#	COMMENT	AIRPORT RESPONSE	GO FORWARD ACTION
1	I am hoping you could better explain the need for an annual $50 fee for the card/fob. What are we insuring? Why is there an annual fee for an item required to access the airport? What would the alternatives be if someone didn't want to pay that fee, how would they get in?	Annual fees ensure users who benefit directly from secure access pay their proportional share of keeping the system operational and compliant. FAA Compliance and Sponsor Obligations reference Grant Assurances, particularly: Grant Assurance 19 – Operation and Maintenance and Grant Assurance 24 – Fee and Rental Structure. The Municipal Airport is obligated to: (1) Properly operate and maintain airport facilities, (2) Establish fees that make the airport as self-sustaining as possible and (3) ensure fees are reasonable, equitable, and nondiscriminatory. The recently upgraded field access system improves security and safety and maintaining it is a legitimate airport expense. Charging a maintenance fee is not only allowed, it can be argued as responsible compliance with FAA obligations. Therefore, payment will be required for field access.	**Per the FAA's San Francisco Airports District Office for a General Aviation airport, such as Watsonville Municipal, there is a sound and commonly accepted justification for charging access fees and annual maintenance fees for an upgraded vehicle and pedestrian gate access system, provided the fees are structured and explained correctly. Airfield Access Credential charges will be implemented, and payment is required for airfield access.**
2	First Comment: The previous regulations and/or exhibit forms for aircraft under construction authorized a 7 year (84 month) completion timeline. The average kit aircraft has 4 airframe sub kits. Along with the need for an engine and avionics system. These each can all take a year to finish. Aircraft sub kits have lead times up to 12 months in some instances. Engines 6-18 months, and a professional subcontracted panel build could be a 6-12 month lead time. All this to say I think a year per aircraft section is reasonable (6 years). And the additional 7th year that we were authorized to have was a good buffer in case delivery schedules or component lead times were excessive and/or unforeseeable. I (and I'm sure many other experimental aircraft builder tenants) request the regulations stay at the 7 year (84 month) completion window. Second: Exhibit D "Aviation Storage Unit (Hangars, Middle or End Room or Tie-Down) Occupancy Permit" has a reference error in the terms. Section 2. Permitted Use, Subsection C states "Stored Aircraft. Any aircraft parked or stored in the Unit for more than five (5) days, which need not be consecutive in any twelve (12) month period, shall be subject to all terms and conditions of this Permit, including, without limitation, Section 3.b above." I believe that last "Section 3.b" should say "Section 2.b" as that is what this term is referring to. Section 3 is below this, not above, and there is no 3b anywhere in these permit terms.	The limitation for construction of aircraft is part of the airport's effort to address the longstanding problem of non-flying aircraft adversely impacting the hangar wait list. Implementing a "Date Certain" is our effort to ensure tenants commit to storing aircraft that contribute to the airport's economic model. Per the Experimental Aircraft Association (EAA), the ballpark is about 1,000 to 3,000 hours of hands-on work for a typical amateur-built/homebuilt aircraft. EAA also breaks it down a bit further in their builder planning material: Most kit-built aircraft: roughly 800–2,000 hours. Plans-built aircraft: often 3,000+ So, if someone works say, 10 hours a week (could be once a week and weekends or combinations thereof), but consistently: 1,000 hours ≈ about 2 years 3,000 hours ≈ about 6 years The 3.b and 2.b item is a typographic error. Thank you for notifying us of this error.	**Date Certain time frames will remain as listed. Repairs are twelve (12) months, Reconstruction/Restoration are twenty-four (24) months, and Experimental/Amateur Built Aircraft are seventy-two (72) months.** **The airport is certainly willing to consider any reasonable request for an extension, not to exceed one year, for construction projects.** **Exhibit D, Section 2, paragraph 2 (c) will be corrected.**
3	Hi folks, as I have understood it, we have traditionally had 7 years to complete an aircraft project. The proposed regulations have reduced this to 6. I'm concerned about this trend. Considering the state of real estate prices in California, building in the hangar is simply my only option to afford aviation since I will likely never be able to afford a single-family home to build in a garage. I'd really like for us to come to a resolution where either we keep the 7 year agreement and/or make it easier to share a hangar to allow maximum use of space, so the airport receives proper funding revenue but, at the same time, those of us who are sincerely trying to push for affordable aviation and education are able to continue this pursuit at KWVI.	Our experience observing aircraft construction indicates aircraft build time covers a wide spectrum, but average between 48-to-60 months or 72-to-84 months. We have chosen time limit just over the average of these time frames.	**Date Certain times remain. Repairs: twelve (12) months, Reconstruction/Restoration: twenty-four (24) months, and Experimental/Amateur Built: seventy-two (72) months or 3,000 hours ≈ about 6 years.**

