Arizona Military Regional Compatibility Project
Western Maricopa County / Luke Air Force Base

Luke Air Force Base Personnel Interest Group Meeting
December 18, 2002
8:30 am

- Introductions
  - Please provide all comments no later than January 27th (5:00pm, please) – Direct comments to PARSONS
  - Additional meeting to be held sometime in February to bring back everyone involved
- Roundtable Discussion
  - Need to work closely together to "correct" some of the information within the Plan that relates to overflight areas, airspace issues, and Luke operations.
  - Need to clarify in the document the mission of Luke.
  - Luke does do a very proactive public outreach program to inform the local jurisdictions, public, other air bases – people are aware of the mission through these outreach efforts.
  - The mission of Luke will remain until the federal government decides to relocate. People need to realize as we protect aviation rights – the use of Luke as an airfield will continue – the regional location (303/101/I-10) is key in the West Valley. Not feasible for Luke to be "plowed under."
  - There is a lack of airspace discussion in the Plan – need to work with Luke to get the information to insert into the Plan.
  - It is difficult for Luke to "move" their airspace patterns – airspace has been reduced 38 percent in the last 5 years. Ensure maximum capability – not waste time taxing between facilities.
  - Luke has 3 departures out of the southern corridor – need to correct the Draft Plan.
  - Luke is already a joint facility – need to correct the information about which jets fly at Luke.
  - Discuss in the Plan the things that Luke has already done to accommodate development in the West Valley.
  - Luke does realize that they have to work with all aviation entities within the West Valley. Ensure that Luke follows up on what has been done to-date.
  - Luke AFB is part of the NAS system – need to clarify further – what Mesa and Chandler have to do with Luke and the mission/flight paths

- No staff is specifically designated to provide all members of the public with information they have asked for, however anything requested in writing have been responded to.
- Luke's mission will continue and in order for it to be here, there will need to be changes.
- Growing Smarter and Growing Smarter Plus are generally not followed. People need to go by the statutes.
- Security is a base issue.
- It might be beneficial for us to look at some alternative uses for Luke (McClellan, and others). If it's an option, lets put it on the table.
- Checkerboard idea is promising. Rather, lets look at existing areas (golf courses, etc) and not limit to the 20-acre criteria. That may save some work.
- Fighter Coountry is looking at expanding the notification box. After the Draft, that area may need to be renamed.
- 3%-5% of flights per year with live ordnance is accurate (in reality: 1200 –1800 approx. flights/year)
- Before the developer spends $ on design etc, move the notification process up in the priorities. This will save money by having an understanding prior to application and project initiation. Provided a clearer direction for zoning.
- If changes are made to the draft, we will need to come back to the table.
- Define the parameters of a noise study and establish guidelines and requirements.
- Clear up definition of APZs. Does not follow arrival/departures (follows only take-off and landing).
- Limiting # of workers and residents in the box & the approach and departure corridor. The two ideas need to be separated. Corridor is possible, box is unrealistic.
- Dept of Defense owning and controlling the land is not a realistic goal. Should be downplayed yet left as a goal. Other better ideas may be Ag. Preservation, perhaps purchasing the development rights of agriculture land and allowing the agriculture use to continue.
- Southern APZ was extended because of the summertime SW winds. Machinery does not operate as efficiently in the heat as in the cooler weather. Thus the aircraft will not climb as efficiently (quickly) in the summertime.
- Golf course might not be incompatible in the LUCA-2 area. Listing of land uses might be alarming.
- Land fills should be ok in LUCA-3.
- Look at cases on a case-by-case basis.
- Land swaps could perhaps benefit Luke's mission. Not mentioned often enough in the draft. Might be further discussed as a possibility.

- Protect the southern departure corridor. Draft mentions ENCOURAGE jurisdictions. Not sure what that means. Luke fighters will continue to take off from both directions. It is important for new pilots not be dropping live ordnance for the first time in combat so training with live ordnance is essential.
- Include Surprise in the APZs. The northern corridor should be ignored.
- Develop a regional park or recreation area in the west valley. Could be very beneficial to the community. Tradeoff potential between municipality or developers and Luke.
- Joint Regional Powers Authority – question this proposal. Work the language of what we're after. Why would they enter into that? McGuire Report points should be highlighted. Luke's benefits are constant even in low economic times. That may be a reason municipalities would want to enter into an agreement.
- 6.3.3: Preemption of Zoning Controls could create problems and not beneficial.
- A source of money -Developers might be asked to contribute to compensate landowners, pay for studies, etc. (Impact fees)
- Written correspondence amongst all parties is crucial to the process – documentation is required if response is desired.
- Require developers and cities to disclose upfront the school sites. Because some land is donated which may be undesirable due to noise and flight pattern and then a school may be placed there.
- Hospitals are also sensitive in the flight path.
- Agua Fria zone is a main flight area.
- AUX 1 and Gila Bend AUX Field – AUX 1 takes over 12,000 flights/year away from the Luke area. Very important to the mission.
- Layout the responsibilities of the partners in the Plan. (Luke's role is to make clear what it takes to do their mission). What are the cities responsibilities? Developers, landowners, etc; if there is a complaint, here is where you can respond in writing. If you're going to sale a piece of property, here is the person you need to tell.
- Elected officials overseeing… so many different factions with reports and action items. Maybe there should be a clearinghouse where everyone (every group) reports their findings and keeps things out in the open.
- Timeline should be aggressive in revising this report and getting it back out on the table.
- Individual land ownership may need to be zeroed in on and identified (between White Tanks and the base).
- Would it be beneficial to ask people to sign a document that says, "I am a willing participant and am willing to proceed in this process and find a solution"?
- Luke can't speculate on the future aircraft and missions.

- Need to look at ways of protecting outside the JULS and ACUIZ. F-16s have a long-term purpose at Luke.
- What we need are solutions.
- Is there some definition of how noise changes with weather? Needs to be a comment in the Plan to speak to Single Event Noise
- State Statute says you only have to disclose that you're in the box. It's also required for resale.
- People didn't seem to be upset about Luke; they seemed more to be upset about the Draft.
- Luke will provide a list of briefings that they have given in the last 12 months. They would like to see the same from other west valley cities.
- Have there been any concerns voiced by agriculture owners concerned about losing their businesses due to development?
- Questions about the different types that may be allowed LUCA-1 & LUCA-2? Trying not to bring birds in (development tends to push the birds towards the open fields – doves aren't a concern), need to be able to land a plane. (Response: It appears that LUCAs may be going away).
- Helps for the jurisdictions to be up front about their intentions, developments etc; so that the playing field is level.
- Luke is a great asset to this region and everyone can continue to prosper from its existence. If Luke were to leave only a small minority would prosper from a huge windfall.
- Is there a pamphlet about 'what it means to live with Luke'? Discussing noise and safety…
- Local channels visitor centers and utility bills may be other means of notifying individuals.
- What is the benefit of developing land for commercial vs. residential use? Don't want to say they "can't" develop it. Focus on the benefit of a profit.
- Noise contours – this study recognizes what the state statute says. JULS study.
- Luke should be apprised of any actions taken by BLM and State Land.