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Senate Bill 10 – Multimodal Planning to be Coordinated by SDCRAA and SANDAG

California Senate Bill 10
- Promote long-range planning
- Enhance regional cooperation
- Ensure consistency between Authority and SANDAG decisions

RASP
- Regional Aviation Strategic Plan
  - SDCRAA (Authority)

AMAP
- Airport Multimodal Access Plan
  - SANDAG

RTP
- Regional Transportation Plan
  - 2011 Update
Project Overview

3-Phase Work Plan

Phase I
Data Gathering and Model Development
Spring - Winter 2009

Phase 2
Evaluation of Concepts and Strategies
Spring - Summer 2010

Phase 3
Regional Aviation Strategic Plan
Fall 2010 - Early 2011

Stakeholder and public outreach
Task-specific documentation and deliverables
RASP Study Area

12 Public Use Airports Located in a Densely Populated and Developed Region

Notes: Tijuana Int. Airport not located in San Diego County. Military facilities are excluded from the RASP.
Strategic Assessment Findings

**Airports That Should be Considered For Additional Uses/Opportunities**

- **McClellan-Palomar Airport**
  - Proximity to population base, access to light rail, and availability of developable land to accommodate new user groups

- **Gillespie Field**
  - Proximity to population base, existing runway length, and availability of developable land for terminal or cargo facilities

- **Brown Field Municipal Airport**

**Legend**
- Additional uses/opportunities:
  - Should be considered
  - May be considered
  - Should not be considered
  - Military—excluded from the RASP

Note: Tijuana International Airport not located in San Diego County.
Strategic Assessment Findings

Airports That May Be Considered For Additional Uses/Opportunities

- **San Diego International Airport**: Proximity to population base and existing infrastructure; intergovernmental agreement required for cross border operation.

- **Ramona Airport**: Proximity to existing facilities, projected population growth, and planned roadway improvements; potential environmental constraints may restrict development.

- **Tijuana International Airport**: Destination Lindbergh established that SAN may reach capacity before 2030.

Note: Tijuana International Airport not located in San Diego County.
Strategic Assessment Findings

**Airports That Should Not be Considered For Additional Uses/Opportunities**

- **Oceanside Municipal Airport**: Lack of infrastructure, community opposition, and limited available land for development; significant constraints to runway extension.
- **Agua Caliente Airport**: Remote location, limited access, and potential development costs.

Note: Tijuana International Airport not located in San Diego County.

*Legend:*
- Additional uses/opportunities:
  - **Green**: Should be considered
  - **Yellow**: May be considered
  - **Gray**: Should not be considered
  - **Military**: Excluded from the RASP

*Map highlights:*
- Fallbrook Airpark
- Borrego Valley Airport
- Ocotillo Airport
- San Diego International Airport
- Jacumba Airport
- Imperial Beach Naval Outlying Field
- Brown Field Municipal Airport
- Miramar Marine Corps Air Station
- Gillespie Field
- Montgomery Field
- San Diego North Island Naval Air Station
- Chula Vista
- Tijuana International Airport
- San Diego
- Riverside
- MEXICO
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System Optimization Toolkit

A Wide Range of Options Were Considered in Fall 2009

- **Airport capability and/or capacity**
  - Runway upgrade or extension
  - Passenger terminal development
  - Cargo facility development
  - GA facility development
  - On-airport access improvements

- **Airport market – construct facilities to accommodate commercial passenger or cargo activity**

- **Federal, state and/or local aviation initiatives**
  - Congestion management (locally initiated) – promote efficient runway use by optimized pricing (depending on goals)
  - Alter rates/charges by user type
  - Induce traffic to other airports
  - Slot controls

- **Enhance Tijuana international Airport for U.S.-based travelers**

- **Changes to surface infrastructure (in coordination with SANDAG)**
  - Improve access (link) between airports and regional surface system
  - Enhance the regional system
  - Improve transit services
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Complicated Factors Constrain Implementation of Alternatives

Forces Requiring Preparation of the RASP

- Aviation Activity Growth
- SDIA Capacity Limitations
- Need to Sustain Economic Growth

Factors Working Against Regional Airport System Solutions

- **Regulatory Factors**
  - No single controlling entity to implement solutions
  - No regulatory mechanisms to relocate activity segments

- **Political Factors**
  - NIMBY
  - Pre-conceived notions regarding effectiveness (or lack) of solutions
  - Consensus among stakeholders is difficult

- **Technical Factors**
  - Lack of appropriate existing facilities
  - Regional demand characteristics
  - Benefit-cost considerations of major capital improvements
Alternative Scenarios

Thirteen Alternative Scenarios for Evaluation of Potential System Changes

1. Commercial Passenger Optimization
   A. Full build-out of the Intermodal Transit Center and north side passenger terminal at SDIA
   B. Preserve SDIA airfield capacity for commercial passenger service
   C. Enhance commercial passenger service at McClellan-Palomar Airport
   D. Introduce commercial passenger service at Brown Field

2. Enhanced Utilization of Tijuana
   A. Tijuana International Airport focus on commercial service
   B. Aviation passenger cross border facility (currently proposed)
   C. Cross border airport terminal

3. California High Speed Rail
   Stations at downtown LA, ONT Airport and:
   A. Station at downtown San Diego
   B. Station at SDIA

4. General Aviation Optimization
   A. Enhance McClellan-Palomar Airport for high-end / corporate general aviation
   B. Enhance Brown Field for high-end / corporate general aviation
   C. Enhance Gillespie Field for mix-use general aviation

5. Air Cargo Optimization
   A. Introduce cargo service at Brown Field
Econometric Model and Baseline Findings
Regional Aviation Travel Demand Model

Decision Support Tool to Assess “What If” Scenarios

- Estimates demand at each airport from each population/commercial area in the region
- Demand divided among commercial air service, GA activity, and air cargo operations to account for different “demand drivers”
- Categories further differentiated to capture market nuances
- Demand model benefits
  - Leverages SANDAG Regional Travel Demand Model
  - Synchronize RASP results with SANDAG’s regional planning in RTP
Demand Model Framework

Passenger Model Framework

A Potential Trip Generator – Generates potential trips from each population/commercial area within the San Diego region

B Airport Ground Access – Identifies the mode, travel time, and cost to get from a population/commercial area to an airport

C Airport Choice Model – Determines the airport to which each a generated trip is assigned

D Airline Service Response – Predicts airlines’ air fare and service response due to changing demand

E Realized Trips – Quantified as the number of trips (translated to enplanements) once equilibrium between demand and supply is reached (RASP Model Projection)

Iterative Process

1. Capacity is Reached
2. Fares Begin to Rise
3. Demand is Suppressed
Historical Trends in Commercial Aviation Activity

Following Each Crisis, Aviation Activity Has Historically Recovered Quickly

Historical U.S. Enplaned Passengers

Source: Jacobs Consultancy Analysis, based on T100 Database, Department of Transportation, February 2010.
Note: Year 2009 enplanement is estimated; Database reports only through the 3rd quarter of the year 2009.
A Strong Recovery From the Current Recession is Predicted for the San Diego Region

