

**MINUTES
CITY OF ORMOND BEACH
AIRPORT MASTER PLAN UPDATE PUBLIC MEETING**

April 28, 2015

6:00 p.m.

City Commission Chambers

I. Welcome and Introductions

Present were Airport Manager Steven Lichliter, Economic Development Director Joe Mannarino, and City Manager Joyce Shanahan, Senior Vice President of Hoyle, Tanner & Associates, Inc. Doug Norman, Hoyle, Tanner & Associates Inc. Airport Planning Manager Evan McDougal, and Hoyle, Tanner & Associates Inc. Senior Airport Planner Hans Dorries.

The meeting began at 6:00 p.m.

Mr. Steven Lichliter, Airport Manager, thanked those in attendance for coming to the meeting. He stated that the public participation process for the Airport Master Plan was extremely important. He introduced the members of the planning team as City Manager Joyce Shanahan, Economic Development Director Joe Mannarino and from Hoyle, Tanner & Associates, Inc.: Senior Vice President Doug Norman, Airport Planning Manager Evan McDougal, and Senior Airport Planner Hans Dorries.

Mr. Lichliter stated that the planning team would explain the master planning process and the objectives of the master plan. He noted that they would also speak about the public involvement program. He stated that findings of the existing inventory conditions at the airport would also be presented along with the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) approved forecast for the airport. He explained that they would detail how that information was used to determine future facility requirements at the airport and explain the public comment forms. He noted that public comment forms could be found in the rear of the Commission Chambers. He explained that the comment forms were there in order to record any questions or comments made by the public in order to make them a part of the master plan. He noted that at the end of the meeting they would answer questions from the public about the inventory and forecast.

Mr. Lichliter explained that because this was a public meeting there were some ground rules to abide by. He requested that all public comments and questions be made in writing on the supplied public comment forms and include the respondent's name and address. He explained that after the presentation, speakers would be able to speak for two minutes each and asked that their comments and questions be specific and relevant to items on the agenda. He stated that all submitted forms would be compiled and included in the Master Plan Report. He displayed a listing of the capital improvements made at the airport from 2009 to 2015. He noted that this would be a starting point for the next phase in capital improvements. He explained that the product of the master plan would be a new capital improvement program for the airport.

Mr. Evan McDougal, Airport Planning Manager, Hoyle, Tanner & Associates, Inc., asked the audience to raise their hand if they lived within five miles of the airport. He then asked any pilots in attendance to raise their hands. He explained that he wanted to get an idea of who the audience was comprised of. He explained that he

wanted to provide a little background on his team. He stated that Mr. Doug Norman was a Senior Vice President at Hoyle, Tanner & Associates, Inc. in their Oviedo office, which he also managed, and was the engineering representative for the master plan update. He stated that Mr. Hans Dorries was a former Florida Institute of Technology instructor, who held a couple of master's degrees in aviation and aviation planning and had worked on master plans throughout the south. He explained that Mr. Dorries was also a specialist in noise and performed a lot of noise analysis. He introduced himself and stated that he was a retired Coast Guard and Army helicopter and airplane driver with various certifications.

II. Goals and Objectives of the Master Plan Update

Mr. McDougal stated that the goals and objectives of the master plan update were to improve overall safety and capacity of the airport, promote orderly and efficient development, plan for facilities and services to meet customer needs and to enhance the airport's ability to be self-sustaining and serve as an economic generator within the local economy. He noted that improving the safety and capacity of the airport was a top priority for the FAA. He stated that the airport's ability to be self-sustaining meant a lot to the local taxpaying communities, who often had to support their airport to some degree. He stated that it was important to try and have the airport pay for itself.

Mr. McDougal noted that one of the outcomes of this process would be a set of drawings called an airport layout plan, and he explained that any future project requesting FAA funds would need to be on that layout plan. He further explained that there were only two components of the airport master plan which the FAA would sign off on, one of which was the forecast, which was already completed, and the second being the airport layout plan, which would have a number of proposed development options on it. He explained that those options were not approved, but that the concept would be approved by the FAA signing that document. He explained that the FAA had to approve those two items in order for the city to seek funding for the airport. He stated that an objective of the plan was consistency, noting that safety would always be a top objective. He stated that the objective for the community was balance, and he noted that a community could not, and did not want to, spend all of their money on the airport. He stated that ideally the economics would support itself and an expansion if it was needed.

III. The Airport Master Planning Process

Mr. McDougal stated that the FAA required a public involvement program to be a part of the airport master planning process. He encouraged audience members to fill out and submit the comment forms provided. He explained that they wanted all of the comments in writing so that they could be addressed. He stated that the other steps in the planning process were the inventory of existing conditions, facility requirements, aviation forecasts, the development and evaluation of alternatives, environmental considerations, airport layout plan drawings set, facilities implementation plan, and financial considerations. He noted that the inventory of existing conditions, facility requirements, and aviation forecast steps had already been completed and that alternative development and evaluation would be next. He noted that there were some obvious needs presently at the airport.

