

COMMENTS & SUGGESTIONS

PUBLIC OUTREACH MEETING - 2018 BUSINESS PLAN UPDATE

JANUARY, HANK LOPEZ COMMUNITY CENTER

1. Question: Is the 2018 Business Plan Update (2018 BPU) merely a plan put together by the County to prove that Reid-Hillview Airport (RHV) is not financially viable? Is this a move by Supervisor Chavez and Sylvia Gallegos to close RHV?
2. Comment: The County should be open and forthright regarding the County's and outside counsel's activities during their review of the County's grant assurances.
3. Comment: The County should explore the use of outside vendors and contractors for services such as mowing, facility repairs, etc. to save money.
4. Question: What specific decisions are going to be made by the County Board of Supervisors (BOS) after reviewing the 2018 BPU? Is the BOS merely going to make a decision regarding acceptance/non-acceptance of FAA grants, or are there other decisions that are likely to be made regarding the future of the Airports?
5. Comment: The proposed 2018 BPU will only shadow the previous 2006 Business Plan, and little new information will be incorporated into the new plan.
6. Comment: The 2018 BPU should be compared with similar plans of other Bay Area airports (San Carlos, Palo Alto, etc.), and the plan should include a comprehensive competitive analysis with other airports.
7. Question: Who are the champions on the current County BOS that support the continued operation of RHV? Only one BOS member has expressed continued support for RHV and one other has gone on record for closure. Additionally three members of the BOS have declined to comment on the subject of RHV. This is being perceived as the first step to the eventual closure of RHV.
8. Comment: The County is not using RHV to its full extent. The County should consider using RHV facilities for additional public events for added revenue. Possibilities include food-related events, arts & craft festivals, etc.
9. Comment: The County should conduct additional public outreach during the 2018 BPU process, including but not limited to weekly and monthly update meetings.
10. Question: Who is going to put together the 2018 BPU, and what is that person's scope of work? Also, how is that person going to show that RHV is viable in the long term?
11. Question: Why does the County allow non-aviation business at RHV, such as a tax business, V&B Transportation, etc.? Why doesn't the County fill those facilities with aviation-related businesses?
12. Question: Why doesn't the County bring back a restaurant to re-occupy the former Red Baron restaurant in the RHV terminal building?

13. Question: Is this going to be a “clean-sheet” business plan, and when will a draft copy of the plan be available for public review?
14. Question: What is the County going to do to provide opportunities for additional on-airport aviation-related businesses? This should include providing on-airport businesses access to County tie-downs at reduced rates.
15. Comment: The County should allow existing on-airport businesses the opportunity to expand, including expanding onto portions of the County's airport facilities and property.
16. Comment: Each of the current RHV FBOs have “a piece of the training pie” that is currently occurring at RHV. A reduction in the total number of RHV FBOs would result in a reduction of these services.
17. Comment: The Airport tie-down rates should be reduced to attract additional tenants, and the County should also improve the existing airport facilities to attract more businesses.
18. Comment: The County is starving RHV Airport, while other airports are doing fantastically.
19. Comment: There are people who are concerned that the former Roads and Airports Director Michael Murdter is responsible for writing the 2018 BPU.
20. Comment: The County only gave seven (7) days of notice of the meeting.
21. Question: Are the consultants who are going to be involved in the RHV property appraisals going to evaluate the aviation-side of the property for commercial or aviation use? The FBO property should be evaluated for aviation use only.
22. Question: What is the County Airports Department paying in interest for the \$3-million dollar loan?
23. Question: Are there concerns regarding grant obligations that the County is expressing? What is the County seeking regarding additional restrictions that would be available if the County did not seek FAA grant monies? Is the County seeking to limit jets, nighttime flying, or add a curfew?
24. Question: How can the County make more money for the airports, like a private business?
25. Comment: The County should add a pro-aviation consultant to the current list of consultants that the County is paying \$100K.
26. Comment: Airport users should to have access to the 2018 BPU consultants while the plan is being updated.
27. Question: When is there going to be an investment in the local communities by the County Airports?
28. Comment: The County should utilize Survey-Monkey during the 2018 BPU process to elicit additional public comments and suggestions.
29. Comment: The County should find small and creative ways to bring in additional revenue, such as restaurants and small businesses, as well as local law enforcement services.

30. Question: Is the County going to include an economic impact report in the 2018 BPU? What are the benefits to the local communities of RHV?
31. Comment: The County should continue to conduct ongoing email outreach during the 2018 BPU process, and the updates should be “enlivened and spiced-up”.

END