4	Thank you for the opportunity to comment. I truly want peace here and I don't know how to tell the truth without angering the management. I find it interesting that the hardware for the new system is being put in before the comment period has expired. That simply shows that you have no intention of paying any attention to the comments and are just going ahead with it anyway. Under the current management Watsonville airport has an identity crisis. It cannot decide if it is a big, busy, airline airport, or a small, fun, general aviation airport. Our management consistently picks the worst characteristics of each kind of airport and mixes them together for our airport. Watsonville was a place where people came to celebrate aviation and make it available to the next generations. Consistently each new idea has been poorly implemented, and most have been dismal failures as a result. Replacing Ul94 with Gami liquid is a perfect example of ignoring all of the relevant information and pushing ahead anyway. The airport management has neither the authority, nor the background to give any kind of driving certification. Using cards to get in and out is ridiculous. How do we do that on a motorcycle? You are openly discriminating against motorcycles. There should never be a card swipe needed to get out because of emergency egress needs. I work at the busiest airports in the world. If you want little Watsonville to be like that, fine, but do it right. We would need real S.I.D.A. badges and training. We would need fuel from the truck available at least 12 hours a day, EVERY day, not just a few weekdays and never holidays that we have currently. We need to have someone answer the radio! This is a big safety issue. If someone is having a problem in the air they need to be able to call Watsonville Unicom and tell a person what is happening so that the appropriate first responders can be notified. A real airport also would answer the radio so that a fuel truck can be standing by so an aircraft can do a quick turn. We have problems with animals on the runway and runway incursions by aircraft. The skydivers are very dangerous as well. These are problems to fix. I am very passionate about Watsonville airport and have been part of it since 1977. It bothers me to see it being destroyed. We have so many aviation professionals among our tenants. Why can't that knowledge ever be used? In summary, no cards, fix the fence to keep the animals out, work on runway incursion prevention, answer the radio, get some real ASTM approved unleaded fuel, move the skydivers, have fuel from the truck available EVERY day, keep lids on fuel tanks closed when it rains, don't let airport staff use drugs, and work with the tenants and not always against them. We can work together to make this the best airport around but always fighting doesn't help any of us. This new card system, as currently planned and implemented, does nothing to increase safety or security, but it does continue the process of keeping people away from the wonders of aviation. There will be no more hangar parties, events, or educational activities.	**The Security Gate upgrade project is part of the Airport's on-going Capital improvement program and was first presented to the Airport Advisory Committee in early 2022. The FAA grant was awarded in summer of 2023. Given that the Municipal Airport receives federal funding, we comply with FAA regulations which often include seeking stakeholder input. If, as you suggest, we "...are just going ahead with it anyway." then the Airport would not have been by updating the WAAC. KWVI continues to be a place where people celebrate aviation, and we prioritize making it available to future generations. We've hosted multiple avenues for engagement: Annual Airport Open House, Fourth Grade Field Trips (with the help of on-field businesses and organizations bringing over 1,800 students to the field since 2022), EAA Young Eagles, Second Saturday Historical display days with Ninety-Nines serving as docents (providing owners opportunities for tax exemptions), scheduled and impromptu tours for charter school groups. Each of these has not only been successfully implemented but have spawned other opportunities such as the upcoming partnership with PVUSD's Tango Flight. Bringing unleaded fuel to the field is part of the Airport's goal of reducing our carbon footprint. Replacing UL94 with G100UL was reasonable as more aircraft could burn G100UL as opposed to the limited applicability for UL94. Tenant surveys confirmed bringing G100UL to KWVI was desired. The so-called "relevant information" was only evident after the fact and is a perfect example of "Monday Morning Quarterbacking". Airport management has never stated a desire or mandate to "certify drivers". The implementation of Airfield Access Credentials is completely reasonable per the FAA. Access methods have considered various modes of travel. There is reasoning supporting documenting field entry and exit and the time when those events occur. The airport has conferred with first responders regarding field access methods. Airport employees