Mr. McDougal stated that the documents primarily used in their planning guidance were the FAA Advisory Circulars (AC) 150/5070-6B Airport Master Plans (Change 2)

and 150/5300-13A Airport Design (Change 1), the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) Guidebook for Airport Master Planning and the Airport Cooperative Research Program (ACRP) Guidebook for General Aviation Facility Planning (Report 113). He noted that all of these documents would be available on the airport's website.

IV. Public Involvement Program

Mr. McDougal stated that evening they would be identifying the stakeholders, i.e., those impacted by the airport and its operations and the key issues. He explained that they would also be making the public aware and providing public input forms.

V. Summary of Inventory of Existing Conditions

Mr. McDougal stated that the airport was one of over 3,000 airports in the National Plan of Integrated Airport Systems (NPIAS). He explained that the NPIAS, which was published by the FAA every two years, categorized different airports. He noted that presently the Ormond Beach Municipal Airport was considered a public-owned airport, a general aviation reliever airport, and an airport with a regional role. He explained that a general aviation reliever airport meant that if Daytona Beach Regional Airport was overcrowded, the extra airplanes could go to Ormond Beach Municipal Airport.

Mr. McDougal stated that they would discuss the airfield facilities and infrastructure and how those were determined. He noted that dimensional standards were predicated on a few factors. He explained that one factor was the aircraft approach category (AAC), which was the speed in which the aircraft was approaching. He further explained that in this case it was a "B" aircraft that was being considered as the critical aircraft, which meant that it had an approach speed of about 91 knots, or 100 miles per hour. He displayed an AAC chart and noted that as you moved through the alphabet the approach speeds rose. He displayed photographs of traditional "B" aircraft, a Beechcraft Baron B58 and a Cessna Citation 550. He noted that aircraft were improving and were able to come in slower than before and their noise level had dropped by 75% over the last 30 years.

Mr. McDougal stated that another dimensional standard was the airplane design group (ADG). He explained that the ADG was based on the wingspan and how the width needed on the side of taxiways was determined. He stated that the current ADG was "II," which described an aircraft with a 20 to 30 foot tail height and a wingspan between 49 and 79 feet. He displayed photographs of ADG "II" type aircraft, a Beechcraft King Air and a Cessna Citation 550. He noted that the airport satisfied those airplanes although they would likely see more Cessna 172s and 150s there than those he displayed. He stated that the third dimensional standard would be the instrument flight visibility category in runway visual range (RVR) values. He explained that for all runways the current instrument visibility category was "5,000 RVR feet," which was about one statute mile. He noted that this was the third item used in a runway design code (RDC). He stated that this was the standard that would be used to build runways at Ormond Beach Municipal Airport presently. He stated that all the runways would be an RDC B-II-5000. He noted that there was an interactive table in the FAA advisory circular online where you could enter the RDC type and it would list all of the different dimensions.

Mr. McDougal displayed aerial photographs of the airport's existing runways. He stated that Runway 8/26 was 4,005 feet in length and 75 feet in width, and that Runway 17/35 was 3,705 feet in length and 100 feet in width. He explained that runway safety areas (RSA) were surfaces surrounding the runway prepared or suitable for reducing the risk of damage to an aircraft in the event of an undershoot, or excursion from the runway. He stated that another area was the runway object free area (ROFA) and explained that area was centered on the ground on a runway centerline to enhance the safety of aircraft operations by having the area remain clear of objects, except for objects required for air navigation or aircraft ground operations. He also identified the runway obstacle free zone (ROFZ) and explained that it was a three dimensional airspace along the runway that extended the runway centerline and was required to be clear of obstacles for protection of aircraft landing or take off from the runway, and for missed approaches.

Mr. McDougal further identified the runway protection zone (RPZ) and explained that it was an area at the ground level prior to the threshold or beyond the runway end, to enhance the safety and protection of people and property on the ground. He noted that the FAA encouraged it to be on your property and stated that there was a land use component to it where they did not want assemblies of people in those areas in case an airplane landed short or overran the runway. He explained that the RPZs changed size based on the size of the aircraft which was why they were so important.

Mr. McDougal stated that threshold siting surfaces were also present for both approach and departure surfaces. He stated that approach surfaces were designed to protect the use of the runway in both visual and instrument meteorological conditions near the airport. He noted that the approach should be clear of obstacles. He explained that for every 20 feet there was a foot increase in elevation on a slope. He noted that because there were non-precision approaches, they were all 20 to 1 approaches. He noted that trees, towers and buildings could not penetrate that 20 to 1 slope. He noted that in the past month the airport performed some tree cutting because trees had been penetrating that area. He explained that if anything was penetrating that area, the FAA would decline to allow instrument approaches at night because they would assume that a pilot coming in would not be able to see an obstruction in that area.