### Historical Enplanements vs. Gross Domestic Product
(indexed to 1981)

- **Enplanements**
- **US GDP**

### Forecast Growth in Real Gross Domestic Product
(indexed to 2006)

- **International**
- **San Diego**
- **LA Region**
- **United States**


Notes:
- GDP growth from 2014 to 2030 estimated based on historical and forecast data available through 2014.
- International GDP represents an aggregated GDP of countries that influence international traffic to/from the study region.
Baseline Scenario Overview

The “Do–Nothing” Scenario Against Which Other Scenarios Will Be Evaluated

A. Airfield facility constraints “cap” activity at SDIA at around 28M annual passengers (14M enplanements)

B. Airfield capacity constraint results in higher fares and lower levels of service

C. Accommodation of some San Diego demand at LA region airports

D. Accommodation of some regional demand at Tijuana International Airport

E. Increased commercial service at McClellan-Palomar
**Baseline Scenario**

Includes Current SDIA Policies and Planned Near-term Improvements

- Accommodation of existing user groups – commercial, cargo, corporate/GA
- Continued nighttime departure curfew
- Destination Lindbergh “Opening Day” recommendations for North Side
- Includes other “approved” or already funded improvements, such as completion of T-2 West 10 gate addition (ongoing; not included in cost estimate)
- Assumes SANDAG transit ridership goal for 2015 of 6% of airport passengers
- Surface improvements per SANDAG’s 2007 RTP – “Revenue Constrained Scenario” (not included in cost estimate)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Factors</th>
<th>Facility requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Property acquisition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intermodal Transit Center (ITC) sized to accommodate 400-600K annual transit passengers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linkage to trolleys (Blue and Orange lines), Coaster/Amtrak, and MTS (</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consolidated rental car facility and ground transportation plaza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dedicated on-airport roadway connecting ITC and south side terminals via dedicated buses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cost estimate: Approximately $535M (per Destination Lindbergh report)
**Baseline Scenario**

**Order of Magnitude Cost Estimates and Potential Funding Sources**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Cost Estimate</th>
<th>Potential Funding Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Property Acquisition</td>
<td>$11 M</td>
<td>PFC/Bonds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail Improvements</td>
<td>$ 50 M</td>
<td>SANDAG/Bonds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermodal Transportation Center</td>
<td>$ 39 M</td>
<td>PFC/Bonds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedicated Roadway</td>
<td>$ 50 M</td>
<td>Bonds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consolidated Rental Car Facility</td>
<td>$300 M</td>
<td>CFC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto Parking</td>
<td>$ 85 M</td>
<td>Private/Bonds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$535 M</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Various agencies are responsible for funding and implementing the above projects; not all are the responsibility of the SDCRAA. All costs were taken from Destination Lindbergh and include soft costs and contingency. Costs associated with T2-West Expansion are not included as the project is ongoing.
Baseline Scenario

Implementation Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Acquisition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedicated Roadways</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRCF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning/Environmental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design/Procurement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Forecast Comparisons and Model Calibration

Demand Model Indicates Capacity Constraint at SDIA Begins in Early 2020s

Historical and Projected Passenger Enplanements
San Diego International Airport

Sources: RASP Forecasts and Financial Forecast Update, Landrum & Brown, Inc. December 2008 and June 2009, respectively.
Note: Model calibrated to actual enplanements from 2006 to 2009; projections may be different from actual.
Projected Passenger Enplanements

Enplaned Passengers in the Region are Projected to Increase 50% Between 2009 and 2030

Notes: Passenger enplanements based on forecast demographic data from International Monetary Fund (IMF), LA Economic Development Corporation (LAEDC), and SANDAG Model calibrated to actual enplanements from 2006 to 2009; projections may be different from actual. Results generally correspond to FAA TAF data for 2025.
SAN CAGR = 4.7% in the "recovery"; 2.5% for the forecast period.
Many Southern Californian Airports Will Also Reach Capacity During the Study Period

Los Angeles International (LAX)

Burbank Airport (BUR)

Long Beach Airport (LGB)

Ontario Airport (ONT)
Regional Demand / Capacity Analyses

Tijuana and Palomar Will Accommodate More Demand as LA Airports Reach Capacity

Airport capacities determined individually based on the latest publicly available documents on each airport’s website. Capacity increases based on aircraft up-gauging, planned and documented facility improvements, and/or removal of policy restrictions.
Suppressed Passenger Demand

As Capacity is Reached, the Number of Suppressed Passengers in the County Increases

Suppressed Aviation Passenger Demand
San Diego Residents and Visitors

Suppressed Demand defined as the number of passengers who would like to travel, but can not due to lack of available capacity and/or high costs.

Note: Suppressed demand presented above relative to 2006; some suppressed demand already exists.
Projected Passengers To / From San Diego Region

San Diego Residents and Visitors Will Increasingly Use Airports Outside the County

Origination and Destination Enplanements
Southern and Baja California Airports

Historical
Projected

SAN
LAX
SNA
ONT
BUR
LGB
TIJ
CRQ

Passenger enplanements (millions)


15 78%
78%
7
85%
Summary of Baseline Findings

- SDIA is expected to reach its airfield capacity earlier than previously forecasted; this is a result of model projections that incorporate numerous econometric variables as well as facility constraints.
- LAX will continue to serve as the region’s international gateway, but will reach its capacity sometime around 2015; this action will cause other airports in the LA region to reach capacity soon after.
- McClellan-Palomar will attract additional passenger demand as SDIA nears capacity; but this is not projected to occur until approximately 2025.

- Tijuana International Airport will continue to experience strong growth driven by domestic Mexican traffic, and will become the largest gateway for US-Mexico traffic in the region.
- Region-wide capacity constraints will result in:
  - Fare increases
  - Diminished service levels
  - Slight changes in traffic mix
  - “Suppressed” aviation passenger demand
Alternative Scenario Findings
Alternative Scenarios

Findings for Highlighted Scenarios are Presented Herein

1. Commercial Passenger Optimization
   A. Full build-out of the ITC and north side terminal at SDIA
   B. Preserve SDIA airfield capacity for commercial passenger service
   C. Enhance commercial passenger service at McClellan-Palomar Airport
   D. Introduce commercial passenger service at Brown Field

2. Enhanced Utilization of Tijuana
   A. Tijuana International Airport focus on commercial service
   B. Aviation passenger cross border facility (currently proposed)
   C. Cross border airport terminal

3. California High Speed Rail
   Stations at downtown LA, ONT Airport and:
   A. Station at downtown San Diego
   B. Station at SDIA

4. General Aviation Optimization
   A. Enhance McClellan-Palomar Airport for high-end / corporate general aviation
   B. Enhance Brown Field for high-end / corporate general aviation
   C. Enhance Gillespie Field for mix-use general aviation

5. Air Cargo Optimization
   A. Introduce cargo service at Brown Field
1. Commercial Passenger Optimization Scenario

A. Full Build-out of the ITC and North Side Passenger Terminal at SDIA

**Scenario Description**

- ITC expanded to accommodate 1.2 - 1.8M passengers
- North side terminal with passenger processing facilities (ticketing, baggage claim, security, etc.)
- Automated People Mover (APM) connecting north side facilities with south concourses