coordinating maintenance, managing projects, addressing mechanical issues, etc. may not respond immediately to non-urgent inquiries/requests. Airport Administration and Operations strive to be as responsive as possible and to date receive more compliments for services rendered than complaints. Regarding someone having a problem while airborne you make a very good point. If you would please take a moment to see staff's commitment to safety at this link: *https://youtu.be/nrsJ1lhQ9Pc*. We do have wildlife challenges and are working with the California Department of Fish and Game to address same. Skydiving is an approved aeronautical activity and has been operating safely since 2015, with that record they are not as "dangerous" as you've stated. Be advised that Staff are subject to random drug testing. Each KWVI employee is passionate about Watsonville airport and works diligently to serve the flying public. In summary, we are working to increase safety and security, continuing the process of bringing people to the wonders of aviation, and serving every tenant, even those who consistently criticize or may not see our effort.**	**Airport will consider input from all submitted comments, the November 2025 Five-person user group and staff input.**
5	In regard to proposed regulation instituting a drivers training program, the Department of Motor Vehicles is the only agency permitted to assess drivers' competency. In regard to proposed regulation requiring a gate card and PIN, there is no reasonable argument that such a system will enhance ramp and hangar security. It will only delay access for emergency vehicles, impose unnecessary costs to the airport, unnecessary delays and inconvenience to those needing to access their valuable property at the airport, and decrease the utility of a public and uniquely valuable resource.	**As the airport sponsor/operator, Airport Management has the authority to adopt and enforce reasonable rules governing vehicle operations on airport property; this includes instituting a driver's "training". Over the last few months there has been viral misconception relative to this effort. The term "training" is an FAA term. We are not requiring "training", we are effectively requiring tenants conduct a "self-assessment" via an on-line presentation and answering questions. Relative to implementing Airfield Access Credentials such an effort ensures only authorized individuals have access and everyone operating a vehicle has completed the self-assessment enhances safety. Regarding first responder and emergency vehicle access, the airport has established processes and procedures for first responder access.**	**Airport will implement an online, via PowerPoint, self-assessment effort based on the "FAA Guide to Ground Vehicle Operations, Comprehensive Guide of Safe Driving on the Airport Surface".**

I am a tenant and operator at Watsonville Municipal Airport. I support improving airport safety, but the proposed Airfield Access and Key Card System contains several serious issues that need to be addressed before implementation. The current version creates new safety hazards, operational delays, legal concerns, and community barriers that did not previously exist. Below are my main concerns: 1. Gate Rules & "No Piggy-Backing" Create Safety Issues: Requiring every user to stop and prevent others from entering the gate creates dangerous situations. This policy forces tenants to block traffic, confront other users, and act like security officers. This is unsafe. This is not standard practice at GA airports. Tenants have no legal authority to stop or question other drivers. This could cause conflict, injury, or blocked access during critical times. Tenants should not be required to "police" other users. 2. Gate System Is Not Reliable Enough for Enforcement: Airport gates have had repeated malfunctions, outages, and access failures. Before adding fines, fees, and penalties, the system must be proven reliable. Otherwise, tenants may be unfairly penalized for airport equipment problems. Fees and fines should be delayed until the system is tested and stable. 3. Card Failures Could Trap People Inside or Lock Them Out: The policy does not explain what happens if a card is lost, broken, stolen, forgotten, or if the gate malfunctions after hours. Without 24/7 staff, tenants could be: trapped inside the fence, or locked out when they need to reach their aircraft for safety reasons.This is a serious safety issue and potential liability for the airport. 4. The Policy Seems to Require Tenants to Act as Security: The rules essentially require tenants to enforce airport access—watching gates, stopping others, and confronting drivers. This is not appropriate.Security is the airport's responsibility, not the tenants'. 5. Selective Gate Access Makes No Sense for Safety-If a person is trusted to enter the AOA, they should be trusted at any gate. Limiting people to certain gates creates: longer routes inside the AOA, more time near aircraft, unnecessary exposure to hazards. This restriction adds risk, not safety. 