Mr. McDougal stated that threshold siting departure surfaces, when cleared of obstacles, allowed pilots to follow standard departure procedures in instrument meteorological conditions. He noted that this slope was 40 to 1, which was very shallow. He stated that he hardly knew of any places that could keep that slope clear. He explained that penetrations required non-standard climb rates or higher departure minimums. He noted that the airport could designate which runways would have these departure surfaces. He stated that the FAA would perform an analysis and if it was not clear, it would issue a non-standard instrument departure. He noted that most pilots were familiar with those.

Mr. McDougal spoke about electronic, visual, and satellite navigational aides (NAVAIDS). He stated that the airport had a very high frequency omnidirectional range and tactical air (VORTAC), which made airways for low and high altitude very high frequency omnidirectional range routes. He noted that VORTAC were being used much less around the country as the global positioning system (GPS) became the primary source of navigation. He stated that there was also an airport beacon, which rotated and was used less and less due to GPS. He explained that pilots used

to figure out where they were at night by going from beacon to beacon. He stated that the airport had runway end identifier lights (REIL), which were bright flashing strobe lights at the end of the runway to help a pilot locate the end of the runway. He also noted precision approach path indications (PAPI). He explained that pilots used the PAPIs as a glide path to make their approach to the end of the runway and explained that PAPIs kept them clear from known obstructions.

Mr. McDougal stated that there were RNAV GPS Instrument Approaches, which were getting better and better as GPS was being more widely used. He stated that the last NAVAID he would mention were the segmented circle and wind cones. He asked if anyone knew the official reason for a segmented circle. He stated that the reason was to draw the pilot's attention to the wind cone in the center of it. He noted that it would also let you know if there was a non-standard pattern. He stated that it was always a challenge to maintain segmented circles.

Mr. McDougal stated that the airport's Airport Traffic Control Tower (ATCT) was constructed and commissioned in 2004. He explained that the ATCT assisted a lot in forecasting as they could use real data instead of guessing. He stated that the ATCT was operated under the FAA Contract Tower Program, which meant that the FAA funded it, but it was privately run. He stated that the tower was operational from 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. 365 days a year. He noted that the airport had an Automated Weather Observing System (AWOS) as its weather reporting facility. He further noted that it specifically was an AWOS III. He stated that the system provided pilots information on a discrete radio frequency about wind speed, direction and gusts, temperature, dew point, altimeter, density altitude, precipitation accumulation, and cloud height as they were approaching the airport.

Mr. McDougal spoke about the existing taxiways and taxi lanes. He explained that taxiways were defined paths established for the taxiing of aircraft from one part of an airport to another and that a taxi lane was a taxiway for low speed and precise taxiing, located generally outside the movement area to provide access from taxiways to parking areas. He displayed an aerial photograph highlighting the different taxiways at the airport. He then displayed an aerial photograph highlighting the different taxi lanes at the airport.

Mr. McDougal spoke about the general aviation facilities at the airport. He stated that those facilities were hangars, terminal buildings, fuel farms, aircraft parking aprons, fixed base operators, flight schools, and a helipad. He stated that every airport needed support facilities. He explained that Ormond Beach Municipal Airport was under the jurisdictional responsibility of the Ormond Beach Fire Department and was primarily served by Ormond Beach Fire Stations 93 and 94. He stated that there was no aircraft rescue and firefighting requirement on a general aviation airport such as the Ormond Beach Municipal Airport. He explained that when passengers were being carried on airplanes with more than 9 seats, they would be required to have an Aircraft Rescue and Firefighting (ARF) Building and firefighting services standing by for commercial passenger carrying aircraft.

Mr. McDougal noted the fuel storage capacities for the different tanks at the airport as follows: three 12,000 gallon AvGAS tanks, one 10,000 gallon Jet-A tank, three 1,000 gallon fuel trucks, and one 2,200 gallon Jet-A truck.

Mr. McDougal stated that one of the recent changes to the master plan documentation was to look at the access, circulation, and parking for people that

were trying to find their way to the airport or into the airport. He cited examples of a cab driver knowing where to pick up a passenger. He asked if there was a communication medium on the gate at the airport.

Mr. Lichliter replied that there was an entry pad with a list provided to identify the facility the person wanted to go to. He explained that the person would then call that facility who could press a number on their phone to open the gate, if necessary.