**Key model assumptions**

- Ground access time/cost estimated as the time/cost required to arrive at the airport terminal, not the actual gate
- Ground access costs to SDIA assumed to decrease over the planning period due to higher transit ridership and improved access
- Ground access time to SDIA assumed to remain unchanged (decrease in average ground access time due to roadway access improvements is offset by the increase in average ground access time due to higher transit ridership)

**Evaluation Factors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility requirements</th>
<th>Evaluation Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Property acquisition</td>
<td>• Property acquisition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APM with secure access between ITC/south concourses</td>
<td>• APM with secure access between ITC/south concourses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail modifications associated with ITC service</td>
<td>• Rail modifications associated with ITC service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expansion of parking facilities</td>
<td>• Expansion of parking facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expansion of consolidated rental car facility (CONRAC)</td>
<td>• Expansion of consolidated rental car facility (CONRAC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modifications to I-5 ramps</td>
<td>• Modifications to I-5 ramps</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Cost estimate: $1.2B
- Implementation timeline: 13-14 years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other considerations</th>
<th>Evaluation Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Requires commitment by transit agencies to serve ITC</td>
<td>• Requires commitment by transit agencies to serve ITC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding non-aviation elements of the ITC requires additional consideration</td>
<td>• Funding non-aviation elements of the ITC requires additional consideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airline funding support unlikely given cost and limited affect on capacity</td>
<td>• Airline funding support unlikely given cost and limited affect on capacity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Scenario 1A: Full Build-out of the ITC and North Side Terminal Comparison to Baseline

Full Build-out of the ITC Has Marginal Impacts to the Capacity Constraints at SDIA

Historical and Projected Enplaned Passengers
San Diego International Airport

Slight decrease in enplanements around 2027 due to increased airport access and model stabilization

SDIA Capacity

Passenger enplanements (millions)

0 3 6 9 12 15 18


RASP Baseline
Scenario 1A
Scenario 1A: Full Build-out of the ITC and North Side Terminal Comparison to Baseline

*Full Build-out of the ITC Has Marginal Impacts to the Capacity Constraints at SDIA*

**Suppressed Aviation Passenger Demand**
San Diego County Residents and Visitors

- **RASP Baseline**
- **Scenario 1A**

Graph showing suppressed enplanements (millions) from 2006 to 2030.
### Scenario Description

- Encourage non-commercial and GA activity to use alternative facilities
- Facilitated via leasing and pricing strategy; would require “coordinated” FBO policy with SDCRAA and other airport sponsors
- Requires SDIA-similar and/or higher level of service facilities at surrounding airports
  - Gillespie: Additional corporate/general aviation facilities (El Cajon development)
  - Montgomery: New FBO, corporate hangars
  - Brown: Elements of proposed private development, including new FBO(s)

- **Key model assumptions**
  - All forecasted GA and cargo operations at SDIA replaced with commercial operations
  - SDIA capacity limit would increase from 14M to 15.8M enplanements (based on average seat capacity and load factors provided in *Destination Lindbergh* report)

### Evaluation Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Factors</th>
<th>Facility requirements</th>
<th>Cost and implementation timeline</th>
<th>Other considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gillespie Field:</td>
<td>Construction of FBO/corporate hangars (El Cajon Development); correct deviations from FAA design standard</td>
<td>Cost estimate: $188M; mostly private funding sources</td>
<td>• Potential legal scrutiny based on perceived access restrictions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery Field:</td>
<td>Construction of FBO/corporate hangars</td>
<td>Implementation timeline: 4-5 years</td>
<td>• No legal mechanism to require GA or cargo users to vacate SDIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown Field:</td>
<td>Construction of FBO/corporate hangars, T-hangars, helicopter FBO/ARFF (phase 1 of proposed development)</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Runway length at Montgomery and Gillespie Field not capable of handling many high-end corporate GA aircraft</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Cost and implementation timeline:*
- Cost estimate: $188M; mostly private funding sources
- Implementation timeline: 4-5 years
Scenario 1B: Preserve SDIA Airfield Capacity for Commercial Service

Graphic Depiction and Facility Requirements

Gillespie Field

Correct Déviations to Standards

El Cajon Development
Scenario 1B: Preserve SDIA Airfield Capacity for Commercial Service

Graphic Depiction and Facility Requirements

Montgomery Field

New FBO/ Corporate Hangars
Scenario 1B: Preserve SDIA Airfield Capacity for Commercial Service

Graphic Depiction and Facility Requirements

Brown Field

FBO/Corporate Hangars
General Aviation T-Hangars
Helicopter FBO

Utility Upgrades
Scenario 1B: Preserve SDIA Airfield Capacity for Commercial Service
Comparison to Baseline

Removing GA and Cargo Operations Delays Capacity Constraint from Approximately 2025 to 2030

Historical and Projected Enplaned Passengers
San Diego International Airport

- SDIA Capacity – Scenario 1B
- SDIA Capacity - Baseline

Passenger enplanements (millions)


RASP Baseline
Scenario 1B
Scenario 1B: Preserve SDIA Airfield Capacity for Commercial Service Comparison to Baseline

*Trend in Suppressed Passenger Demand is Also Delayed Approximately 5 Years*

**Suppressed Aviation Passenger Demand**
San Diego County Residents and Visitors

Graph showing the trend in suppressed passenger demand from 2006 to 2030, with a comparison between the RASP Baseline and Scenario 1B.
1. Commercial Passenger Optimization Scenarios

C. Enhance Commercial Passenger Service at McClellan-Palomar Airport

### Scenario Description

- **Provide facilities for multi-carrier commercial service**
- **Facilitation enhanced via lease incentives and pricing strategies, etc.**
- **Key model assumptions**
  - Airport capacity would be increased from approximately 500K to 750K annual enplanements
  - Non-stop/direct services would be offered to markets within 1,500 mile radius
  - Two subsets of air service “drivers” considered:
    - i. CRQ infrastructure enhancement
    - ii. SDIA capacity limits

### Evaluation Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility requirements</th>
<th>Cost and implementation timeline</th>
<th>Other considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• 1,000-foot runway extension to 6,000 total feet; requires a bridge foundation due to landfill location</td>
<td>Cost estimate: $160M; driven by runway ext. and parking garage</td>
<td>• Fleet restricted to regional jets (C-II); no mainline jets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 8,000 SF terminal expansion for a total of 27,000 SF</td>
<td>Implementation timeline: 6-8 years; with 4-5 addl. years for approvals</td>
<td>• Extensive environmental review and approvals required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 2,800 space parking deck</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Existing SDIA airlines unlikely to support split operation between SDIA and CRQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Additional roadway modifications (additional study required)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Scenario 1C: Enhance Commercial Passenger Service at CRQ

Graphic Depiction and Facility Requirements

Terminal Expansion
Parking Deck
Runway Extension

College Blvd
El Camino Real
R/W 6-24 4,897'
Palomar Airport Rd
Scenario 1C: Enhance Commercial Passenger Service at CRQ Comparison to Baseline

