetings will be held at the Holiday Inn Hotel (Conference Center) Long Beach Airport, 2640 North Lakewood Blvd., Long Beach, CA 90815.

*Comments:* Send comments on the proposal, in triplicate, to: Clark Desing, Operations Support Group, AJV-W2, Western Service Area, Air Traffic Organization, Federal Aviation Administration, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, WA 98057.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Francie Hope, Operations Support Group, Western Service Area, Air Traffic Organization, Federal Aviation Administration, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, WA 98057; telephone: (425-203-4500).

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### Meeting Procedures

(a) The meetings will be informal in nature and will be conducted by one or more representatives of the FAA Western Service Area. A representative from the FAA will present a briefing on the planned Class C airspace areas. Each participant will be given an opportunity to deliver comments or make a presentation, although a time limit may be imposed. Only comments concerning the plan to establish the Long Beach Class C airspace or the revision of Santa

Ana (John Wayne), CA, Class C airspace area will be accepted.

(b) The meetings will be open to all persons on a space-available basis. There will be no admission fee or other charge to attend and participate.

(c) Any person wishing to make a presentation to the FAA panel will be asked to sign in and estimate the amount of time needed for such presentation. This will permit the panel to allocate an appropriate amount of time for each presenter. These meetings will not be adjourned until everyone on the list has had an opportunity to address the panel.

(d) Position papers or other handout material relating to the substance of these meetings will be accepted. Participants wishing to submit handout material should present an original and two copies (3 copies total) to the presiding officer. There should be additional copies of each handout available for other attendees.

(e) These meetings will not be formally recorded. However, a summary of comments made at the meetings will be filed in the docket.

#### Agenda for the Meetings

- Sign-in.
- Presentation of Meeting Procedures.
- Informal Presentation of the planned Class C Airspace areas.
- Public Presentations and Discussions.
- Closing Comments.

Issued in Washington, DC, on March 31, 2010.

**Paul Gallant,**

*Acting Manager, Airspace and Rules Group.*

[FR Doc. 2010-7652 Filed 4-2-10; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910-13-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Federal Aviation Administration

#### Eighth Meeting: Joint RTCA Special Committee 213: EUROCAE WG-79: Enhanced Flight Vision Systems/Synthetic Vision Systems (EFVS/SVS)

**AGENCY:** Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

**ACTION:** Notice of Joint RTCA Special Committee 213: EUROCAE WG-79: Enhanced Flight Vision Systems/Synthetic Vision Systems (EFVS/SVS).

**SUMMARY:** The FAA is issuing this notice to advise the public of a meeting of Joint RTCA Special Committee 213: EUROCAE WG-79: Enhanced Flight Vision Systems/Synthetic Vision Systems (EFVS/SVS).

**DATES:** The meeting will be held April 27-29, 2010. Sign-in: 8:30 a.m. (0830)

# Senate Faces Challenging House Conference on FAA Reauthorization Bill

**Posted:** March 23rd, 2010 10:16 AM EDT

**By Geof Koss, CQ Staff**Congressional Quarterly Today

The Senate voted 93-0 Monday night to pass the FAA reauthorization bill, setting up what are expected to be difficult conference negotiations with the House over competing legislation.

"It's not going to be an easy one," Kay Bailey Hutchison of Texas, the ranking Republican on the Senate Commerce, Science and Transportation Committee, said of the forthcoming conference. "The differences are pretty big."

The bill (HR 1586), which would authorize about \$34.1 billion for the FAA through fiscal 2011, would impose new air safety requirements and restrictions on carriers to prevent lengthy tarmac delays. It would expedite the transition to the modernized air traffic control system known as "NextGen" and increase the general aviation jet tax fuel to 36 cents per gallon from the current rate of 21.9 cents per gallon.

Prior to final passage, the chamber adopted by voice vote a manager's package of aviation amendments negotiated off the Senate floor by Commerce Chairman John D. Rockefeller IV, D-W.Va., Hutchison and others.

Senators agreed to continue discussing one of the thorniest issues that had delayed the bill last week -- so-called slots and perimeter restrictions affecting long-distance flights in and out of Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport, about four miles from the Capitol. Current law restricts the number of flights at the airport, with only 24 permitted each day to go beyond a 1,250-mile perimeter.