6. Deactivation for Administrative Issues Is Unsafe: The airport should not deactivate a tenant's access for: late payments, paperwork issues, or minor administrative problems. That could leave aircraft unsecured or unattended during weather changes or emergencies. Access control should never be used as a billing tool. 7. No Emergency Access Provisions Are Included: There is no system in place for: urgent maintenance, sudden weather, aircraft emergencies, after-hours access needs, or emergency vehicles. Safe airport operations require immediate access in these scenarios. 8. The System Will Hurt Educational and Community Outreach: The airport has always been a community resource. Under the new rules, school tours, aviation education, youth programs, and public events would require complicated approvals and escort limitations. This restricts activities that have always been safe and beneficial. We should not make education and community access harder. 9. No Evidence Shows This System Solves a Real Problem: There is no record of: security breaches, unauthorized entries, criminal activity, or safety problems caused by current gate access. A system this restrictive should only be implemented if a real need is demonstrated. 10. Ramp Event Operations Need Clarification. If everything inside the fence is AOA, then: How does Specialized Helicopters (or any tenant) host events or tours on its ramp? How do we bring school groups or the public onto the ramp? Will all visitors need training or special approval? This will severely limit long-standing, positive airport traditions. REQUESTS: Before implementation, I respectfully request that the City and Airport:: 1. Delay fees and fines until the system is proven reliable. 2. Remove the requirement that tenants police gate access.3. Add clear emergency and after-hours access procedures.4. Allow full gate access to all AOA-authorized users.5. Protect community events, school tours, and outreach programs.6. Do not deactivate access for non-safety administrative issues. 7. Clarify how tenant ramp events will function under the new rules.8. Provide the actual incident data justifying this system.We all want a safe, functional airport. These issues can be fixed, but the system should not be implemented—and certainly not enforced with fees—until the policy is revised to support safety, not compromise it.Thank you for your time and consideration.	**1. Gate Rules & "No Piggy-Backing" Create Safety Issues:** The Airport will implement "Smart Gate" technology which addresses "Piggy - Backing". This technology uses advanced systems to enhance vehicle access control. Smart Gate technology will ideally eliminate tenants' need to "police" each other. **2. Gate System Is Not Reliable Enough for Enforcement:** As with any new technology there is a period of technical challenges. New technology often has bugs or unforeseen issues that can only be detected after implementation, leading to temporary operational setbacks. Additionally, users are a key variable and being unfamiliar with new technologies, leading to confusion and delays is a certainty, but over time diminishes. **3. Card Failures Could Trap People Inside or Lock Them Out:** It's possible but unlikely access credentials are lost in a vehicle. There will be the ability to exit the field in case of emergency without credential access. Such "emergency exits" will log as such and be reported to management. As for pedestrian gates, exit is always possible. **4. The Policy Seems to Require Tenants to Act as Security:** The regulations require tenants to adhere to reasonable actions in support of safety, efficient operations and protection of airport assets. **5. Selective Gate Access Makes No Sense for Safety:** All credentialed individuals have access to any Vehicle and Pedestrian Gates. **6. Deactivation for Administrative Issues Is Unsafe:** Tenants are subject to the Airport Sponsor's administrative regulations as a condition of their "Month-to-Month" tenancy. **7. No Emergency Access Provisions Are Included:** The updated airfield access process will not adversely impact first responder's access. **8. The System Will Hurt Educational and Community Outreach:** The updated airfield access process will not adversely impact on school tours, aviation education, youth programs, or public events. **9. No Evidence Shows This System Solves a Real Problem:** Tenants are generally unaware of instances of unauthorized entry to the field. There are instances, although infrequent but some recently, of such unauthorized entries/access. This system is not restrictive and in fact brings value to the tenants and the airport. **10. Ramp Event Operations Need Clarification:** The Municipal Airport is currently "Zoned" as a Public Facility (City Zoning and California Land Use Planning Handbook) that conflicts with airport desire to allow activities by entities other than the Municipal Airport. As such Airport Management is pursuing Administrative Use Permits to address this concern.	**Airport will consider input from all comments, November 2025 Five-person user group and staff input.**

6

	Comment	Response	Action