Infrastructure Enhancement Stimulates Traffic Growth at McClellan-Palomar

Historical and Projected Enplaned Passengers
McClellan-Palomar Airport

- CRQ Capacity (Scenario 1C)
- CRQ Capacity (Baseline)
- RASP Baseline
- Scenario 1C -- Infrastructure Driven
- Scenario 1C -- SDIA Capacity Driven

Passenger enplanements (thousands)

Year:
- 2008
- 2010
- 2012
- 2014
- 2016
- 2018
- 2020
- 2022
- 2024
- 2026
- 2028
- 2030

Capacity Levels:
- 0
- 50
- 100
- 150
- 200
- 250
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Scenario 1C: Enhance Commercial Passenger Service at CRQ
Comparison to Baseline

*Increased Commercial Passenger Service Does Not Alleviate Capacity Constraints at SDIA*

**Historical and Projected Enplaned Passengers**
San Diego International Airport

- **SDIA Capacity**
- **RASP Baseline**
- **Scenario 1C**

Passenger enplanements (millions)

- 2008: 9 million
- 2010: 7 million
- 2012: 8 million
- 2014: 9 million
- 2016: 10 million
- 2018: 11 million
- 2020: 12 million
- 2022: 13 million
- 2024: 14 million
- 2026: 14 million
- 2028: 15 million
- 2030: 16 million

Comparison to Baseline
- Increased Commercial Passenger Service Does Not Alleviate Capacity Constraints at SDIA
Scenario 1C: Enhance Commercial Passenger Service at CRQ

Comparison to Baseline

Enhancement Allows More Passenger to Travel With Increased Total Regional Capacity

Suppressed Aviation Passenger Demand
San Diego County Residents and Visitors

- RASP Baseline
- Scenario 1C
1. Commercial Passenger Optimization Scenarios

**D. Introduce Commercial Passenger Service at Brown Field**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario Description</th>
<th>Evaluation Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▪ Provide facilities for multi-carrier commercial jet service to destinations within 1,500 miles of San Diego</td>
<td>Facility requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Facilitated via incentives and pricing strategy; would require “coordinated” policy with SDCRAA and City of San Diego</td>
<td>▪ New passenger terminal building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Access/entrance roadway improvements, including connection to highway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ 2,800 surface parking spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Facilities for FAR Part 139 certification (e.g., security fencing, fire fighting facilities, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Utility upgrades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost estimate: $100M; driven by utility upgrades and terminal development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Implementation timeline: 6-8 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost and implementation timeline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Context</td>
<td>Other considerations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Airlines unlikely to support split operation between SDIA and SDM; AIP funding predicated on airline agreements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Remote location in southern portion of the County is not desirable for commercial passenger operators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Limited runway approach capability significantly affects viability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Significant public and political opposition anticipated</td>
<td>▪ Fleet unrestricted, but most likely regional jet service (&lt;70 seat aircraft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Proximity to commercial service airports negatively impacts viability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Terrain and implementation of precision approach</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Scenario 1D: Introduce Commercial Service at Brown Field

Graphic Depiction and Facility Requirements
Scenario 1D: Introduce Commercial Service at Brown Field

Scenario Is “Fatally” Flawed

- Precision instrument approaches are infeasible per two FAA determinations (2009 and 2010)
- Precision approach into runway 26R not feasible
  - Extremely high terrain to the north and east
  - Location of the Mexican border
- Precision approach into runway 8L not feasible either
  - Rapidly rising high terrain to the northeast
  - Location of the Mexican border restricts missed approach procedure
- Commercial service is unlikely without an instrument approach; AIP funding is predicated on user agreements
- Recommendation – Scenario should be omitted from additional consideration
1. Commercial Passenger Optimization
   A. Full build-out of the ITC and north side terminal at SDIA
   B. Preserve SDIA airfield capacity for commercial passenger service
   C. Enhance commercial passenger service at McClellan-Palomar Airport
   D. Introduce commercial passenger service at Brown Field

2. Enhanced Utilization of Tijuana
   A. Tijuana International Airport focus on commercial service
   B. Aviation passenger cross border facility (currently proposed)
   C. Cross border airport terminal

3. California High Speed Rail
   Stations at downtown LA, ONT Airport and:
   A. Station at downtown San Diego
   B. Station at SDIA

4. General Aviation Optimization
   A. Enhance McClellan-Palomar Airport for high-end / corporate general aviation
   B. Enhance Brown Field for high-end / corporate general aviation
   C. Enhance Gillespie Field for mix-use general aviation

5. Air Cargo Optimization
   A. Introduce cargo service at Brown Field
4. General Aviation Optimization Scenarios

2020 Forecast Aircraft Operations and Demand Break-down


Note: Operational frequency of corporate aircraft is assumed to be 2X recreational aircrafts.
4. General Aviation Optimization Scenarios

A. Enhance McClellan-Palomar for High-end / Corporate GA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario Description</th>
<th>Evaluation Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▪ Construct new and convert existing commercial facilities for corporate GA uses (existing terminal would be converted to high-end FBO facility)</td>
<td>▪ 1,000-foot runway extension to provide 6,000 feet of departure length</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Assumes the Airport would no longer accommodate commercial passenger activity and no additional passenger facilities would be provided</td>
<td>▪ Convert existing terminal building into FBO facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Facilitated via leasing and pricing strategies; would also require “coordinated” FBO policy with SDCRAA and County of San Diego</td>
<td>▪ Cost estimate: $82M; driven primarily by runway extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Implementation timeline: 5-6 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cost and implementation timeline

Other considerations

- Eliminates need/costs associated with maintaining Part 139 certification
- Extensive environmental review and approvals required for runway extension

The G-V (corporate jet aircraft) requires 5,910 feet of runway at a max takeoff weight (MTOW) of 91,000 lbs.
Scenario 4A: Enhance CRQ for High-end / Corporate GA

Graphic Depiction and Facility Requirements
Scenario 4A: Enhance CRQ for High-end / Corporate GA Traffic Shift from Baseline

**Potential GA traffic shift to CRQ**

- **San Diego (SDIA)**: Substantial traffic shift due to high congestion at SDIA; significant number of corporate operations would remain due to downtown proximity.

- **Gillespie (SEE)**: Some high-end GA traffic may shift due to FBO facility, increased runway length, and ILS.

- **Montgomery Field (MYF)**: Some corporate traffic may shift due to FBO facility and ILS.

- **Oceanside (OKB)**: No traffic shift since current demand at OKB would not benefit from ILS or longer runway.

- **Brown Field (SDM)**: Some corporate traffic may shift due to FBO facility and ILS; however, shift likely to be low given 50 mile distance between SDM and CRQ.