'Inconvenient and Discriminatory'

The restriction, which irks many Western lawmakers, means that many flights must land at Dulles International Airport, about 27 miles west of the Capitol. "Obviously, this is inconvenient and discriminatory," said Arizona Republican Jon Kyl.

A compromise amendment by John Ensign, R-Nev., would have allowed carriers with existing slots at Reagan National to convert up to 15 round trips to routes beyond the 1,250-mile perimeter. However, Ensign withdrew the amendment after Virginia Democrats Jim Webb and Mark Warner, in whose state both airports are located, agreed to continue talks on the matter prior to the House-Senate conference.

Lawmakers from Virginia and Maryland oppose expanding flights at the airport because of noise and traffic concerns, but changes to the rule contained in the House bill (HR

915) mean that additional flights are likely to be allowed by the final bill. The House bill would allow 10 additional flights from Reagan National to destinations exceeding the 1,250-mile perimeter while requiring a reduction of shorter flights by the same number.

Another contentious issue the conference committee will have to resolve is a provision in the House bill that could make it easier for workers at FedEx to unionize. The change, which is opposed by FedEx but supported by its chief rival, UPS, would allow most FedEx employees to organize locally.

Republican Sens. Lamar Alexander and Bob Corker of Tennessee, where FedEx is a major employer, are vowing to fight the House language in conference. They initially delayed the Senate FAA debate over the matter before lifting their holds.

Additionally, conferees will have to resolve a dispute over whether passenger fees can be used by airports to fund bicycle storage. Such fees could be used to build bike storage facilities under the House bill, thanks to language by Transportation and Infrastructure Chairman James L. Oberstar, D-Minn., who is an avid cyclist. However, the Senate bill includes a provision by John McCain, R-Ariz., that would block the funds from being used for bike storage.

Passage of the Senate bill capped a week of debate that largely focused on non-aviation matters as senators eyed the must-pass bill as a vehicle for unrelated amendments.

Among the extraneous amendments voted on last week were a handful that would have curtailed earmarks and federal spending. Senators also voted down an amendment that would have reauthorized a controversial Washington, D.C., school voucher program.

The Senate bill is expected to be used as the vehicle for moving to conference talks, with the House version likely attached as an amendment by the House Rules Committee.

FAA's current authorization expires on March 31, and an additional short-term extension is expected before then. The House passed a bill (HR 4853) last week to extend the current authorization for three months. The Senate is expected to follow suit this week.

Kathryn A. Wolfe contributed to this story.

Source: CQ Today Round-the-clock coverage of news from Capitol Hill. ©2010 Congressional Quarterly Inc. All Rights Reserved.

# Updating air traffic system top aim of Senate bill

**Posted:** March 23rd, 2010 10:10 AM EDT

**By JOAN LOWY, Associated Press Writer** **Associated Press Financial Wire**

Replacing World War II-era radar with 21st century GPS technology and implementing several new airline safety rules would be required under a \$34.5 billion bill approved Monday by the Senate.

The measure funding the Federal Aviation Administration through Sept. 30, 2011, calls for key elements of the FAA's NextGen program to be in place at the busiest American airports by 2014. The nation's antiquated air traffic control system is a major source of airline delays.

The new system is projected to cost the FAA as much as \$22 billion through 2025. Airlines would have to spend as much as \$20 billion more to install equipment in their planes.

In the long term, the system is expected to save airlines money by allowing planes in crowded air corridors to take more direct routes and fly closer to each other without safety risks, reducing delays, saving energy and cutting down on pollution, including greenhouse gas emissions. Pilots will have real time information on the location of other aircraft.

The system is crucial to handling the expected growth in air traffic from about 700 million passengers in 2009 to the more than 1 billion annually by 2023.

The United States lags behind other nations in making the transition to the new technology, said Sen. Jay Rockefeller, D-W.Va., a key sponsor of the bill. Even Mongolia, he said, is further along.

"It's embarrassing," Rockefeller said.

The bill contains a provision authorizing the FAA to make grants to airlines to help cover equipment costs. Some airline executives have said that as much as they want the new system, they can't afford to put it in their planes.

Airlines have suffered repeated shocks over the past decade, including the Sept. 11 terror attacks, the SARS virus, volatile oil prices and the current economic downturn. They have shed more than 158,000 full-time jobs since employment peaked in 2001 and lost an estimated \$30 billion to \$60 billion in recent years.

