

Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport Authority (PMGAA) Master Plan
 Airport Master Plan Stakeholder Committee Meeting #3
 June 25, 2019 / 2:00 PM – 3:00 PM
 Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport Saguaro A/B Conference Room

Attendees	
Name	Organization
Josh Rodgers	Planning – Town of Gilbert
Eva Cutro	Planning Manager – Town of Gilbert
Brett Nadler	Phoenix Sky Harbor International Airport
Chris Andres	City of Chandler - Chandler Municipal Airport (CHD)
Aric Bopp	Economic Development - City of Mesa
Erik Swanson	Town of Queen Creek
Rustyn Sherer	Arizona Public Service
Rudy Equivias	Senior Planner – City of Apache Junction
Mark Gaspers	Boeing
Brian Sexton	Communications Manager/PIO, Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport Authority
Bob Draper	Engineering & Facilities Director, Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport Authority
Brian O’Neill	Executive Director/CEO, Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport Authority
Ryan Smith	Director of Communications/Community Relations, Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport Authority
Scott Brownlee	Deputy Director/COO, Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport Authority
Tony Bianchi	Airport Planning Manager, Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport Authority

Consultant Team	
Name	Organization
Mark McFarland	Mead & Hunt, Inc.
Chris Hacker	Mead & Hunt, Inc.
Kelly Phelps	PSM ²
Carissa Valdez	PSM ²

Introductions and Opening Remarks

Airport Representative Tony Bianchi, (PMGAA) opened the meeting by welcoming the committee to the third stakeholder meeting. He provided the update that, since the last meeting, the Facility Requirements chapter has been finalized, and a series of discussions regarding some of the alternatives has occurred.

Mark McFarland, Mead & Hunt, Inc. (Consultant Rep. McFarland) reminded the committee that the Airport Master Plan is a planning document, and it incorporates what we think will happen at the airport over the next 20 years.

Airport Master Planning Advisory Meeting Agenda

Consultant Rep. McFarland provided an overview of the meeting agenda:

- ✓ Introductory Remarks
- ✓ Project Approach and Schedule
- ✓ Forecasts of Aviation Activity Review
- ✓ Facility Requirements Review
- ✓ Airfield Alternatives
- ✓ Landside Alternative – West Side
- ✓ Landside Alternative – East Side
- ✓ Conceptual Development Plan
- ✓ Next Steps

Project Approach and Schedule

Consultant Rep. McFarland introduced the section by stating that the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) funded a lot of the study and provides guidance on how the master plan will be prepared. In developing a master plan, it is a building block process that ultimately results in a final Master Plan document. The project team presented completed sections a few months ago to this group (Stakeholder Committee) and others. The project team received comments before moving on to the next section. The Facility Needs Determination was published and feedback was received. We are now in the process of developing alternatives and once a preferred development concept is agreed upon, we will complete a financial plan based upon the approved concept.

Consultant Rep. McFarland introduced the Project Schedule, explaining schedule milestones and that there will be one more Stakeholder Committee meeting likely in September of 2019.

Consultant Rep. McFarland discussed the online public and stakeholder surveys remain open for comments, and he encouraged the committee to participate. The public survey has received 177 responses to date with these results:

- 34 percent of respondents indicate they have used Gateway five or more times in the past five years.
- 70 percent of respondents indicated low cost parking was important (more important than proximity to terminal).
- 42 percent indicated airline destinations are a critical factor in utilizing Gateway.
- 35 percent indicated proximity to home is a critical factor in utilizing Gateway.

Airport Representative Tony Bianchi indicated that one of the interesting results to the public survey on how passengers travel to/from IWA when traveling is that rideshare (Lyft/Uber/Shuttle) has been on airport a couple of years, and Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport recently signed a user agreement with Uber. Over 25 percent respondents answered that they use this service. Brett (Nadler) was asked if Sky Harbor tracks the utilization of ride-shares verses self-parking.