- **Ramona (RNM)**: No traffic shift since current demand at RNM would not benefit from ILS or longer runway.
Scenario 4A: Enhance CRQ for High-end / Corporate GA
Comparison to Baseline

Diversion of High-end GA Traffic to CRQ Delays Capacity Constraint at SDIA

Historical and Projected Enplaned Passengers
San Diego International Airport

- SDIA Capacity (Scenario 4A)
- SDIA Capacity (Baseline)

Passenger enplanements (millions)

- RASP Baseline
- Scenario 4A

Scenario 4A: Enhance CRQ for High-end / Corporate GA
Comparison to Baseline

*Enhancement Allows More Passenger to Travel as Total Regional Capacity Increases*

**Suppressed Aviation Passenger Demand**
San Diego County Residents and Visitors

- **RASP Baseline**
- **Scenario 4A**
### 4. General Aviation Optimization Scenarios

#### B. Enhance Brown Field for High-end / Corporate GA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario Description</th>
<th>Evaluation Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construct new and build-out existing facilities exclusively for corporate GA</td>
<td>Facility requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistent with ALP and proposed private development plans</td>
<td>• Phase 1 of the private developer’s plan, including construction of FBO/corporate hangar, additional T-hangars, and helicopter FBO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitated via leasing and pricing strategies; would also require “coordinated” FBO policy with SDCRAA and City of San Diego</td>
<td>Cost and implementation timeline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Utility upgrades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost estimate: $63M; mostly funding with private sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Implementation timeline: 3-4 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other considerations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Existing runway length is adequate, but may require reconstruction for additional strength</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Planning for certain facilities already underway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Appears to have community and political support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Scenario 4B: Enhance Brown Field for High-end / Corporate GA

Graphic Depiction and Facility Requirements

[Diagram of a map showing various facilities and upgrades for the Brown Field, including FBO/Corporate Hangars, General Aviation T-Hangars, Helicopter FBO, Utility Upgrades, and areas marked for Future CA 905.]
Scenario 4B: Enhance Brown Field for High-end / Corporate GA Traffic Shift from Baseline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Potential GA Traffic Shift to SDM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Diego (SDIA)</td>
<td>Moderate traffic shift due to high congestion at SDIA; significant number of corporate operations would remain due to proximity to downtown and ILS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gillespie (SEE)</td>
<td>Some high-end GA traffic may be shifted due to FBO facility, but overall shift expected to be minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery Field (MYF)</td>
<td>Some corporate traffic may shift due to FBO facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceanside (OKB)</td>
<td>No traffic shift since existing demand at OKB would not benefit from the enhancements at SDM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McClellan-Palomar (CRQ)</td>
<td>Very limited traffic shift for high-end FBO facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramona (RNM)</td>
<td>No traffic shift since existing demand at RNM would not benefit from the enhancement at SDM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Diagram of airport locations and traffic patterns.
Scenario 4B: Enhance Brown Field for High-end / Corporate GA Traffic Shift from Baseline

**Diversion of High-end Corporate GA Traffic to SDM Delays Capacity Constraints at SDIA**

**Historical and Projected Enplaned Passengers**
San Diego International Airport

- **SDIA Capacity (Scenario 4B)**
- **SDIA Capacity (Baseline)**

![Graph showing historical and projected enplaned passengers with a comparison between Baseline and Scenario 4B capacity constraints at SDIA.](image-url)
Scenario 4B: Enhance Brown Field for High-end / Corporate GA Traffic Shift from Baseline

Enhancement Allows More Passenger to Travel as Total Regional Capacity Increases

Suppressed Aviation Passenger Demand
San Diego County Residents and Visitors

- RASP Baseline
- Scenario 4B
### 4. General Aviation Optimization Scenarios

#### C. Enhance Gillespie Field for Mix-use General Aviation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario Description</th>
<th>Evaluation Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▪ Build-out of facilities to support corporate and recreational GA activity</td>
<td>Facility requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Assumes implementation of El Cajon Development</td>
<td>• “El Cajon Plaza” a planned 70-acre development including FBO site, indoor storage hangars, and tie-down space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Facilitated via leasing and pricing strategy; would require “coordinated” FBO policy with SDCRAA and County of San Diego</td>
<td>• Correct FAA design standard deficiencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Utility upgrades and drainage improvements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Factors Toward Implementation

1. Orange and Green Trolley lines provide public transportation between the Airport and downtown San Diego
2. Parallel runways allow segregation of training and itinerant operations
3. Completion of CA 52 extension and interchange with CA 67 improve accessibility

Cost and implementation timeline

| Cost estimate: $90M |
| Implementation timeline: 3-4 years |

Other considerations

| · Some planning underway |
| · Sub-standard airfield separations may be addressed as leaseholds expire or are relocated; no set schedule |
| · Environmental approval needed for various projects |
Scenario 4C: Enhance Gillespie Field for Mix-use General Aviation

Graphic Depiction and Facility Requirements
Scenario 4C: Enhance Gillespie Field for Mix-use General Aviation Traffic Shift from Baseline

Potential GA Traffic Shift to SEE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Traffic Shift Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Diego (SDIA)</td>
<td>Moderate traffic shift due to high congestion at SDIA; significant number of corporate operations would remain due to close proximity to downtown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McClellan-Palomar (CRQ)</td>
<td>Some high-end GA traffic shift expected for FBO facility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery Field (MYF)</td>
<td>Some corporate traffic shift expected for FBO facility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceanside (OKB)</td>
<td>No traffic shift since the existing demand at OKB would not benefit from the enhancement at SEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown Field (SDM)</td>
<td>Some corporate traffic shift expected due to FBO facility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramona (RNM)</td>
<td>Some corporate traffic shift expected due to FBO facility.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Scenario 4C: Enhance Gillespie Field for Mix-use General Aviation Comparison to Baseline

**Diversion of GA Traffic to Gillespie Delays Capacity Constraints at SDIA**

**Historical and Projected Enplaned Passengers**
San Diego International Airport

- **SDIA Capacity (Scenario 4C)**
- **SDIA Capacity (Baseline)**

*Graph showing historical and projected enplaned passengers (millions) from 2008 to 2030 for San Diego International Airport under the baseline and Scenario 4C for Gillespie Field.*
Scenario 4C: Enhance Gillespie Field for Mix-use General Aviation Comparison to Baseline

Enhancement Allows More Passengers to Travel as Total Regional Capacity Increases

Suppressed Aviation Passenger Demand
San Diego County Residents and Visitors

Suppressed enplanements (millions)

- RASP Baseline
- Scenario 4C

Alternative Scenarios

Findings for Highlighted Scenarios are Presented Herein

1. Commercial Passenger Optimization
   A. Full build-out of the ITC and north side terminal at SDIA
   B. Preserve SDIA airfield capacity for commercial passenger service
   C. Enhance commercial passenger service at McClellan-Palomar Airport
   D. Introduce commercial passenger service at Brown Field

2. Enhanced Utilization of Tijuana
   A. Tijuana International Airport focus on commercial service
   B. Aviation passenger cross border facility (currently proposed)
   C. Cross border airport terminal

3. California High Speed Rail
   Stations at downtown LA, ONT Airport and:
   A. Station at downtown San Diego
   B. Station at SDIA

4. General Aviation Optimization
   A. Enhance McClellan-Palomar Airport for high-end / corporate general aviation
   B. Enhance Brown Field for high-end / corporate general aviation
   C. Enhance Gillespie Field for mix-use general aviation