Mr. McDougal noted that the circulation would be reviewed as the planning process went on, and they would try and determine if there were any ways to improve it in the future, particularly with respect to roadways. He noted that the airport owned two non-aeronautical facilities and leased the land with the revenue coming back to the airport. He explained that it was an FAA requirement that if revenue was generated on airport obligated land that all proceeds flow to the airport as opposed to the General Fund. He stated that those two facilities were the Ormond Beach Sports Complex, which was 113 acres, and the River Bend Golf Course, which was 172 acres.

VI. FAA Approved Aviation Activity Forecast

Mr. Hans Dorries, Senior Airport Planner, Hoyle, Tanner & Associates, Inc., displayed the approved forecast and a letter from the FAA stating that they had reviewed the forecast and thought it was reasonable to be used in the master plan. He stated that the first step was a survey of the existing based aircraft. He noted that the aircraft at the airport were counted and that there were 163 based aircraft as of December 2014. He stated that the next step was to look at different forecasts and explained that the FAA put out a forecast called a Terminal Area Forecast (TAF) and an aerospace forecast, which was a national look at the entire aviation system. He explained that the TAF was specific to each airport. He explained that they looked at all of those forecasts and tried to determine what reasonable growth rates would be. He displayed those growth rates on a chart and noted that the base aircraft increased from 163 in 2014 to a forecasted 207 in 2034.

Mr. Dorries noted that the same predicting was done with operations, explaining that an operation was either the takeoff or landing of an aircraft. He explained that they started with a baseline for total annual operations and used the TAF, the tower opinion, and FAA data systems to determine their total. He stated that they determined that 124,695 would be the baseline for 2014. He displayed a graph showing that the forecasted total annual operations changed from 124,685 in 2014 to 152,575 in 2034. He noted that the next step was to break operations down into two types: itinerant and local. He explained that itinerant meant that these were operations that came to the airport and then left the airport. He noted that those would be aircraft based in other airports which came to Ormond Beach for a specific reason. He displayed a graph with the itinerant operations forecast and noted that they anticipated an increase from the baseline of 67,764 in 2014 to 83,916 in 2034.

Mr. Dorries stated that local operations comprised the aircraft that operated within the tower control and comprised most of the flight training actions at the airport. He explained that flight students would fly and come back to the same airport to practice or practice landings and takeoffs. He displayed a graph with the local operations showing 56,931 in 2014 and 68,659 in 2034. He noted that there were also helicopter operations at the airport and that the base in 2014 was 6,235 and 7,629 were forecasted for 2034. He stated that they also looked at instrument operations

and explained that those were the aircraft that were flown by instrument procedures and were mostly itinerant operations. He displayed a graph with the instrument operations projections and noted it was forecasted to rise from 7,454 in 2014 to 9,229 in 2034.

Mr. Dorries noted that they had spoken to the ATCT to get estimates on the peak periods. He noted that they determined that summer was usually the time for peak activity and that the average day during the peak month would have 624 operations and could get as many as 110 operations in an hour. He explained that the peak months had 13,240 operations in 2014. He noted that an operation could be either a takeoff or landing of an aircraft. He explained that a "touch and go," or takeoff and landing, or landing and takeoff, was normally counted as two operations.

Mr. Dorries stated that the last part in the forecast table was the critical aircraft forecast. He noted that the AAG was "B" and the ADG was "II," as previously mentioned by Mr. McDougal. He stated that the Taxiway Design Group (TDG) was 1B. He explained that the TDG depended on the aircraft's requirements to taxi around the airport. He noted on a graph that the airport was currently a B-II with a 1B TDG and was forecasted to remain so in the future until 2034, where it was forecasted to be a C-II with a 1B TDG. He stated that they thought it was a possibility in 20 years that larger aircraft may want to operate at the airport, but he noted that it was not a certainty. He noted that C-II was not the designation for large commercial aircraft and that designation did not change the dimension of the airplane; but as Mr. McDougal had explained the designation, it had to do with the speed of the approach.

VII. How to Determine Future Facility Requirements

Mr. Dorries stated that first they calculated the annual service volume (ASV). He explained that they looked at the geometry of the runway configuration. He stated that the FAA provided guidance in the form of FAA Advisory Circular (AC) 150/5060-5 Airport Capacity and Delay. He noted that was a very theoretical methodology for estimating the capacity of an airport. He stated that for the existing runway configuration, the ASV was 230,000 annual operations, which was what it was estimated that the airport could handle under no constraints. He stated that the forecast was for operations to be at about 66% of capacity in 2034, noting that a lot of capacity would remain. He explained that if they were at 80% of capacity, they would perform additional calculations in order to look at delay.