Committee Member Brett Nadler (Sky Harbor International Airport) stated they do but the data was not with him.

Airport Representative Tony Bianchi requested data be shared with him to see what the statistics are for a large airport.

Chris Hacker, Mead & Hunt, Inc. (Consultant Rep. Hacker) stated that one of the key things would be that the links to the survey will remain open for a few more days and encouraged the committee to participate.

Airport Representative Tony Bianchi shared that the committee's survey is a little different than the public survey, because it will include the alternatives.

Consultant Rep. McFarland reminded the committee that Tony (Bianchi) is the client representative, and all comments should go through him.

Forecasts Aviation Activity Review

Consultant Rep. McFarland presented that there is a substantial increase in the number of enplanements forecasted for the 20-year plan. While enplanements are not going to double, the increase is significant. The total operations go from 316,000 to 369,000 during the next 20 years. A lot of those numbers will be generated by flight training activity. Total based aircraft all over the United States are not growing like they used to, because general aviation for smaller aircraft is not growing. Some growth at the airport is anticipated to still occur.

Consultant Rep. McFarland presented the layout of existing facilities. The East runway, farthest from the existing terminal is 9,300 feet long. Although the shortest, it does have the greatest pavement strength. The lowest minimum approach is on the south end of the center runway. On the south end of the west side runway are the SkyBridge Arizona facilities. SkyBridge Arizona has their own master plan and the Airport will incorporate those improvements in their document.

Facility Requirements Review

Consultant Rep. McFarland summarized the needs and considerations for facility requirements related to the runway system. The consulting team examined the potential for extending Runway 12L/30R, Runway 12R/30L, a parallel taxiway to Runway 12C/30C, other taxiway crossings to facilitate aircraft movements, and improved instrument approach capabilities to the runways. There is also a short-term focus to make improvements to the existing passenger terminal on the west side of the airport to ensure that it accommodates short-term demand. In the long term, it is anticipated that the passenger terminal will relocate to the east side. General aviation and industrial aviation will continue to be demand driven, and development parcels will be identified.

Airside Alternatives

Consultant Rep. McFarland presented two airside alternatives. The alternatives represented study of the runway length considerations, instrument approach capability, parallel taxiway improvement considerations, and exit and connecting taxiway improvements. In consideration of the ILS (Instrument Landing System) approach to the center runway, it should have a full taxiway system. The alternatives primarily examined the placement of that parallel taxiway system on the west side of the center runway.

Consultant Rep. Hacker commented that the alternative that placed the parallel taxiway on the west side of the center runway has a jog to avoid the existing VOR (Very High Frequency Omni-Directional Range).

Committee Member Erik Swanson (Town of Queen Creek) asked how many airports in the United States have three or more 10,000-foot runways.

Consultant Rep. McFarland responded not many, but Sea-TAC (Port of Seattle) does.

Consultant Rep. Hacker added that LAX (Los Angeles International Airport) also does.

Committee Member Erik Swanson commented probably less than 20 airports in the United States have three or more runways at that length.

Consultant Rep. McFarland responded that it is likely true that you would have more than three parallel runways at any of the large hub airports.

Airport Representative Scott Brownlee, Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport Authority responded large hubs might have at least three runways, however they might not all be parallel.

Consultant Rep. McFarland commented that one of the things that the consulting team looked at was capacity, which showed the importance for this airport to have three runways. The consulting team also looked at the question, what if we put the parallel runway on the east side of the center runway rather than the west side? The taxiway was most effective on the west side. Locating the parallel runway on the west side was proposed in anticipation of more aircraft operations on the west side than the east side. This alternative also included vast improvement to instrument approach capability to both the center and east runways, which is required at this airport. Since the airport experiences good weather almost all the time, the need for improved approaches is mitigated.