5. Air Cargo Optimization
   A. Introduce cargo service at Brown Field
5. Air Cargo Optimization Scenario

A. Introduce Cargo Service at Brown Field

Scenario Description

- Construction of facilities at Brown Field to accommodate cargo service
- Facilitated via incentives and pricing strategies

Implementation Context

1. Carriers unwilling to operate from facilities south of SDIA due to proximity to sort infrastructure; AIP funding predicated on airline agreements
2. Majority of SDIA cargo is accommodated on integrated / express carriers (90%) and originates in or is destined for downtown San Diego
3. Limited runway approach capability significantly affects viability
4. Lack of nearby cargo infrastructure (e.g., freight forwarders)
5. Significant public and political opposition (historic and anticipated)

Evaluation Factors

Facility requirements

- New cargo buildings and apron
- Upgrade runway pavement for heavier aircraft associated with cargo flights
- Improve access roads around airport (many improvements already scheduled through SANDAG)
- Utility improvements

Cost and implementation timeline

Cost estimate: $235M
Implementation timeline: 6-10 years

Other considerations

- Some planning underway
- Environmental approval needed for various projects
- Terrain and implementation of precision approach
Scenario 5A: Introduce Cargo Service at Brown Field

Graphic Depiction and Facility Requirements
Scenario 5A: Introduce Cargo Service at Brown Field

Scenario Is “Fatally” Flawed

- Carriers unwilling to operate from facilities south of SDIA due to proximity to sort infrastructure; AIP funding predicated on airline / user agreements
- Lack of nearby cargo infrastructure (e.g., freight forwarders)
- Precision instrument approaches are infeasible per two FAA determinations (2009 and 2010)
- Significant local public and political opposition (historic and anticipated)
- Recommendation – Scenario should be omitted from additional consideration

---

June 29, 2009

Mr. M.C. Tussey
Deputy Director of Airports
3750 John J Montgomery Dr
San Diego, CA 92123

Dear Mr. Tussey,

I am writing this letter to follow-up our conversation over the telephone call on 6/26/09 regarding your request to explore the possibilities of developing of a vertically guided Instrument Approach Procedure (IAP) into Runway 8L at Brown Field Municipal, San Diego, CA.

I have conducted a feasibility study for you request and unfortunately your request at the present time is not practical for the following reasons:

a.) Procedure development criteria require the aircraft to climb straight ahead if a missed approach is executed for a certain distance prior to turning. The distance for the straight ahead climb is determined based on the amount of turn. In this particular instance a left turn of more than 120 degrees is required. This amount of turn would require the aircraft to fly a minimum of 7.3 (NM) from the Runway 8L threshold prior to turning. Due to rapidly rising high terrain, northeast of the airport, it makes this option not possible.

b.) Second most important, is the close proximity of the airport to the Mexican border. Due to the location of the airport in relationship to the Mexican boarder, the direction of the missed approach is restricted to a left turn only, again restricting capabilities due to the high terrain northeast of the field.

c.) Finally, a procedure into Runway 26R is also not possible due to limited airspace for the procedure and the same problems as mentioned above.

Unfortunately, it would appear that your best option is the minimums published on the current (IAP).

Should you need you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact Mr. George Reese at (425) 917-6749.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Jason E. Pitts
Manager
Alternative Scenarios

Findings for Highlighted Scenarios are Presented Herein

1. Commercial Passenger Optimization
   A. Full build-out of the ITC and north side terminal at SDIA
   B. Preserve SDIA airfield capacity for commercial passenger service
   C. Enhance commercial passenger service at McClellan-Palomar Airport
   D. Introduce commercial passenger service at Brown Field

2. Enhanced Utilization of Tijuana
   A. Tijuana International Airport focus on commercial service
   B. Aviation passenger cross border facility (currently proposed)
   C. Cross border airport terminal

3. California High Speed Rail
   Stations at downtown LA, ONT Airport and:
   A. Station at downtown San Diego
   B. Station at SDIA

4. General Aviation Optimization
   A. Enhance McClellan-Palomar Airport for high-end / corporate general aviation
   B. Enhance Brown Field for high-end / corporate general aviation
   C. Enhance Gillespie Field for mix-use general aviation

5. Air Cargo Optimization
   A. Introduce cargo service at Brown Field
Summary of Findings to Date

Evaluation Matrix Compares Relative Costs and Benefits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demand accommodated over the Baseline in 2030 (thousand enplanements)</th>
<th>Estimated cost ($ millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Passenger Optimization</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial 1A</td>
<td>ITC and north side terminal at SDIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial 1B</td>
<td>SDIA passengers only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial 1C</td>
<td>Passengers at CRQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA 4A</td>
<td>CRQ high-end GA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA 4B</td>
<td>SDM high-end GA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA 4C</td>
<td>SEE mixed-use</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Commercial Passenger Optimization
- General Aviation Optimization
- High Speed Rail (Nov 2010)
- Enhanced Utilization of Tijuana (Nov 2010)
Summary of Findings to Date

There is No “Silver Bullet” in the Scenarios Modeled to Date

- Analyses confirm previous thinking that Scenario 1A: Full build-out of the ITC and north side terminal at SDIA – has little effect on suppressed demand relative to the Baseline; although the scenario provides regional access and other benefits not captured by the model

- Of the scenarios modeled to date, Scenario 1B: Preserve SDIA airfield capacity for commercial passenger service – provided the best performance relative to demand; however, implementation of this scenario would be difficult, at best

- Scenario 1C: Enhance commercial passenger service at CRQ – has little effect on suppressed demand relative to the Baseline

- Both Brown Field alternatives (1D and 5A) are “fatally” flawed and should be omitted from additional consideration

- The GA optimization scenarios (4A, 4B, and 4C) have similar costs and provide nearly the same, but nominal, impact on demand relative to the Baseline

- California HSR and Tijuana utilization scenarios are still under consideration; findings will be presented in the October / November timeframe
Public/Stakeholder Coordination
Public/Stakeholder Outreach

Accomplishments in the First Half of 2010

- Stakeholder presentations
  - Airport advisory groups
  - SANDAG
    - Transportation Committee, March 19, 2010
  - Business/community organizations
    - San Diego Concierge Association, February 10, 2010
    - San Diego Regional Economic Development Corporation Investor Breakfast, July 23, 2010

- Elected officials outreach

- Web Page: www.sdrasp.com
Public/Stakeholder Outreach

Upcoming RASP Open Houses

- **Downtown**
  - Tuesday, Sept. 14, 2010, 5:30-7:30 p.m.
  - San Diego County Regional Airport Authority

- **North**
  - Thursday, Sept. 16, 2010, 5:30-7:30 p.m.
  - McClellan-Palomar Airport

- **East**
  - Wednesday, Sept. 22, 2010, 5:30-7:30 p.m.
  - Gillespie Field

- **South**
  - Thursday, Sept. 30, 2010, 5:30-7:30 p.m.
  - South County Economic Development Council
Schedule and Work Plan