Mr. Doug Norman, Senior Vice President, Hoyle, Tanner & Associates, Inc., stated that Ormond Beach was classified as a B-II which meant that the FAA took into account the size of aircraft utilizing the airport and that there were at least 500 operations. He explained that the dimensional standards in the taxiways and runways would all be designed to meet that classification. He stated that every three years the FDOT performed an evaluation of all of the airports in Florida. He explained that they performed a pavement condition index (PCI) on the pavement. He stated that the study he would be referencing was performed in 2011 and while the pavement had been recently inspected again in 2014, the data had not yet been made available. He noted that because of that it did not show Taxiway A, Taxiway C, and the realignment portion of Taxiway E, and the Taxiway B intersection. He explained that those had all been redone and were therefore in good condition. He noted that the only pavement in poor condition was Taxiway D and Taxiway B, Taxiway E, and Taxiway F were in fair condition.

A member of the public in attendance noted that he was not a pilot and asked Mr. Norman to explain the taxiways.

Mr. Norman used the laser pointer to point out the taxiways on the overhead projection screen which displayed a PowerPoint slide of an overhead map of the airport taxiways. He stated that Taxiway A was the parallel to Runway 8/26. He identified Taxiway C, Taxiway B, Taxiway E, and Taxiway D. He explained that every runway was classified by the direction in which it ran. He cited Runway 8/26 as an example and noted that it ran in a 360 degree pattern, 80 degrees and 260 degrees. He noted that Runway 17/35's pavement was in good condition, but its runway markings were faded. He stated that Runway 8/26's pavement was in fair condition and its runway markings were also faded. He stated that the FAA took this criteria and made recommendations on when the runways and taxiways needed to be rehabilitated. He noted that he did not have that data present, but in the future those pavements would have to be reconditioned, milled, and overlaid. He stated that the runways were in relatively good condition and that the facilities overall were in very good condition. He cited Taxiway D and Taxiway E as those likely needing attention in the near future.

Mr. Dorries stated that there were runway length requirements. He stated that the FAA provided guidance in Advisory Circular (AC) 150/5325-4B Runway Length Requirements for Airport Design. He explained that the AC provided how a runway length was to be estimated for airport purposes. He stated that the factors that governed the suitability of runway length included airport elevation, temperature, wind velocity, airplane operating weights, takeoff and landing flap settings, runway surface conditions (dry or wet), effective runway gradient and obstructions, and noise abatement procedures. He displayed tables showing different types of aircraft. He explained that up to 75% of the fleet was in the first table, while 25% were in the second table.

Mr. Dorries explained that they took those figures and looked at what the hottest month would be and what the mean daily maximum temperature would be in the hottest month. He noted that the estimate was that the hottest month for the airport was July and that the mean daily maximum temperature was 90.6 degrees Fahrenheit. He stated that if they wanted to have the ability to offer the runway to 75% of the fleet, which constituted the aircraft varieties in the first table shown, at 90% useful load, they would need a runway length of 6,700 feet. He noted that if they wished to limit the useful load to 60%, then they would only need a runway length of 4,600 feet. He stated that if they wanted to have the ability to offer the runway to 100% of the fleet, which constituted the aircraft varieties in both of the tables shown at 90% useful load, then they would need a runway length of 8,400 feet. He noted that if they wished to limit the useful load to 60%, then they would only need a runway length of 5,400 feet.

Mr. Dorries stated that the overall apron area, where the airplanes were parked, was insufficient, and there were too many airplanes parked too closely together. He explained that the existing apron pavement condition also needed to be improved and that the aircraft circulation provided by the current taxi lanes was insufficient. He noted that they did not want to have airplanes running into each other or into a building. He stated that fixed base operators (FBO) were operators who offered services to the airport. He noted that there were currently limited FBO services for itinerant traffic. He explained that this was a problem because of the apron area and

that if a jet wanted to come in they would have to call in ahead of time and reserve the space as things would have to be moved around to accommodate them.

Mr. Dorries stated that the airport manager's office was currently located in the ATCT, which was an area restricted to public access. He noted that it would be nice to have it located in an area that was more accessible to the public. He stated that there were two fuel farms located at the intersection of Taxiway B and Taxiway D, which was a convenient location for aircraft refueling. He noted that they were thinking about possible different locations for those fuel farms as many pilots who wanted to refuel may also want to exit the aircraft and use restroom facilities or FBO services in order to take a break.

VIII. Public Comments

Mr. McDougal asked members of the public who wished to speak to please give their name and address at the start of their comments and explained that they would each have two minutes to speak. He requested that comments be kept to items on the agenda, which included the airport inventory and the forecast that was presented. He requested that comments and questions be provided in writing on the comment forms provided. He noted that not all comments and questions could be answered that evening and that additional answers and updates could be provided on the airport website. He stated that the intent was for the public to have an opportunity to make their comments, and he explained that if a brief answer could be provided after their question, they would try and answer it at that time; but otherwise the answer would be provided at a later date.

Mr. Lichliter explained that there was an airport webpage that could be found at www.ormondbeach.org and on that webpage there would be a dedicated subpage for the 2015 Airport Master Plan Update. He noted that this presentation would be available on that subpage.