Among the safety measures in the bill is a requirement that FAA update how many hours airlines can require pilots to work and how much rest they must get between work days. Airlines would be required to have remedial training programs for pilots who fail skills

tests or make other errors, and programs that use electronic data recorded during flights to spot safety trends before they cause an accident.

The safety measures were in response to last year's crash of a regional airliner near Buffalo, N.Y., which took 50 lives.

The bill also:

Raises the minimum number of hours of flying experience an airline co-pilot must have from 250 hours to 800.

Bans pilots from using personal electronic devices in the cockpit, a response to an incident last October in which pilots of a Northwest Airlines plane flew more than 100 miles past their destination of Minneapolis while they were working on their laptops.

Doubles to twice a year the frequency of FAA inspections of foreign aircraft repair and maintenance stations that work on U.S. planes.

Contains a "passenger bill of rights" that would require airlines to provide food, water and other amenities to passengers kept waiting on tarmacs and give them the opportunity to deplane after a three-hour wait.

That would give legal status to Transportation Department rules adopted in December that also limited tarmac waits to three hours and fine airlines up to \$27,500 per passenger for violations.

Authorizes \$8 billion over two years for airport improvement projects, which supporters said would generate 150,000 jobs.

The House passed a three-year FAA funding bill last year that includes several contentious labor provisions not part of the Senate bill. The House bill would also raise the passenger facility charge, which goes to airports to pay for improvements, from \$4.50 per ticket to \$7. Differences between the two bills remain to be worked out.

Associated Press writer Jim Abrams contributed to this report.

On the Net:

FAA: <http://www.faa.gov>

# MEMO

**TO:** Aviation Technical Advisory Committee

**FROM:** Michael Armstrong, Aviation Program Manager  
Armstron@scag.ca.gov/213-236-1914

**SUBJECT:** Regional General Aviation Forecast Update for 2012 RTP

**DATE:** April 22, 2009

---

## **Background**

SCAG will be updating its regional general aviation activity forecasts, last developed in 2003, for its upcoming 2012 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). Updated 2035 forecasts are needed to gauge the present and future state of the regional general aviation industry given the severe downturn over the past few years, to forecast the need for new and upgraded general aviation facilities, and to craft new strategies to help sustain general aviation airports in the region and the communities that depend on them. Updated 2035 forecasts will also be needed to forecast new aviation emission inventories for revised air quality management plans (AQMPs) for PM2.5 and ozone that will also be developed in 2012.

From 1984 to 1997 total general aviation operations at the region's 45 general aviation airports, six air carrier airports and two commuter airports declined by 12.2% from 5,053,339 to 4,437,388 operations. From 1997 to 2001 total operations increased slightly, by 2.8%, to 4,561,294 operations. This increase was due to new product liability laws that revitalized general aviation manufacturing, in combination with industry sponsored programs to promote general aviation flying and robust growth in business jet aviation fueled partly by new fractional ownership arrangements. Because of these emerging, promising trends, the last general aviation forecast that was done by SCAG in 2003 forecast total general aviation operations to reach 5,521,753 operations in 2030, or a modest 0.78% average annual growth rate from 2003 to 2030. SCAG's 2003 Regional General Aviation Study can be accessed using this link:  
<http://www.scag.ca.gov/aviation/>

The previous SCAG regional general aviation study was completed in 1996. It forecast a 0.87% average annual growth rate from 1993 (4,744,609 operations) to 2015 (5,650,573 operations). However, if based on actual 2001 operations, the 2015 forecast in the 1996 study represents a 1.7% average annual growth rate from 2001 to 2015.

The last general aviation activity inventory for the region was done in 2001, which is why that is the last year for which there is any actual operations data. Because of the events of 9/11/2001 and the steep economic downturn since 2007, total general aviation operations for the region are likely significantly lower than they were in 2001, continuing a downward trend since 1984.

M. Armstrong 4/22/10 #156563  
Updated Regional General Aviation Forecasts

However, for various reasons, the most recent forecast by the FAA, issued in March 2010, reflects a 1% average annual growth rate for US general aviation operations from 2008 to 2025. Is this future growth rate too optimistic, and is it realistic for the SCAG Region? Uncertainties such as this make developing new regional general aviation forecasts for Southern California a challenging and problematic exercise.