**2010**
- July: Identify scenario details
- August: Evaluate and model the baseline scenario
- September: Preliminary modeling of scenarios
- October: Evaluation and final modeling of all scenarios
- November: Identify financial considerations and other implementation factors
- December: Plan Open Houses
  - Secure locations
  - Draft elected officials invitations
  - Draft e-mail invitation for EDCs
  - Draft media advisory
- Progress briefing with Senator Kehoe
- Distribute invitations & media advisory
- Finalize “best” concepts
  - Implementation strategies
  - Prepare draft RASP report

**2011**
- January: Final report
- February: Final briefing with Senator Kehoe
- March: Draft and distribute news release and Annual Update
  - Update presentation and website
  - Draft RASP information to SANDAG for draft RTP

---

- Technical Work Task
- Public / Elected Official Outreach
- RASP Board Committee Meeting
- RASP Subcommittee Meeting
- Public Open House
- Airport Advisory Group briefings
- Presentation to SDCRAA Board
- Presentation to SANDAG Board
- Draft / Final Report
Scenario Details:
Cost Estimates, Funding Sources and Implementation Schedules
### Scenario 1A: Full Build-out of the ITC and North Side Terminal at SDIA

**Order of Magnitude Cost Estimates and Potential Funding Sources**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Cost Estimate</th>
<th>Potential Funding Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Property Acquisition</td>
<td>$13 M</td>
<td>PFC/Bonds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITC (Passenger Processing)</td>
<td>$311 M</td>
<td>SANDAG/Bonds/PFC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail Modifications</td>
<td>$13 M</td>
<td>SANDAG/PFC/Bonds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto Parking Expansion</td>
<td>$224 M</td>
<td>Private/Bonds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRCF Expansion</td>
<td>$24 M</td>
<td>CFC/Bonds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5 Ramps</td>
<td>$43 M</td>
<td>SANDAG/Bonds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APM</td>
<td>$611 M</td>
<td>PFC/Private/Bonds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,239 M</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- All costs were taken from Destination Lindbergh and include soft costs and contingency.
- Construction costs for the APM may be less depending on alignment and grade.
- Ancillary and enabling projects included.
### Scenario 1A: Full Build-out of the ITC and North Side Terminal at SDIA

#### Implementation Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation Schedule</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Development</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Acquisition</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITC(PAX Processing)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail Modification</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking/CRCF Expansion</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5 Ramp Modification</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APM</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Planning/Environmental**: Light blue
- **Design/Procurement**: Dark blue
- **Construction**: Yellow
### Scenario 1B: Preserve SDIA Airfield Capacity for Commercial Service

**Order of Magnitude Cost Estimates and Potential Funding Sources**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Cost Estimate</th>
<th>Potential Funding Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SEE: El Cajon development</td>
<td>$65 M</td>
<td>Private/Bonds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deviations to standards</td>
<td>$50 M</td>
<td>Private/Bonds/AIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>$115 M</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFY: FBO at Gibbs/Hotel Locations</td>
<td>$25 M</td>
<td>Private/Bonds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>$25 M</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDM: FBO</td>
<td>$39 M</td>
<td>Private/Bonds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDM: T-Hangars</td>
<td>$3 M</td>
<td>Private/Bonds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDM: Helicopter FBO and ARFF</td>
<td>$6 M</td>
<td>Private/Bonds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>$48 M</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$188 M</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- FBO cost estimates based on a range of values provided by SDCRAA.
- Private development costs provided by City of San Diego.
- Includes utilities and infrastructure improvements for all development.
- Bonds would be issued by local municipalities or airport sponsors, not SDCRAA.
Scenario 1B: Preserve SDIA Airfield Capacity for Commercial Service

Implementation Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>See: El Cajon Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBO/Corporate Hangars</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correct Deviations/Standards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDM: Private Developer: Phase 1 Plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBO/Corporate Hangars</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MYF: Modifications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBO/Corporate Hangars</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning/Environmental Design/Procurement Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Scenario 1C: Enhance Commercial Passenger Service at CRQ

Cost Estimates, Potential Funding Sources, and Implementation Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Cost Estimate</th>
<th>Potential Funding Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Runway Extension</td>
<td>$80 M</td>
<td>AIP/PFC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terminal Expansion</td>
<td>$4 M</td>
<td>PFC/Bonds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Garage</td>
<td>$76 M</td>
<td>Private/Bonds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$160 M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
- Apron unit cost ($200/sy) from Destination Lindbergh.
- Cost estimate for runway extension provided by San Diego County.
- Terminal building expansion cost ($350/sf) from Destination Lindbergh.
- Structured parking estimated at $24,000/structured parking stall.
### Scenario 1D: Introduce Commercial Service at Brown Field

**Order of Magnitude Cost Estimates and Potential Funding Sources**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Cost Estimate</th>
<th>Potential Funding Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part 139 Certification (Facilities)</td>
<td>$9 M</td>
<td>AIP/PFC/Bonds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passenger Terminal</td>
<td>$19 M</td>
<td>PFC/Bonds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadway Improvements</td>
<td>$10 M</td>
<td>CalDOT/FHWA/PFC/Bonds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto Parking</td>
<td>$11 M</td>
<td>Private/Bonds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>$50 M</td>
<td>AIP/PFC/Bonds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$101 M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- Apron unit cost ($200/sy) from *Destination Lindbergh*.
- Terminal Building Expansion cost ($350/sf) from Destination Lindbergh / approximately 28,500 sf per CRQ terminal.
- Part 139 costs estimated based on upgrades and expenses at CRQ and recent cost at other airports.
- Surface parking cost ($4,000/surface stall) from JDA / 2,800 parking spaces based on full build-out for CRQ parking.
- The 15,500 SY of apron space needed is approximately equal to the space needed to park 6 B737s.
- Utility costs from City of San Diego ($50M).
Scenario 1D: Introduce Commercial Service at Brown Field

Implementation Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Development Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runway Extension</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terminal to FBO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Scenario 4A: Enhance CRQ for High-end / Corporate GA

#### Cost Estimates, Potential Funding Sources, and Implementation Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Cost Estimate</th>
<th>Potential Funding Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Runway Extension</td>
<td>$80 M</td>
<td>AIP/Bonds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversion of Terminal to FBO</td>
<td>$2 M</td>
<td>Private/Bonds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$82 M</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table Notes:**
- Cost estimate for runway extension provided by SDCAA.
- Terminal building conversion cost based on recent projects at other airports.