Mr. Paul Schulten, 1201 Kirkpatrick Circle, presented a theoretical scenario where he was a businessman and a pilot who owned an airplane and wanted to visit sunny Florida. He noted that this theoretical pilot had heard about Ormond Crossings and was considering having a business in the area and moving his family to Ormond Beach. He stated that this pilot would load up his wife in his airplane and fly to the Ormond Beach Municipal Airport. He asked where this theoretical pilot would park as there was no place to put his airplane. He noted that there was no place for the pilot's wife to use the restroom if she exited the airplane. He asked where he would buy fuel. He noted that if the tower was closed he would not know what to do or where to go. He stated that this pilot and his wife might want to go into the city to eat and explore the area. He stated that it would not happen because there was no place to put their airplane. He noted that the wife would not want to come back since she could not use the restroom at the airport.

Mr. Schulten stated that he did have an airplane which was based out of the airport. He noted that it was not a very open and hospitable airport, which was a shame as it was a wonderful facility and located in sunny Florida where everyone wanted to be. He noted that Ormond Crossings and other business developments in the area would want airplane access, but he reiterated that there was nowhere for them to go at the airport. He explained that presently someone coming in would land and just get gas and leave. He noted that his observation as a pilot flying into the airport was

that it was a dead end. He stated that it would be great if something could be done as the airport had great facilities and great businesses.

Mr. Stan Driscoll, 10 Sandalwood Lane, stated that his home was located directly under the north-south runway on the Tomoka River. He noted that in the objectives for the plan it had listed airport expansion. He stated that he did not see anything in the presentation about noise abatement. He asked what the airport's plans for noise abatement were. He stated that he had presently been informed by airport management that when the tower was operating it could not see the aircraft when they were out over the Tomoka River. He noted that if the airport tower could not see aircraft, then it could not control them. He stated that the Ormond Beach Municipal Airport was primarily a flight school operation and did not have many transient aircraft. He explained that student pilots were coming into the airport flying very low and slow and pushing outside the recommended flight pattern. He further explained that there was a recommended flight path to remain west of the river, but he noted that the student pilots did not follow it.

Mr. Driscoll stated that he would like to see a specific section on noise abatement in the master plan report. He noted that one of the slides in the presentation discussed FAA requirements for airport length and that one of the considerations was noise abatement procedures. He asked what the noise abatement procedures were for the airport and asked what would be done to make sure that planes remained to the west of the river and did not fly in over the predominately residential areas on the east side of the river.

Ms. Peggy Farmer, 4 Allenwood Look, stated that she lived within the five mile range of the airport. She noted that she did not have a business at the airport but explained that she was very concerned about the economic prosperity of Ormond Beach. She stated that she had been waiting patiently for Ormond Crossings, which was the greatest possibility for the city's future. She noted that she and others were working diligently to enhance the beauty of the North US1 corridor, which was located in front of Ormond Crossings. She explained that Ormond Crossings went further back by the airport and that for Ormond Crossings to attract good corporate businesses and industry they needed the airport to improve. She stated that it was the little airport that could, but it now needed to become the little airport that did. She explained that the airport was an embarrassment and that she had heard repeatedly that planes landed there and their occupants could not go to the restroom. She stated that the community could do better than that. She explained that she felt that in the budget and long-range planning there should be plans to improve the airport so that it would welcome people to the wonderful community. She stated that economic prosperity had to be protected.

Mr. David Slick, 322 John Anderson Drive, stated that he had lived in Ormond Beach since 1986 and had specifically moved to the city because of the airport. He stated that he owned Command Medical Products which now had a payroll of about \$4.5 to \$5 million, and employed about 125 people, which had a tremendous impact on the community. He noted that his business was located in the Airport Industrial Park specifically because of the airport. He stated that the airport should be an economic development engine. He mentioned that Ormond Crossings was just starting to blossom again due to the national economy. He explained that the businesses coming down to look at Ormond Crossings would go through the same scouting process as he did, and he noted that he also looked at Deland, Daytona Beach, and New Smyrna Beach before landing in Ormond Beach. He explained that he came to Ormond Beach because he loved the community and not because the airport was

the best around. He stated that there was now an opportunity to get some things in the airport master plan which would make it enticing for those coming looking to build buildings and businesses in the new Ormond Crossings. He stated that he hoped that the city would start working diligently on a city-run FBO, an extension of the runway, and other things that would really help make the airport viable for the next 20 to 30 years. He explained that new airplanes would require extensions of the runway.

