Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport Authority (PMGAA) Master Plan

Airport Master Plan Technical Advisory Committee Meeting #2

January 15, 2019 / 1:30 PM – 3:30 PM

Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport Saguaro A/B Conference Room

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Attendees** | |
| **Name** | **Organization** |
| Matt Nebgen | Gateway Aviation Services FBO/PMGAA |
| Col. Matt Stubbs | Arizona Army National Guard- Dept of Emergency & Military Affairs |
| Jose Martinez | SkyBridge Arizona (SkyBridge) |
| Scott Brownlee | Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport Authority |
| Rex Grinder | UND/CGCC Aerospace (UND/CGCC) |
| Doug Mack | Air Traffic Control- SERCO |
| Brian Sexton | Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport Authority |
| Larry Randle, Jr. | Textron Aviation |
| Don Kriz | Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) – Aeronautics Division |
| Margie Evanson | Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport Authority |
| Scott Tinnesand | Boeing |
| J. Brian O’Neill | Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport Authority |
| Tony Bianchi | Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport Authority |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Consultant Team** | |
| **Name** | **Organization** |
| Mark McFarland | Mead & Hunt, Inc. |
| Chris Hacker | Mead & Hunt, Inc. |
| Eunique Jackson | Mead & Hunt, Inc. |
| Carissa Valdez | PSM2 |

*General comments from the Airport Master Plan Technical Advisory Committee meeting have been summarized below.*

*Committee Member, Don Kriz (ADOT) –* The runway length shown on slide #10, *Runway Length and Pavement Strength Requirement for B747-400 operations*, indicates there are two runways, Runway 12R/30L and Runway 12C/30C, that are currently longer than the 9,500 feet recommended by your analysis. Airside Development Alternative 2 depicts a runway extension for Runway 12R/30L. What is the disconnect?

*Response:* The east parallel runway (Runway 12L/30R) was designed and constructed to provide the greatest pavement strength for more demanding aircraft*.* The runway lengths identified for Airside Development Alternative #2 were from the prior master plan, and it is only a preliminary alternative. Based on the facility requirements analysis and design aircraft, it could warrant a runway extension to accommodate a fully loaded heavier aircraft.

*Committee Member, Larry Randle, Jr. (Textron Aviation) –* The SkyBridge development is due to take place on land west of Runway 12R/30L, including land where the present-day compass rose is located. Has discussion been had, or has a decision been made, regarding relocating the compass rose to an area where space is available?

*Response:* The alternatives analysis will look closely at this issue and accommodating a possible relocation as SkyBridge has expressed interest in possibly relocating the compass rose, however, it is currently excluded from their lease with PMGAA.

*Committee Member, Jose Martinez (SkyBridge)* – The taxiway leading west from Taxiway A, as shown in Alternative 1, appears to be a taxiway connector to the SkyBridge development area. Is this being constructed? Is Taxiway L going to be relocated, as shown?

*Response:* The alternatives analysis will also look at these issues. Those exhibits shown on the Airport Layout Plan (ALP) and preliminary alternatives presented do not mean they will all be constructed but are shown for runway, taxiway connectivity options. Any offset between taxiways is based on FAA design guidance.

*Committee Member, Rex Grinder (UND/CGCC)* – Commented regarding the 2008 plan, IWA put forth a plan that if a new terminal didn’t happen in 10 years that it would still be okay. Is there talk about moving to the east side in your ongoing planning? Any thoughts given to operators and taking that equipment and moving it out to the east runway? Also, what about taxi times and reducing runway occupancy times?

*Response:* The alternative analysis will look closely at these issues, but the facility requirements analysis and approved forecasts indicated that an east side facility should continue to be planned for in the longer term of the planning horizon. There is no immediate plan to relocate the ILS.

*Committee Member, Rex Grinder (UND/CGCC)* – Construction of terminal facilities on the east side of airport property as well as Airport Surveillance Radar (ASR) removal have been discussed. If nether has happened in the last 10 years, what is the tipping point?

*Response:* The tipping point would be when inadequacies with the terminal and/or support facilities on the west side of the airport (access, parking, terminal building ability to accommodate demand even with improvements) drive the need for a relocated passenger terminal.