Consultant Rep. Hacker stated as we progress through defining each of these alternatives in developing the Preferred Conceptual Development Plan, viable projects outside of each alternative can be chosen in the development of the Conceptual Development Plan. It is not just one or the other, it can be customized.

Consultant Rep. McFarland On the Airside, the consulting team looked at run-up areas at the far north end of the west runway. Air Traffic Control specifically stated that smaller general aviation aircraft are doing run-ups in the operational area for the taxiway or the taxiway system. Air Traffic Control expressed the need for an area outside of the aircraft movement area where run-ups can be done. In addition, we have a larger demand for the industrial aviation users and for maintenance operators doing repairs and requiring engine runs. The alternative suggested that the run-up area will be located adjacent to Taxiway Yankee for general aviation, with a separate maintenance run-up area. Also, the current Compass Calibration Pad is adjacent to the SkyBridge leasehold. Both the Airport and SkyBridge Arizona would have an interest in relocating this function. Alternative locations were discussed.

Airport Representative Tony Bianchi shared that one of the needs that has emerged is this run-up pad. What we want to consider is, based on the orientation of the run-up location, noise is generated and impacts land uses surrounding the Airport. Where is the best place on the airfield for run-ups to occur? Can we put in any noise mitigation, so communities are not negatively impacted?

Landside Alternative – West Side

Consultant Rep. McFarland shared that in examining the existing terminal and its functional areas, passenger check-in and ticketing has capacity through 2038. There are other areas of the terminal buildings that will need to be improved. This includes Gates 1 through 4 in the terminal annex. These gates have met their useful life as they were built in 2006 and are essentially modular trailers.

Consultant Rep. Hacker stated that a key consideration for developing the new footprint for the terminal annex area was the recent improvements to the baggage makeup area. This would allow the existing passenger facilities to stay on the east side for a while longer.

Consultant Rep. McFarland stated that when the time comes to expand the passenger terminal on the east side, it will be done in separate phases as demand warrants. This will help the Airport to repurpose the west side terminal buildings, likely as general aviation uses, when the passenger terminal moves to the east side.

Landside Alternatives – East Side

Consultant Rep. McFarland stated Airport staff has been planning for development on the east side. This plan includes a “spine road” through the development area that would connect at Hawes Road and Ellsworth Road. The Airport is also requesting a passenger terminal development reserve area large enough to meet potential demand, but not in excess, to maximize the amount of development area for non-aeronautical use. The most prized non-aeronautical area is along Ellsworth Road. The best place for the new passenger terminal is at the far north end of the east side development area. Concepts that can ultimately accommodate about 30 gates are being recommended. The initial construction of 10 gates has already been environmentally approved.

Airport Representative Tony Bianchi asked from an industry standpoint, which design is recommended, or what is the industry standard for TSA and security requirements and other industry standards? Looking at Sky Harbor (International Airport), they took the first concept with a more linear design at Terminal 3.

Consultant Rep. McFarland responded that the pier/finger is an efficient use of space, but the site selected will dictate the configuration.

Consultant Rep. Hacker stated each of the terminal designs has its own advantages or disadvantages. With the pier/finger there is less walk distance for connecting passengers which is similar to Phoenix-Sky Harbor Terminal 4. The curvilinear is more of a hybrid model that has advantages of one finger being able to double up on the concourse, yet passengers will still experience a longer walking distance. The linear terminal equates with longer distance and walking between gates for connections. When looking at the proposed IWA site, the linear terminal option offers the shortest walking distance from passenger vehicle, through security, and to the aircraft.

Airport Representative Tony Bianchi stated that the current airport layout plan has 60 total gates that take up nearly all of the east side of the airport. The Airport is never going to need that many gates. This master plan has more efficient infrastructure, demands less roadway and less circulation, and keeps the cost down while at the same time opening 400 acres for non-aeronautical development or other additional development capable of generating revenue.