Mr. Mike Jiloty, 15 Winding Creek Way, stated that he owned a small business in Ormond Beach. He explained that he just wanted to underscore the thought that the Ormond Beach Municipal Airport was a port of entry for the community. He stated that he started flying in the late 1980s and flew in and out of airports throughout the state of Florida. He noted that he was specifically thinking about airports in Naples, Lakeland, and Tallahassee. He explained that during that time those airports had gone through major makeovers and a renaissance of sorts so that they were now very presentable, welcoming for the business community, and also very much a part of their own communities. He stated that those were the types of things he would like to see for the Ormond Beach Municipal Airport. He stated that the airport would be a driver for economic development in Ormond Crossings, and he thought that it was vital that as many improvements were included in the master plan as possible so that in the decades ahead the airport could be made an even more important part of the community.

Mr. Al Jorczak, 679 N. Beach Street, stated that he would like to echo some of Mr. Slick's comments as he also had a business in the Airport Industrial Park. He stated that he relocated from Connecticut to Ormond Beach because he wanted to be close to an airport. He noted that he had lived in the city for almost 25 years and felt that the progress made on the previous master plan for the airport had not gone terribly well in terms of capitalizing on projects. He stated that the airport was sadly deficient as compared to surrounding airports in other communities. He explained that it was not a business friendly airport for those who might want to come and relocate to the area. He stated that Ormond Crossings could be a huge economic driver, located just north of the airport, but only if the city was to take the asset of the airport and use it effectively. He noted that presently it was not being used very effectively. He explained that projects and improvements took a very long time to develop and just because they were in the master plan it did not necessarily mean that they were going to get done. He stated that he thought the objective should be to look to maximizing the capability of what could be developed in the plan. He noted that if something was not in the plan it could not be done, so they should consider what should be in the plan and then look at it from a capital budgeting standpoint. He stated that the airport needed to be improved upon if it was going to attract businesses.

Mr. Charles Russell, 14 Cotton Mill Court, asked what, if anything, in the master plan would look at the citizens who were harassed daily by flight school planes. He explained that there had been a long process previously that had elicited pledges of abiding by the flight path, but he stated that it was routinely being violated. He stated that the community should be polled on it. He stated that flight schools had to be told that they were offensive to those that lived there. He noted that pledges and promises had been made but were broken every day. He asked if flight school operators were required to have liability insurance. He noted that the FAA did not require liability insurance for planes.

Mr. Lichliter stated that he could not answer that question as he did not run a flight school. He stated that he would find out for Mr. Russell and see if he could get some specific information about what the flight schools did or did not carry for insurance. He noted that he would find the answer and contact Mr. Russell.

An individual in the audience asked Mr. Lichliter when the comment forms had to be turned in; whereby, Mr. Lichliter replied that he would prefer to receive them that evening, but that they could also be emailed or mailed to him at a later date, if that was not possible.

Ms. Mary Schulten noted that she was under 18 years old and would therefore not disclose her address. She stated that she was part of the Ormond Aircraft Group and President of the Volusia Teenage Republicans and had interned for both Florida State Representative Paul Renner and Florida Senator Travis Hutson and as such had the greater good of the community in mind. She stated that she thought that the airport was a wonderful asset to the community, but it needed to be utilized better. She noted that a good FBO would have an impact. She explained that she herself was a student pilot and wanted to return to locations she flew to that had great FBOs. She stated that she thought that Ormond Beach's options and potential were limited by not having somewhere where pilots could use the restrooms and get a drink after they landed. She noted that another problem was that fuel was not available all of the time. She stated that she would like to see those improvements be made.

Mr. Eric Sanderson, 302 River Bluff Drive, stated that he lived in the big pocket near the north and south runway. He explained that he did not know anything about the student flight plans or helicopters and was not too worried about the noise but noted that the flight students flew right above his home. He stated that he was formerly a firefighter and paramedic. He explained that his home butted up against the woods and if anything were to happen there would be no stopping a brush fire coming up to the woods. He noted that there had never been a controlled burn in that location. He stated that two fire stations would not be able to handle it if something were to happen. He asked about the flight plan and noted that helicopters also flew over his home.

Mr. Lichliter stated that the practice patterns for the helicopters were part of the published noise abatement procedures. He explained that the helicopters should not be flying on the other side of Airport Road over by Tomoka Oaks and the Trails. He stated that they would continue to work with the helicopter operators to make them do so. He explained that student pilots and other transitory pilots may not always realize that those flight plans were in effect, but it was something that they could keep working on with them. He noted that the pattern was supposed to keep them on the airport side of Airport Road.

Mr. Schulten stated that he was sympathetic to those living around the airport. He noted that he saw a lot of flight schools not abiding by the set out procedures. He explained that it made him feel bad as he was a pilot, too. He noted that many students performed very shallow approaches, and he was not sure what they were being taught as airlines did not fly like that. He stated that it was unsafe. He stated that it would be easy to fix the issue of the flight path over the river as flyers could be given to different flight schools to instruct them on the proper flight paths. He offered his assistance. He stated that every airport around the world was unique. He stated that there was no reason that the students could not move their flight patterns 500

feet in the other direction. He noted that it was actually good practice and that there was no reason that their flight instructors could not teach them to do a minimum three degree glide slope, which was what airliners did.

