

April 15, 2004

Gillespie Field
Airport Administration Building
Attn: Peter Drinkwater
1960 Joe Crosson Dr
El Cajon, CA 92020

Dear Peter,

GALA has reviewed the proposed Airport Layout Plan and has major concerns about how this document affects certain present leaseholds and all future leaseholds. Several proposals appear to create substantial and long-term negative effects on areas within our present leaseholds. In an effort to assure that the final impact is positive, rather than negative, we believe that these issues must be explored prior to the adoption of any plan. Here are our initial observations and questions. We reserve the right to submit our final thoughts prior to May 21.

*Presenting a plan to GALA on April 6 and planning for final approval in June does not allow adequate time for review. Immediate approval of an ALP is less important than an ALP without major flaws.

*The proposed ALP increased the Building Restriction Line (BRL) from 250 ft to 300 ft west of 17-35. Why? Does this mean a reduction in usable aviation land? Will this change cause the elimination of existing aircraft tie down spaces?

*Taxi way A and B were designed for a B-II aircraft yet the ALP states "B-II aircraft seldom use these taxi ways". What criteria was used to determine the need for B-II standards on these taxi ways? If taxiway B currently meets B-II clearance standards, why alter taxiway A?

*The Runway Visibility Zone/Control Tower Clear Line of Sight line further restricts the BRL. The proposed plan "rezones" a major portion of four existing leaseholds to non-building area. Does this constitute a "taking of rights?" Under the terms of existing Master leases, does the County have a legal right to do this?

*The Control Tower Clear Line of Sight line appears to ignore building height considerations. What is the definition of the CTCLS? Why does it ignore height?

*Does the establishment of this Clear Line of Sight line improve aviation safety? Does established data justify the establishment of this line?

*The ALP concludes that additional hangars are needed, and then prevents existing Master Leaseholders from building hangars by moving the BRL.

*A new Tower site could reduce or eliminate the BRL problem. Can the new tower be moved to Phase I construction?

*Existing Master Leaseholders depend on new construction and capital improvements to extend or renew their lease. Removing the ability to build by moving the BRL will prevent new capital improvements and may prevent lease renewals.

*There are two types of FBO's on Gillespie. Those that are passive and those that provide major service to the aviation public. Golden State has fit in the second category for over 30 years. This plan destroys their leasehold. Is this justified? If so, how can this action be mitigated?

*Gillespie currently has more hangars (500) than any General Aviation airport in the world known to GALA members. Does adding 400 additional hangers make sense? T Hangar construction

produces few jobs, little activity, limited fuel sales, and minimum revenue. Is this really the highest and best aviation use for the majority of the new 70-acre parcel?

*All existing aviation parcels have been developed with private capital. All future aviation parcels should be developed with private capital. Future aviation parcels should be submitted for RFP. Let the market place decide the highest and best aviation use for each parcel.

*All aviation parcels should be developed with the same criteria that has existed by several decades. Criteria such as 5-acre minimum size parcels, \$5,000 per acre per year capital improvement requirements, etc. Preferential treatment for any special interest group would be a misuse of public funds and would destroy the existing level playing field.

*The Federal Aviation Agency, the County of San Diego and GALA all share the same basic objective: To develop Gillespie Field in a manner that best serves the aviation public. In general, GALA believes that high standards, uniformly enforced throughout the Southern California airport system, are the correct road toward this objective. Our final concern is that the FAA is engaging in selective enforcement by attempting to hold Gillespie Field to a standard that they are unable or unwilling to enforce on all Southern California airports.

The purpose of every GALA member is to properly serve the aviation public and to protect their investment in existing facilities. We are pleased that the current County Airport Authority is actively seeking to resolve issues that have been long ignored and we are willing to do our part in working toward resolutions. We would like to repeat our request for a meeting attended by a planner that is capable of answering technical questions, yourself as Airport Director, and any member of your staff. Our hope would be to create mutual understanding of the issues and to work toward solutions.

Sincerely,
GILLESPIE AIRPORTS LESSEES ASSOCIATION

Dick McDowell
President

Wayne Breise
Secretary

cc: All Master Leaseholders