7	I fully support all proposed changes to increase field security and hangar provisions. Please be considerate and have common sense solutions for edge cases such as transient pilots and cases where a pilot forgets their key card in their plane or at home. Please continue doing everything possible to reduce hangar wait list times. Anything over a 1 year wait I consider to be unreasonable and a reflection that not enough is being done to encourage hangar turnover, so that active airmen can use the facilities. Thanks for all you do.	Provisions for Transient Pilots, entry and exit, have been considered. Like Drivers Licenses, employee ID cards, and other credentials, tenants are encouraged to ensure Airfield Access Credentials are in their possession when required. Aviation Storage Unit demand has historically exceeded supply. The Airport's recently implemented "A Date Certain" regulation is the latest attempt to reduce HWL times.	**Airport will require access credentials for field entry/exit. We will work with all tenants, particularly corporate operators, to ensure the policy implementation is reasonable and workable.**
8	any security weakness currently at WVI is the result of: 1. gates that routinely malfunction in the open and partially open position. I find gates stuck open on a routine basis and have to call the airport to have it addressed. Spending money on the gates. Put in limit switches to make sure they close with immediate notifications if they do not.. 2. ineffective perimeter fence.. if someone wants to gain unauthorized access to the airport, they can get by the fence at many places. Adding a key card system will not improve security at the Airport. It will simply make it harder and more expensive for the people who have authorization to access the field. additional comments: 1. skydivers landing on the field It's an accident waiting to happen, especially when an aircraft needs to go around or wind blows the skydiver off course. 2. Watsonville needs a designated turf landing area on the airport to decrease the chances of ground loops and other incidents particular to tail wheel aircraft..These have been implemented at many other airports. The tuef landing area and the paved runway are the same runway. Operations only occur on one surface at a time.	1. The Security Gate update is intended to replace gate motors and structures, some over 30 years old. The recent update has had start-up issues as we implement the new technology, but we are addressing and mitigating such issues as they arise. 2. During the recent budget year the airport has been making repairs to the fence line on a per incident basis. For the 2026-2027 budget year the airport is planning a CapEx commitment to expand repairs along the perimeter fence. 3. As noted above, the statistics don't support the claim that skydiving increases danger for our airfield operations. 4. Regarding a designated turf landing area on the airport please refer to the Airport's 2023 Master Plan; pages 3-24 to 3-25 and 4-44 to 4-50.	**Airport will move forward with the security gate policy implementation and CapEx investment in fence lines.** **Additionally, the Parachute Landing Area (PLA) will continue to be available.** **Pilots interested in bringing a Turf landing aera to the field are encouraged to consult the 2023 Master Plan.**
9	I wanted to ask a question that I'm sure you're getting a lot regarding the proposed changes to the airport regulations: why? Is WVI currently dealing with a security problem that justifies these security and access changes? I have not observed a single instance of suspicious behavior or issues with airport security in all of my (frequent) visits to the airport. This is a change that pulls WVI even further away from a welcoming municipal airport with seemingly annoying and unnecessary access restrictions. I do not want to have to carry around an entry card or clicker - both things that I could easily forget in my commute to the airport - when a simple code is sufficient. If there is justification for the added access restrictions - and additional cost to the City of Watsonville and therefore airport tenants - I would like the City of Watsonville to disclose the reasons and cause for concerns, as that should be something tenants at the airport should be aware of. Also, these two sentences in the Access section of the regulations are in contradiction to each other - how could someone escort multiple vehicles without tailgating? You expect the gate to fully close after each car even if they are in the same group? That is ridiculous and makes no sense	Tenants are generally unaware of instances, although infrequent, of unauthorized entry to the field. As part of tenant's Month-to-Month permit the airport can require airfield access credentials. Again, like your Driver's License and Airmen Certificate, which many individuals always carry, the card key, key fob, or potential mobile device entry allows access to the airfield. The Smart Gate Technology will prohibit Tailgating, while allowing credentialed individuals to enter and even allow escorted individuals access via the credentialed tenant's access device.	**Airport will consider input from all comments, November 2025 Five-person user group and staff input.**
10	Please list 3 other airports within a 100mi radius that have implemented such restrictive and controlled access policies. This sounds more appropriate to a military base rather than a civilian use PUBLIC facility. BTW, I used to drive onto both Moffett Field and Fort Ord with fewer restrictions. Absolutely, no drivers test at either of those facilities. Has there been some major threats to national security that I don't know about? Or some major on field vehicle accidents?	During the recent Virtual Call with interested tenants, Airport Management shared a graphic listing nine Bay Area Airports which require access credentials other than simple four-digit codes or will be implementing such. Locally, Salinas Municipal is planning to require "driver's training" during 2026 and Hollister Municipal is looking to follow Watsonville Municipal's effort in late 2026.	**Airport will consider input from all comments, November 2025 Five-person user group and staff input.**

