

SAN MARTIN BUSINESS PLAN COMMUNITY MEETING

Summary of Community Meeting

Wednesday May 23, 2018

Santa Clara County Roads and Airports Department hosted a community meeting on Wednesday May 23rd, 2018 from 6:30-8:30 p.m. to discuss the proposed County of Santa Clara Airports 2018 Updated Business Plan. The meeting was held at the San Martin Airport, 13030 Murphy Avenue in San Martin. Approximately fifty (50) people attended the meeting. County Airport Commissioner John Carr attended the meeting.

County Airports Director Eric Peterson presented and answered questions. In addition, Harry Freitas, Director of the County's Roads and Airports Department, and Ken Betts, Airports Assistant Director, were in attendance and interacted with the attendees before and after the meeting.

This meeting is part of a public outreach effort Staff is employing to solicit input on the Business Plan update effort as directed by the Board of Supervisors.

Meeting Summary: The meeting started at approximately 6:40 p.m. In addition to the personnel there to answer questions and present information, approximately forty (40) members of the public attended. Most of the attendees were pilots and users of the airport. At least three (3) people were identified as members of the local community.

A brief PowerPoint presentation was given by the Airports Director Eric Peterson, to orient the attendees to the purpose of the business plan effort the scope of what was covered in the Draft Business Plan, recommendations from the Business Plan, options for the Board of Supervisors consideration, near term activities that would occur at the Airport regardless of the Business Plan decisions and next steps in the process. The presentation concluded with schedule and process information relating to where the Business Plan would be presented and when. A question and answer period followed the presentation.

After the presentation many questions, suggestions and opinions were offered to the staff. The comments and responses offered during the meeting are captured below in the order they were given.

Comment/Question	Response
<p>What will happen to the Magnum tenant hangars at the end of the lease, and what will the rental rates be for those hangars? Will the rates be the same as the County's existing hangars?</p>	<p>The County has not yet determined what the final disposition of the Magnum hangars will be at the end of the Magnum lease in 2020. The County will most likely take over the individual tenant hangars at that time, but the details of that transition have not been developed.</p>
<p>What is the current condition of the Magnum tenant hangars, and what would rehabilitation of those hangars cost?</p>	<p>The County has not inspected the Magnum hangars and therefore has not made any determination as to their current condition and what upgrades or repairs would be required.</p>
<p>Why would the County lower their current hangar and tie-down rates just to attract more tenants, and then end up with more maintenance for the same income?</p>	<p>The County will evaluate future fees and charges, as well as any reductions in those fees based on the expected increase in tenancy that might arise from such reductions.</p>
<p>Charging the same for the Magnum hangars as the current rates being charged for County hangars will kill the airport and be a "deal-breaker".</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p>By taking over the Magnum hangars the County will be setting up a "rich people" side of the airport, wherein the Magnum hangars will be more expensive than the County hangars. Magnum tenants have spent a lot of money on hangar maintenance because Magnum has not been maintaining those hangars.</p>	<p>If the County elects to take over the Magnum hangars, the fees charged for those hangars will be based on the condition of the hangars, as well as market rates at the time of the FBO transition. Those rates have not yet been determined.</p>

<p>What other California airport do not take FAA AIP funds?</p>	<p>The County will research other airports that do not take FAA grants and how they fund their operations and facilities.</p>
<p>Will the County take future AIP grant funding now that the County understands what it takes to operate the airports without those funds?</p>	<p>The County Board of Supervisors will evaluate the Airports Business Plan Update and make a determination regarding future FAA grant funding applications.</p>
<p>What entity will get the future non-aviation commercial property leases?</p>	<p>The County will seek the best-use and highest value from any future commercial property leases through an appropriate RFP process.</p>
<p>Has the County made any estimates of how much revenue could be made of the available commercial property?</p>	<p>The County has received property appraisals from an outside consultant for the available commercial property, and those reports will be made available to the public as part of the updated business plan.</p>
<p>Is commercial property development common at other public-use airports?</p>	<p>Yes, many other airports utilize commercial property revenue to enhance the operating budgets of their facilities.</p>
<p>What will be the FAA's response to the County's plan to develop commercial property and what will be their position regarding the proposed RHV FBO realignment?</p>	<p>The County has conducted previous outreach to the FAA regarding commercial property development, and most of the proposed future development is outlined in the County's current Airport Master Plan. The RHV FBO realignment as outlined in the Business Plan Updated is an early proposal only and has not yet been vetted through the FAA.</p>

<p>There is great concern that the decision not to take FAA AIP funds is the first step in closing RHV Airport. If that is the case, what would be the process for closing the airport?</p>	<p>There is no current or proposed plan to close either of the two County airports, and the Board of Supervisors has not tasked the Roads and Airports staff with studying airport closures.</p>
<p>What is the next step for the 2018 Business Plan Update?</p>	<p>The updated plan will be red-lined with proposed changes, and those changes will be provided to the public on the Airport's website to provide transparency of the process.</p>
<p>Since 50% of the proposed twenty-million in capital improvements and airport projects are eligible for FAA funding, the County should provide a business plan that incorporates two approaches to airport funding. One with and one without FAA AIP funding.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p>Will the FBO's continue to sell fuel at the airports?</p>	<p>The County assumes that the RHV FBO's will continue to provide fuel after new FBO leases have been put into effect. No determination has been made regarding the E16 fuel services.</p>
<p>Is there any future E16 development plans for new construction, such as a lengthened runway?</p>	<p>Although some improvements are outlined in the current E16 Master Plan, no near-term development is currently planned to take place.</p>
<p>The County's current E16 AIP plan includes property acquisition adjacent to the airport. Is that part of the plan still in place?</p>	<p>The inclusion of acquiring additional property is hold-over from previous Airport Capitol Improvement Plans and are associated with the future runway lengthening. With the changes in general aviation and the lack of development in the Coyote Valley, future runway expansion has been tabled indefinitely. There are no current plans to acquire addition</p>

	property at E16.
A WAAS enabled approach should be included in future E16 plans.	Comment noted.
Any future FBO's at both RHV and E16 will need a long-term lease commitment in order to justify any future investments.	Comment noted.
Many Magnum hangar tenants paid \$40 to \$80 thousand dollars for their hangars, and the County will be getting these for free.	Comment noted.
If the County intends on taking over the Magnum hangars they should be priced at rates much lower than the current County hangars, otherwise everyone will leave the airport and move to Hollister and Watsonville.	Comment noted.
There should be a vision statement in the business plan that, with all available funding, including FAA AIP grants, both County airports could be world-class facilities.	Comment noted.
The 2018 Business Plan Update should not be just a simple "pay-the-bills" plan but should include a great deal of re-investment plans.	Comment noted.
Wouldn't extending the E16 runway as per the current master plan attract new business?	It is hard to forecast future needs for additional improvements at E16 given the current state of general aviation. Currently the FAA is not funding new surfaces at airports due to declining trends in general aviation in the U.S.

County committed to continue to notify attendees through email and postcards where possible about future opportunities to provide input.