*Committee Member, Rex Grinder (UND/CGCC)* – Has any thought been given to relocating the Instrument Landing System (ILS) equipment to the east runway? A precision GPS approach would be sufficient for operators. Is the purpose of retaining the ILS equipment and approaches to maintain and/or attract operations by older aircraft and operators?

*Response:* Good questions. This too will be addressed in the alternatives analysis. IWA is well served by existing instrument approach capabilities and navigation aids.

*Committee Member, Rex Grinder (UND/CGCC)* – Our students rarely use the ILS approach here. Our flight instructors understand commercial aircraft are operating in the airspace and that the ATCT (control tower) is working hard to get all aircraft in and out of Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport (IWA). Though we believe it is a great learning environment for our students here, we conduct Instrument Flight Rules (IFR) operations at nearby airports, unless unable to. A precision GPS approach would be best to replace the ILS. It is a bit costly, but is a fairly quick installation process. Obtaining a new Global Positioning System (GPS) approach is not a long process, but moving equipment from the center runway to another is a big deal and quite costly.

*Committee Member, Brian O’Neill (Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport Authority)* – Commented that there will be challenges associated with relocating commercial operations to the east side of the airport. Future development of a new commercial passenger terminal, access roadways, vehicle parking, and other necessary airport facilities will be demand-driven. Currently, Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport Authority cannot financially afford to undertake a project of that magnitude and the airlines may not be supportive of such a move. The goal is to identify and develop additional long-term funding sources and work with our airline partners on a transition plan to meet their long-term needs as they continue to grow.

*Committee Member, Tony Bianchi (Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport Authority)* – If we were to add or relocate instrumentation from Runway 12C/30C to the east runway, Runway 12L/30R, or pursue implementation of instrumentation for IFR operations, that would likely expand our Runway Protection Zones onto land that we do not own, or currently have an easement for?

*Response*: Yes, it could.

*Committee Member, Scott Tinnesand (Boein*g) – Indicated that during previous airspace meetings, discussions about removing the ASR on IWA’s eastside were had. Due to the financial responsibility for removal, the ASR has remained. Is this still the case? It will need to be relocated for future airport development to ensue. Where will the airport relocate the ASR? What are future plans for the ASR?

*Response:* There was an ASR relocation study completed. The preferred location is at the Rittenhouse Auxiliary Field near Queen Creek. There is an agreement to site it, but it comes down to a funding issue to move it and addressing the perpetual easement with the FAA on the current ASR.

*Committee Member, Matt Nebgen (Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport Association/FBO) –* What is the expected time frame for construction of terminal facilities on the east side? When can we expect greater detail on this matter? I understand money is the driving factor. Have you considered modifying or further expanding the terminal facilities currently located west? What ideas have been explored to reduce the cost of constructing a new terminal east of Runway 12L/30R? Maybe reducing the number of gates?

*Response:* This will be more thoroughly addressed in alternatives analysis, including terminal location and required acreage, which could be reduced from what was first anticipated. The facility requirements analysis indicated that an east side facility should continue to be planned for in the longer term of the planning horizon. We would abide by the completed Environmental Assessment on the east side, which identified an initial 10-12 gate terminal.

*Committee Member, Rex Grinder (UND/CGCC) -* Officials have commented that Sossaman Road is going to face issues as a result of increase in airport operations. An increase in airport operations means an increase in vehicular traffic. To minimize airport impact to Sossaman Road, use of Ray Road should be considered.

*Response:* That is correct. Traffic counts related to passenger, employment, university and SkyBridge traffic are projected to increase. Initial analysis shows a decreased level of service approaching a failing level of service between 2030 and 2040 for Sossaman Road. This too will be addressed in the alternatives analysis.

*Consultant Rep. Mark McFarland (Mead & Hunt, Inc.) –* The next steps that we are going to work on include the development of the alternatives analysis and the Conceptual Development Plan for IWA along with Working Paper #3. We will have our third Working Group meeting in late April or early May 2019 time frame. We appreciate your participation. Any additional comments should go through Tony Bianchi for consideration.