11	I hangar an aircraft at the Watsonville airport. I have a vested interest in airport security. However, reading through the proposed changes, I think we have gone too far. This is why: On the subject of tailgating, the proposed system blames the first driver for the actions of a different person who is breaking the rules by tailgating. I've found it very hard to fully block the gate to prevent another driver from following me. Sometimes when I stop clear of the sensor the other car passes me without issue. Do you want me to get out of my car and confront them physically? Does the next person need to wait for the gate to close before swiping their card or putting in their code? That seems inefficient. Is there a sign that says no tailgating unless authorized to be on the airport? The clause saying accepting a keycard is agreement in full to all airport rules is overreaching and feels very silicon valley in a terms and conditions sort of way. I'd prefer to not carry another card around with me just to open the airport gate. What will be the system of access if I arrive at the airport and have forgotten the card? What if it's late at night? The folks hangared at Salinas complain about this. What is the problem we're trying to solve? Are many people sneaking on to the airport property? Is this a FAA mandated improvement to support commuter air service?	**The proposed Vehicle Gate configuration is based on Smart Gate technology. This new gate has features which address "Piggy-Backing" without placing the burden on the tenant.** **As part of your Month-to-Month permit, the airport can require Airfield Access Credentials.** **Again, like your Driver's License and Airmen Certificate, which many individuals always carry, the card key, key fob, or potential mobile device entry allows access.**	**Airport will consider input from all comments, November 2025 Five-person user group and staff input.**
12	2.2 A. "Each Permittee may request a Card Key for up to two (2) Sponsor users, subject to justification, approval by the Airport and payment of an annual fee. Please strike the part "for up to two (2) Sponsor users". The airport already has the approval and justification. There may be legitimate multiple pilots for one aircraft. Limiting to two Sponsor users is unnecessary. 2.4 Escorting Please describe the precedent for limiting number of 2 vehicles or 4 guests that can be escorted per permittee. Is this limit to apply to each permittee? Two permittees would have a total of 4 vehicles and 8 guests? "Guests must always be within hearing and sight of the ASU permittee or CAAP" Since ASU permittees or CAAP's are responsible for their guests this would be impractical and unneeded. Example: If two guests were under immediate control of a permittee and one guest needed the restroom, all three would need to walk to the restroom to comply per current proposed rule. Using a similar situation the FAA describes supervision as "to the extent necessary" It would be up to the permittee to evaluate and control a guest since the permittee is ultimately responsible. Example: A child may need to be escorted to the restroom and an adult familiar with the airport could use the restroom without escort. Judgement and responsibility is still the permittee. A situation not specifically spelled out is if a permittee is escorting a guest in to the airport, and that guest is also a permittee, after escorting to the destination (hangar, business or tiedown) both permittees would then be free to use the airport normally. I am assuming that to demonstrate that an escorting is taking place both vehicles would travel together to the destination. A non permittee guest would of course be supervised.	**There may very well be cases when a Permitee desires to sponsor more than two "Sponsorees".** **Requirements for "Escorting" are meant to be reasonable, and the expectation is the Permittee is ultimately responsible for all escorted individuals.**	**Airport will consider input from all comments, November 2025 Five-person user group and staff input.**

13	Question 1: "ARTICLE TWO – AIRFIELD ACCESS AUTHORIZATION POLICY ... Access to the AOA is limited to authorized individuals and is managed exclusively through assigned unique "Card Keys"." - How do pilots visiting WVI using transient parking access their aircraft? Are they to be issued card keys? If not, how would they access their aircraft after hours or when the field is not attended? - Will pedestrian gates continue to be accessible on a 24 hour basis with a code available for transient pilots to use as is the case today? Such a system is in use at airports similar to WVI (that is, airports without 24 hour attendance, SIDA areas, 121 airline service, etc). - If the intent is to restrict transient pilots, this severely reduces the utility of WVI and reduces safety by creating unnecessary time pressure to return