

**TABLE 5-3  
JWA FORECAST OPERATIONS BY AIRCRAFT ENGINE TYPE  
COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES**

Year	Piston	Turbine	Jet	Helicopter/Other	Total Operations <sup>a</sup>
<b>Existing Conditions</b>					
2016	147,300	9,800	31,800	3,900	<b>192,800</b>
<b>Unconstrained Baseline Scenario</b>					
2026	147,100	12,000	43,600	5,100	<b>207,800</b>
<b>Proposed Project</b>					
2026	111,000	11,700	40,400	4,800	<b>167,900</b>
<b>Alternative 1</b>					
2026	111,600	10,800	41,400	4,800	<b>168,600</b>
<b>Alternative 2</b>					
2026	114,700	10,000	39,900	4,800	<b>169,400</b>
<b>Alternative 3</b>					
2026	147,000	9,500	36,400	4,700	<b>197,600</b>
<b>No Project (Constrained Forecasts)</b>					
2026	147,000	10,900	38,300	4,800	<b>201,000</b>
Note: Numbers may not add up due to rounding.					
<sup>a</sup> An operation is defined as either a takeoff or landing, each counting as one operation.					
Source: AECOM 2018b (Appendix D to this Program EIR)					

The level of environmental impact and ability to meet Project Objectives is considered as part of the identification of the environmentally superior alternative, which is discussed in Section 5.5. Included in Section 5.5, Table 5-24 provides a brief comparison of the impacts of each of the alternatives, compared to the Proposed Project and Table 5-25 provides a matrix that compares each alternative’s ability to meet the Project Objectives.

### 5.4.1 ALTERNATIVE 2

The concept of an alternative with the full service FBOs located on the east side of the Airport was developed as part of the outreach efforts conducted by Airport staff with the general aviation tenants and stakeholders to identify issues the general aviation community would like addressed and priorities for making improvements (see Section 2.4 for a discussion of the outreach effort).

Alternative 2 proposes development of a Full Service Northeast FBO and a Full Service Southeast FBO. This alternative minimizes the extent that general aviation aircraft have to cross Runway 20R/2L to access the shorter general aviation runway (Runway 20L/2R). The total aircraft storage capacity for all the facilities included under this alternative is approximately 361 based aircraft. Alternative 2 accommodates seven more general aviation aircraft than the Proposed Project and five more aircraft than Alternative 1.<sup>1</sup>Table 5-4 provides a comparison of the type of

<sup>1</sup> As shown in Table 5-1 compared to the Proposed Project and Alternative 1 the increase is entirely associated with an increase in the number spaces allocated for single-engine fixed-wing piston aircraft. It accommodates fewer fixed-wing turbine engine aircraft.