A member of the audience began to interject and the presenters reiterated that any comments needed to be made into the microphone and on the record.

Mr. Driscoll stated that there was a specific published flight plan where the flights were supposed to remain west of the river and not come by Tomoka Oaks or Hidden Hills. He stated that the flight plan was not being enforced. He explained that he was told that the tower could not see the flights that far out because the radar that they were looking at was Daytona Beach's radar. He stated that he did not know whether it was airport management or the tower control that was deficient.

Mr. Lichliter stated that there were voluntary noise abatement procedures and published flight patterns for the airport. He explained that the issue was that the tower's primary function was to maintain safe separation of aircraft and that they did not have the perspective to necessarily tell which spot on the ground the plane was over as they were primarily concerned with their location in the air. He further explained that the city did not have any authority to enforce noise abatement procedures as that was the sole purview of the FAA. He noted that it was a challenge and very frustrating. He stated that they could not go further than voluntary procedures, but he noted that they did communicate with the flights schools and were open to developing new voluntary procedures. He explained that the flight schools did need to work on being professional as they were holding themselves out as a place to train professional pilots. He noted that it was frustrating for him, as well as the residents impacted by it; but he explained that the city was doing what it could to help the situation. He reiterated that the tower was concerned with safe separation of aircraft. He requested that the discussion focus on the master plan and asked for any other speakers who had comments on the master plan.

Mr. Jorczak stated that he currently served on the city's Planning Board and had previously served on the Aviation Advisory Board. He noted that he had a technical question with respect to the forecasting procedure that had been determined in conjunction with the FAA. He asked what the long-term plans were with respect to what was anticipated to be done with the industrial segment of Ormond Crossings, and the other added segment, which would be wholesale retail and housing. He noted that Ormond Crossings would be a huge development located on the north side of the airport. He asked how the potential for the time span in which Ormond Crossings' development would take place was factored into the projection for the usage of the airport and how it would impact those numbers. He explained that as companies started to come in to fill the industrial park and more business class aircraft began to utilize the airport, it would have an impact on how those numbers changed. He noted that while they were forecasting today, they were really looking out 10 or 15 years in terms of what that development structure would be. He stated that this was where it was critical with respect to how much could be packed into the plan to even achieve the funding necessary for segments of the plan to be accomplished. He stated that if those numbers should not be based on some formula that did not look at the specific circumstances in Ormond Beach. He again noted that if a project was not in the plan they could not get funding for it.

Mr. McDougal stated that this formula and forecast had been approved by the FAA. He noted that while it was a long-term forecast, the first five years were the most

accurate. He stated that the first five years showed a slow and steady growth which was what they anticipated to happen. He explained that the FAA and FDOT had based aircraft at a certain level, and then Mr. Lichliter did an inventory and the based aircraft figure was much higher. He noted that as those things changed the master plan would change. He explained that if they had to do a revision to the forecast because of an increase in activity they could do so and seek a new forecast approval. He noted that they would show that growth was occurring and that it was not staying with the forecast. He stated that FDOT and FAA forecasts were right part of the time over time. He noted that the economics would change and it would affect the forecast. He stated that it was important to look at the forecast three to five years in the future and to see where there were increases and changes.

IX. Final Comments and Meeting Adjournment

Mr. McDougal stated that the next steps would be to look at the alternatives. He explained that some of the alternatives would be coming from the comment form suggestions. He stated that they would look at how those ideas could happen at the airport and look at things such as where an FBO or a General Aviation (GA) Terminal could be located. He noted that an FBO was normally a private business selling services to pilots. He stated that a GA Terminal could provide facilities such as a restaurant, restrooms, and water. He noted that those things were important. He explained that they would review the alternatives and then evaluate them against things like environmental constraints, airspace constraints, and ground space constraints. He stated that they would create alternatives and then propose likely alternatives which would be brought back to see what would work the best for the community.

Mr. McDougal stated that he anticipated that the next meeting would take place at the end of July or in early August. He thanked those in attendance for participating and encouraged them to complete the comment forms provided and return them to Mr. Lichliter.

Mr. Lichliter stated that the comment forms had been provided previously and that he had received a lot of responses, but he encouraged those in attendance to complete it if they had not already and noted that they could use a new form to elaborate or provide additional details to existing comments made. He noted that the comment forms would be used to develop the new master plan. He stated that the form would be available on the website along with the PowerPoint presentation shown that evening. He thanked those in attendance for coming and participating.

The meeting ended at 7:21 p.m.

Transcribed by: Colby Cilento