

Here is an e-mail from Jim Washington describing a "second alternative to the HMB airport master plan":

---

Congratulations to the committee for agreeing to Alternate "D" on 3 July. You all deserve great praise for completing the description of this new alternate. I have given a copy of the written comments to Ric Lohman for the 9 July meeting. I added comment 25 that itemized the concerns on the poster board that we were using to keep that of our observations. I am going to Seattle and Portland, but will be back Wednesday evening. Hope to see you at the MCCC meeting.

I still believe that the environmental analysis should look at an alternative that best fits the land use that exists around the airport. I thought the committee was starting to make great suggestions that would improve safety and reduce future noise. We should continue to look at these ideas during the environmental review.

OK, Then; here is alternative "E" and some comments why this proposal should be evaluated:

- 1) Change the VFH pattern to be west of the airport in lieu of east of the airport. This would remove the majority of the VFH traffic away from El Granada and Moss Beach Heights (The hospital). VFH traffic would then be aligned with the GPS approach traffic. I believe this to be safer for the pilots. This also removes problems associated with the coastal hills being the the airspace of the easterly pattern. The hills on the west are lower than the airspace limits. The pattern over the water would provide easy guide paths back the the airport if an aircraft needed to land quickly.
- 2) Provide the GPS and ASOS systems to make it safer for pilots. This provides greater usability of the airport without providing additional noise due the approach being over water.
- 3) Move the displaced thresholds to 1,100 from each end of the 5,000 foot runway. This would provide 5,000 feet for take offs and 3,900 feet for landing. The major benefit would be the expansion of the Airport Protection Zones at the end of each runway to allow for more safety for neighbors to the airport from accidents that may occur near to the ends of the runways. The present APZs only provide minimal safety. Change all the runway lighting to accomodate this change.
- 4) Provide a full length parralel taxiway and high speed exit connector taxiways. This configuration would allow for the airport to restrict touch and goes. The runway would be safer due to aircraft leaving the runway sooner. Practice operations would be able to taxi bacvk to the end of the runway without interfering with hangar or tie down activity.
- 5) Provide hangar and other land side improvements similiar to Alternative "D".

This will probably cost about 3 million more than "D", but I believe the improved safety and associated noise reductions will be greatly worth the investment.

I Hope the MCCC approves including this alternative in the environmental analysis. Evaluation does not mean acceptance. I believe the final Master Plan could have the best features of any the the three alternatives being evaluated.

Thanks to all of you for your great effort and participation. See you at the next MCCC meeting or Airport Subcommittee meeting.



[Back](#)