**Diagram Notes:**
- Development Program activities spread over 14 years.
- Runway Extension: 5 years.
- Terminal to FBO: 4 years.
Scenario 4B: Enhance Brown Field for High-end / Corporate GA

Cost Estimates, Potential Funding Sources, and Implementation Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Cost Estimate</th>
<th>Potential Funding Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utility Upgrade</td>
<td>$15 M</td>
<td>Private/Bonds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBO/Corporate Hangars</td>
<td>$39 M</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA T-Hangars</td>
<td>$3 M</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helicopter FBO/ARFF</td>
<td>$6 M</td>
<td>Private/AIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$63 M</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-Development</td>
<td>FBO</td>
<td>T-Hangars</td>
<td>Helicopter FBO</td>
<td>ARFF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: FBO costs assumed to be between $25M and $40M based on recent and planned development costs at local airports. Utility costs from City of San Diego and applied based on 25% development in this scenario.
**Scenario 4C: Enhance Gillespie Field for Mix-use General Aviation**

**Cost Estimates, Potential Funding Sources, and Implementation Schedule**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Cost Estimate</th>
<th>Potential Funding Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>El Cajon development</td>
<td>$40 M</td>
<td>AIP/Private/Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correct Deviations to Standards</td>
<td>$50 M</td>
<td>AIP/Bonds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$90 M</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend:
- **Light Blue**: Planning/Environmental
- **Yellow**: Design/Procurement
- **Dark Blue**: Construction
**Scenario 5A: Introduce Cargo Service at Brown Field**

**Cost Estimates, Potential Funding Sources, and Implementation Schedule**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Cost Estimate</th>
<th>Potential Funding Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Runway Upgrade</td>
<td>$80 M</td>
<td>AIP/Bonds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadway Improvements</td>
<td>$10 M</td>
<td>SANDAG/FHWA/Bonds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cargo Buildings and Apron</td>
<td>$94 M</td>
<td>Private/Bonds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>$50 M</td>
<td>Bonds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$234 M</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- Based on unit costs from other airports; assumed runway reconstruction would cost approx $400 SY.
- Cargo apron area was based on existing SF of cargo area at SDIA.
- Utility costs provided by City of San Diego.

![Gantt Chart]

The Gantt chart illustrates the planned timeline for the implementation of each component, with shaded areas indicating the estimated planning, environmental, design, procurement, and construction phases.
Supplemental Information
# Regional Forecast Facility Improvement and Operational Assumptions

Baseline scenario assumes combined growth of new airlines and existing airlines, with no new airport developments or significant improvements beginning in 2016. Continued deployment of new airport facilities, replacement of small regional airports, and larger regional airports, is planned for the expansion of major airports. The focus will be on improving airport capacity during peak periods. The assumptions for regional airports reflect infrastructure improvements more so than baseline scenarios.

## Airports Activity Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Diego International</td>
<td>18,200</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>21,010</td>
<td>42,200</td>
<td>26,213</td>
<td>51,000</td>
<td>10,875</td>
<td>23,500</td>
<td>14,270</td>
<td>29,000</td>
<td>Non-Identified</td>
<td>Non-Identified</td>
<td>Non-Identified</td>
<td>Non-Identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McClellan-Palomar</td>
<td>14,100</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>17,200</td>
<td>34,200</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery Field</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>Non-Identified</td>
<td>Non-Identified</td>
<td>Non-Identified</td>
<td>Non-Identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown Field Municipal</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>Non-Identified</td>
<td>Non-Identified</td>
<td>Non-Identified</td>
<td>Non-Identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gillespie Field</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>Non-Identified</td>
<td>Non-Identified</td>
<td>Non-Identified</td>
<td>Non-Identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramona</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: N/A = Not Applicable

Sources:
- San Diego County Regional Airport District, May, 2006
- San Diego County Regional Airport District, December, 2008
- FAA National Plan of Integrated Airport Systems, 2006
- San Diego County Regional Airport District Plan

## Facility and Operations Data

- **San Diego International**
  - Historical 2007: 18,200
  - Forecast 2010: 35,000
- **McClellan-Palomar**
  - Historical 2007: 14,100
  - Forecast 2010: 30,000
- **Montgomery Field**
  - Historical 2007: 5,500
  - Forecast 2010: 10,000
- **Brown Field Municipal**
  - Historical 2007: 8,500
  - Forecast 2010: 18,000
- **Gillespie Field**
  - Historical 2007: 1,000
  - Forecast 2010: 2,000
- **Ramona**
  - Historical 2007: 5,000
  - Forecast 2010: 10,000
## Strategic Assessment Summary Matrix

### Current Markets/Hole

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commercial Service</th>
<th>FAA Designated Reflector</th>
<th>Annual Aviation</th>
<th>Not in FAA NPIAS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Diego International (SAN)</td>
<td>McClellan-Palomar (MCR)</td>
<td>Montgomery Field Municipal (MGT)</td>
<td>Brown Field Municipal (SMB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpine Field (SAL)</td>
<td>Ramona (RMA)</td>
<td>Evergreen Valley (EGV)</td>
<td>Oceanside Community (OCD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escondido (EOD)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Facility Assessment/Recommendation of Current Users

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Assessment</th>
<th>Recommendation of Current Users</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary Regional Access</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to Regional Airports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrument Approach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passenger Terminal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR/Corporate Terminal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cargo Facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Development Potential

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Potential</th>
<th>Possible Change In Hole?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proximity to Users/Market Size (a)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadway Upgrades</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Airport Land Available for Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity to Highway/Highway Tracts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Concerns/Access</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Concerns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Consideration in the RASP

- **Should the airport be considered for additional uses or opportunities to optimize the region’s aviation system?**
- **Consideration for additional uses or opportunities to optimize the region’s aviation system.**
  - Additional use opportunities are identified based on the strategic assessment and consultation with stakeholders.

### Notes and References

- FAA NPIAS = National Airspace Integrated Airport Systems
- [Regional Aviation Strategic Plan (RASP)](http://example.com)
- [Regional Aviation Strategic Plan (RASP)](http://example.com)
- [Regional Aviation Strategic Plan (RASP)](http://example.com)
Historical Region-wide Aviation Demand

Notes:
- Airports with fewer than 1 million annual enplanements are not listed.
- GROWTH = Compound Annual Growth Rate.
- US airports airline market share is based on seat capacity in 2008.
- Tijuana International Airport airline market share is based on seat capacity 2008 to date.
- All airports' non-stop destinations are from Quarter 1 2009.
- Income figures are in 2009 dollars.
- Sources: Jacobs Consultancy, based on Tj00, census, Bureau of Economic Analysis, Cross Border Terminal Study, August 2009.
Existing and Projected Region-wide Aviation Demand

- Burbank Airport (BUR)
- Ontario International Airport (ONT)
- San Bernardino
- Long Beach Airport (LGB)
- John Wayne Orange County Airport (SNA)
- McClellan-Palomar Airport (CRQ)
- San Diego International Airport (SAN)
- Tijuana International Airport (TIJ)

Enplanements:
- Northern California
- Domestic (excluding California)
- International (excluding Mexico and Canada)
- Mexico

Notes:
- GROWTH = Compound Annual Growth Rate
- Population
- Real GDP
- Income
- Enplanements

Sources:
- Jacobs Consulting Analysis, Model Results, July 2010
- Based on SANDAG RTP, Update, 2009, SCAG RTP, 200x
- World Economic Outlook Database, IMF, October 2009, 2009-2010
- Economic Forecast 5 Mid-year Update, Los Angeles Economic Development Corporation, December 2008

AVIATION TRAVEL DEMAND MODEL INPUTS AND FINANCES
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA/BAJA CALIFORNIA REGION
San Diego County Regional Airport Authority