during attended hours. It may also encourage visitors not warned ahead of time of such rules to access their property via undesirable means, e.g. scaling the airport fence in order to acess their aircraft to leave. - If the intent is not to restrict transient pilots or their passengers this way, then what is the rationale for requiring locally based pilots to obtain a card key, complete training, and pay fees associated with that? What level of safety or security is provided by requiring one group to comply with restrictions but not another? Question 2 :"2.4 Escorting: ... A. ASU Permittee or CAAPs may escort up to four (4) pedestrians or two vehicles not exceeding four guests into the AOA." - What is the basis for the number of pedestrians or vehicles listed? - Does the pilot of a six passenger GA airplane based at WVI require special permission to utilize every seat of their aircraft? - What about the operator of a larger or turbine powered aircraft (i.e. based corporate aircraft)? Does a corporate pilot have to get approval for each passenger beyond 4? What is the process for the airport to either allow or reject such approval? Question 3: B. Airport staff monitor and inspect Card Key usage and adherence to gate procedures. Non-compliance, such as failing to wait for a gate to close or allowing unauthorized access, may result in Card Key deactivation or administrative action including but not limited to fines. "Tailgating" and "Piggybacking" through gates is prohibited. How does a tenant escort their visitors, either arriving via pedestrian or vehicle gates in other vehicles, without creating the appearance of violating this rule and risking fine, eviction, or loss of access to their aircraft? Consider the following examples: Example 1, a pilot arrives at WVI, readies their aircraft, and their passengers later arrive in a vehicle to meet them. The pilot drives to the vehicle gate on the AOA side, causes the gate to open, and allows their guests to enter. Example 2: A pilot arrives at WVI in their vehicle with their guests following immediately behind them. They open the gate with the card key and drive in, allowing their guests to follow behind them and then wait until the gate closes. Would either example not have the appearance of someone violating the rules and regulations? How would another party, for example watching surveillance video, make such a determination? Question 4:"3.1 Hangar "Swap List" Wait Administration ... Effective January 1, 2026, Swap List Position Holders are billed an Administrative/Accounting Processing fee as listed on the current Rate and Fee Schedule" What is the justification for charging recurring fees for members of a waiting list who have asked WVI to not call/offer/bypass their position on the list until they are ready for a swap? A member of the swap list who has made such a request receives no calls and there is no "waiting on them" required each time a hangar becomes available. As such would it make more sense to charge a fee to be initially placed on the list?	**We assume this question relates to pilots who have flown into KWVI, tied down aircraft and desire to exit the AOA and re-enter some time thereafter. Arriving transient pilots will view a digital display posted at two pedestrian gates in front of the terminal. Upon interaction with these displays, transient pilots will obtain access credentials to re-enter the field 24/7. These credentials will be valid for a defined period communicated to the transient pilot.** **The basis for the number of pedestrians or vehicles listed is based on our review of traffic over time.** **A six passenger GA airplane based at WVI does not require special permission to utilize every seat of their aircraft.** **A corporate pilot does not have to get approval for each passenger beyond 4.** **The examples listed are reasonable and would not be considered non-complaint.** **This question seems to confuse two separate airport procedures/policies: the Hangar Wait List and the Swap List. The change for 2026 is charging Swap List position holders an annual fee as the management of the Swap List does incur additional effort once a hangar becomes available. Every position holder on the Swap List must be contacted prior to the next available hangar being offered. This effort requires additional time, research, and outreach.**	**Airport will consider input from all comments, November 2025 Five-person user group and staff input.**
14	Thanks for working on making the airport a better place for everyone.	**We appreciate the support.**	

