



**ARIZONA MILITARY
REGIONAL COMPATIBILITY PROJECT**
DAVIS-MONTHAN AIR FORCE BASE

**Davis-Monthan Air Force Base / Tucson Joint Land Use Study
Policy Advisory Committee Briefing
Meeting Minutes
July 23, 2003: 1:30 – 4:30 pm
Tucson-Pima Public Library, Lower Level Conference Room**

1. Welcome Introductions
2. Public Informational Meeting held July 9th, 2003
 - a. Over 130 people in attendance
 - b. Next Public Informational Meeting – September 23rd, 2003
 - i. Venue TBA
 - ii. 5:00 to 7:00 pm (presentation @ 5:30 pm)
 - iii. Format: public presentation then “all question” time period
3. Next PAC meeting September 23, 2003
4. Task 2 Briefing Paper Update
 - a. Received comments from individuals. Edited version with public comments will be put onto the website.
5. Discussion Notes
 - a. Request from PAC member for Working Group to provide a worksheet of functional definitions for ldn, dnl, db, etc.
 - b. United States Air Force Base-wide class-A accident data between 1985 and 2000 was provided to the PAC. Question: what is the exact number of accidents on the data map? Answer: 108.
 - i. Question: what is the 108 class-A accidents as a percentage of the total flights worldwide flown during 1985 to 2000? Need to figure a percentage of risk.
 - ii. Since 1968 Davis-Monthan has had 2 class A accidents.
 - iii. According to the class-A accident data, the highest percentage of accidents occur in the clear zone, APZ I and APZ II.
 - iv. What is the margin of safety 5,000 feet, 2,500 feet, or 1,500 feet?

- v. Question: is there any data that the pilot had or did not have control of the aircraft? Answer: the AFB safety center keeps a record of the accident and investigation with findings. It would be very timely to go through all the reports to figure out which were which. However, all pilots are trained to bail out at a certain point.
 - vi. Based on the percentage of accidents in the clear zone, APZ I and APZ II, could one calculate the percentage of where they would occur in the DM environs area?
 - vii. 27 of the 108 were F-16's aircraft (roughly 25 percent). This makes the case for the single engine going down more often than a twin engine. The joint strike fighter is also a single-engine aircraft.
- c. Why have we gone from 30,000 to 50,000 foot "paddle?" Answer: The City of Tucson adopted the 50,000 foot paddle length as part of their Airport Environs Zone.
 - d. 30,000 foot paddle is regulated from 2001 Arizona state legislation.
 - e. What is the risk calculation and how do we determine a reasonable paddle length?
 - f. Comment: we should set the criteria and standards and then set the length and width of the paddle?
 - g. Question: how are the new regulations going to affect the existing homeowners? Comment: need to make sure that we include existing homeowners in the noise attenuation guidelines.
 - h. What are the conflicts with the uses in the Pima County Parks and Recreation Master Plan?
 - i. Comment: private property owners' concerns need to be balanced. Within the 0 to 30,000 foot and 30,000 to 50,000 foot need to notify owners (approx 130 owners).
 - j. Comment: would like to see acquisition as a potential strategy. If the state provided all of the property owners \$20,000 per acre, we would need \$79 million.
 - i. Oklahoma uses "matching funds." Tucson could piggy back this with DoD funding match.
 - ii. Comment: if we want to get national money then you have to lobby.
 - k. A special exemption process will be developed for noise and safety criteria.
 - l. The idea of the differential density and the "split paddle" is a good idea.
 - m. Comment: align the center paddle with the major two flight paths.
 - n. How are we going to resolve the 50,000 foot paddle? How long should the paddle be?

- o. Obtain the North Desert Plan.
- p. Does the land use matrix correspond to some specific aircraft or consider all aircrafts?
- q. How much land does a plane need to touch down safely if there is a problem at 20,000 feet? Answer: it would be 45,000 feet (justification for the 50,000 foot paddle).
- r. What other facilities/installations have a 50,000 foot approach and departure corridor? Can we compare the other bases and there standards to justify what the end of the DM paddle should be?
- s. Military Facilities Task Force (draft document in October). Will comparatively analyze the economics, missions, access to the range, and military capabilities of all Arizona military installations.
- t. Question: in the analysis, are we going to use the 2003 AICUZ noise contours or the 2003 Hypothetical noise contours?
- u. Comment: consider a no-build zone along the center of the take-off runway (based on accident data presented).
- v. How do you look at density of persons when you have time of days that are at a zero level occupancy during some period of the days?
 - i. Look at DM's flight hours with operational data. When are the aircrafts flying? Use weighted averages of flight activity.
- w. Strategy for progress: go step by step. Start with the paddle, then determine how to split it up, then set the standards for land use.
- x. PRINT OUT 11x17 maps to the PAC committee
- y. Risk management – what are the numbers with the notes of the table – identify at maximum density – what would the population be in those areas be based on the density

6. Next Steps

- a. Next PAC meeting August 20th, 2003
 - i. Provide PAC with maps of the split paddle and noise contours.