## Alternative Forecast Methodologies

Forecasting future general aviation activity for a region is as much art as science. Here are some of the methodologies that have typically been employed, from simplest to most complicated:

1. **Subjective judgment** (i.e., educated guessing)—In lieu of good trend data and future demographic data, subjective but informed judgment about future growth rates for individual airports are often substituted, based upon empirical observations and knowledge of local conditions.
2. **Straight-line forecasts**—Where there is good trend data, linear regression is typically employed to develop forecasts based on a “best fit” of available historic activity data. However, if there is an historic downward trend, subjective judgment about more optimistic future conditions is typically employed to stabilize forecasts and avoid the implication of aviation activity zeroing out sometime in the future as a result of extrapolating downward trends.
3. **Econometric forecasts**—These forecasts use regression and other statistical techniques to draw correlations between historic aviation activity and economic and demographic variables such as population, employment and income. Activity forecasts are based forecasts of those variables in a defined airport service area. Such forecasts usually produce positive results since those variables almost always increase in growing urban and suburban areas. The FAA Terminal Area Forecasts are basically unconstrained econometric forecasts that are based on correlations between historic aviation activity at towered and non-towered airports and local and national economic indicators. Informed, subjective judgment is usually employed to make econometric forecasts more realistic by reflecting the particular characteristics of an airport and its local service area, including airport service constraints and airspace constraints.
4. **Top-down airport allocation forecast methodology**--The three forecasting methodologies listed above are all airport-specific, and would require individual airport forecasts to be aggregated to produce an overall regional forecast. The limitations of this process include the fact that it does not consider interactions between individual airports including their relative capabilities in serving future demand, the potential for overlapping service areas and double counting future demand, and regional conditions including airspace constraints. To address these limitations, a “top-down allocation

methodology can be employed in which the total regional market is initially forecast based upon a variety of factors including national FAA forecasts, regional economic and demographic forecasts, national and regional trends in the general aviation industry, aircraft manufacturing production schedules and forecasts, pilot training and age cohort analysis, projected fuel cost, and other factors. The regional forecast is segmented into based aircraft and operations by aircraft and operations type, and allocated to individual airports. The allocation process can incorporate any number of factors including:

- Available airport facilities and capacities
- Planned improvements in airport master plans
- Historic shares at airports
- Historic shifts in based aircraft and operations between airports
- Forecast subregional changes in population, employment, income and other factors
- Existing and planned ground access facilities
- Anticipated future airspace constraints

In the SCAG Region there has been an historic migration of based aircraft and operations from the urban air carrier airports to general aviation reliever airports and suburban general aviation airports. This has been especially true of recreational piston aircraft, mainly due to escalating costs of operating at air carrier airports in combination with increased urban airspace restrictions. Also, certain general aviation airports with requisite facilities and accessibility to certain types of employment nodes (entertainment, high-tech etc.) have seen high growth rates in corporate aviation. These types of factors should be incorporated into any top-down allocation methodology that would be employed in the SCAG Region. This methodology would be largely quantitative, but would still employ informed, subjective judgment to make the allocations more realistic by reflecting the particular conditions and circumstances of the region.

5. **Bottoms-up airport allocation forecast methodology**—In theory, regional general aviation forecasting could also be done by generating general aviation travel demand at a subregional level, and allocating that demand to airports through use of an airport choice model. The choice model (typically a nested multinomial logit model) would incorporate the primary variables that determine the propensity of general aviation users to use particular airports. Such a model would be most appropriate for general aviation as a competitive mode of transportation for inter-city travel. It would be similar to the multinomial logit (discrete choice) airport choice/demand allocation model that SCAG has employed in its last four regional transportation plans to forecast and allocate commercial aviation demand. However, such models are very complex and require a substantial amount of survey data to calibrate the airport choice variables. They may also not be very accurate in simulating how recreational flyers choose airports, since recreational flyers are typically less sensitive to standard airport allocation factors such as travel time to the airport and number of jet aircraft flights, and are more sensitive to airport costs.

## **Recommendation**

It is recommended that Methodology #4, a top-down airport allocation methodology, be used to develop updated 2035 regional general aviation forecasts for SCAG's 2012 Regional Transportation Plan. The methodology would be largely quantitative, but would also employ informed, subjective judgment to reflect the particular conditions and circumstances of the region and at individual airports. ATAC would play a key role in supplying technical review and input to the development of new regional general aviation forecasts. A new regional general aviation inventory of based aircraft and operations would be conducted by SCAG aviation staff, to be used in developing the updated general aviation forecasts for the SCAG Region.