15	It is disingenuous to say that transient pilots can call the airport if they lose or forget the gate code, as the airport office never answer calls to Unicom, and only answers the phone less that half the time during business hours. Tailgating in the gate is something that airport vehicles do all the time, so it is ridiculous to say it is unsafe. Requiring a card for egress is both burdensome and frankly dangerous. The airport fence has holes in it large enough for large wildlife to enter (deer, coyotes) so clearly a human being can enter anytime they like, completely destroying the argument that the vehicle and human access system is anything other than a way to harass and overcharge airport tenants. Emergency responders often need to access the airport on very short notice, for SAR and law enforcement actions (I know by personally flying many such missions). You would either stop these lifesaving activities or need to issue card keys to every emergency worker, law enforcement officer, medical professional, and SAR volunteer in two counties. The corporate hangars, by design, are set up for businesses that own aircraft. Each employee and client would need access, which restricts the abilities of the businesses to run their business, which is grounds for a lawsuit. I myself would require about 50 cards to continue as I have been.	**The Airport will implement an on-call number for airfield access for transient pilots. The primary challenge with "Tailgating" is not allowing authorized individuals to enter but that "Piggybacking" which is an unauthorized entry. Requiring credentials for egress is recognized as a tried and proven method to ensure who has exited the airport.** **The airport fence line does have voids, and the airport is implementing plans to address this issue.** **Emergency responders will have airfield access via mutually agreed upon technology.** **It is agreed corporate hangars are set up for businesses that own aircraft. However, this does not exclude Corporate Hangars from similar requirements of other tenants. The Airport is committed to working with Corporate Hangar permittees just as we do with other permittees.**	**Airport will consider input from all comments, November 2025 Five-person user group and staff input.**
16	1. I am against the requirement to exit the vehicle gates using a fob or any other device such as a phone. Safety is a big issue and if we passed a security device to get in there is no need to do it again to get out. Maybe it is just so the airport management can track us? That is not needed, we are trustworthy folks. 2. The walk-in gate process is fraught with peril especially for transient pilots. The idea that their code might expire or they forget it is solved by calling airport management is a non starter. There is no one to answer the phone in off hours. This will result in a bad reputation for our airport. 3. It sounds like our remote devices resembling garage door remote openers will no longer be available. That is very handy for us who are frequently accessing our hangars. Please make that possible. you can code it so you know whose clicker it is. I think you may have gone too far in this gate security issue. As I recall the last serious issue we had, the robbers flew in and out. Thanks for listening.	**1. Although unlikely it's possible vehicles could be leaving the field when that was not the desire. Requiring a code for exiting vehicles helps ensure that only authorized vehicles can leave the field. Logging exit codes document movements and can identify the amount of vehicle activity. The requirement does bolster security, promotes accountability, and contributes to a more efficient environment.** **2. As noted above the Airport will implement an on-call number for airfield access for transient pilots.** **3. A new remote Key Fob operates similar to the current garage door openers, but less bulky. Additionally, mobile device access, on a subscription basis, will be available.**	**Airport will consider input from all comments, November 2025 Five-person user group and staff input.**
17	I have noticed that for the last year and a half there has been a laminated note next to the keypad of the east gate stating, "The entry code is the CTAF". My initial thought was this must be a case study to see how much theft, vandalism, etc. happens when the gate code is posted for the public to see. Most homeless people have smart phones and the stupidest criminal would find it obvious to Google the CTAF and get access to the airport in under a minute. How many instances of theft or illegal activity have happened since June of 2024 when the note was put there? Please also confirm how much money has been and will be spent to complete the new security system. I would like nothing more than to be convinced this isn't grossly frivolous spending that could be better used to serve, rather than burden pilots and their families who call KWVI home or a favorite place to visit. The note telling any and everyone who wants in is still there by the way (9:05 pm, 12/15/25). It doesn't bother me because we don't have a security problem but maybe it should have been taken down before trying to convince everyone the current gate system isn't safe.	**For some years, gate code updates were communicated via US Mail or email. When updated (a recommended "Best Practice") there are always complaints by individuals who didn't get the code or question why the change is needed. Calls to staff asking, "What's the Code?" are frequent. To address this during recent upgrade codes to a "known reference" were placed on the pedestals.** **There has been only one instance of illegal entry requiring law enforcement response since June of 2024. The 2022 Airport Capital Improvement Program grant award was $475,000 for the project, which commenced in 2023. Ninety percent of the grant was provided by the FAA, five percent funded by Caltrans and the remaining five percent was funded by the Airport's Enterprise Fund balance.**	**Airport will consider input from all comments, November 2025 Five-person user group and staff input.**