Airport Representative Brian O'Neill, Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport Authority stated it is important to segregate the two, because the passenger terminal is demand driven. It may be a decade away, but the non-aeronautical development should start happening now. Connectivity through the roadway is necessary, but separate the terminal development from the non-aeronautical. There are two distinct areas you can preserve in that area for future development needs. The people of Queen Creek say that 52,000 people a day use Ellsworth Road. There must be some opportunity to have non-aeronautical development to meet some of their needs.

Airport Representative Tony Bianchi stated that this provides us with more flexibility.

Airport Representative Tony Bianchi asked if there was any preference regarding the east side alternatives shown?

Committee Member Mark Gaspers, Boeing asked if the green area is accessible for non-aeronautical?

Airport Representative Tony Bianchi responded yes, all non-aeronautical, but revenue producing for the airport.

Consultant Rep. McFarland stated that the most valuable land on the airport is the area adjacent to the taxiway system. The project team did not identify that the green area would go all the way to the building restriction line. The team did leave a significant depth for aeronautical development to mirror the aeronautical depth similar to the west side.

Committee Member Chris Andres, City of Chandler - Chandler Municipal Airport stated a preference for the linear pier, because operations can start from the center and keep running. If additional operations are needed, there is a lot of flexibility without completely disrupting ongoing operations. Plus, it can always be widened for concession opportunities.

Committee Member Erik Swanson, Town of Queen Creek asked if alternative one provides extra expansion capabilities. It seems that there is opportunity on either end to come at a 45 (degree angle) and add an additional 10 gates on either side. Is that a possibility with alternative one?

Consultant Rep. McFarland responded yes.

Committee Member Chris Andres, City of Chandler - Chandler Municipal Airport (CHD) stated that for alternative three, options are limited unless selecting a perpendicular configuration.

Consultant Rep. McFarland stated that was an interesting concept. Internally the conversation was you have the gates in the back, and what if we did more of a linear? From an engineering standpoint, that is a lot of concrete. What are the costs associated with that? What are the options of extending the hammer head design?

Committee Member Chris Andres, City of Chandler - Chandler Municipal Airport (CHD) stated one of the challenges of the linear pier is that longer taxi distances if pilots must maneuver around the ends of the terminal to get to the airfield.

Consultant Rep. McFarland stated a double loaded concourse is much less expensive. Again, the consulting team will identify a concept and that will go in the Master Plan.

Airport Representative Tony Bianchi stated that goes back to Eric's point of view that the first alternative provides a little expansion opportunity. But the first initial phase, it doesn't seem optimal to have all your gates and support facilities at one far end.

Consultant Rep. McFarland responded keeping the geometry at the airports simple helps you avoid costing yourself money by wasting space.

Committee Member Erik Swanson, Town of Queen Creek asked about the "spine road" drop to the west. Wouldn't it make more sense to have the spine road further up and in to allow for future airport use? That is a primary road.

Airport Representative Tony Bianchi stated just take advantage of the existing crossing, because that is what was done with this design. The project team tried to take advantage of where the existing crossings are located especially with Williams Field Road alignment.

Airport Representative Bob Draper, Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport Authority stated it gives you more flexibility between aeronautical and non-aeronautical.

Committee Member Chris Andres, City of Chandler - Chandler Municipal Airport (CHD) stated that gives you a lot more flexibility, because, for example, at Sky Harbor the roadways determine the actual configuration.

Airport Representative Brian O'Neill responded to Mark (McFarland) by moving the main arterial road (spine road) to the north, outside of the ASR-8 critical area, there is a section of non-developed land that can be used as flex space for either aeronautical or non-aeronautical based on development needs.

Committee Member Chris Andres, City of Chandler - Chandler Municipal Airport (CHD) stated that way 100 years from now the Airport can expand as far east as you want (on airport property).

Conceptual Development Plan

Consultant Rep. McFarland stated, if we look at all these considerations, we did use alternative one airside in that we do have the parallel taxiways system for the center runway being on the west side of the center runway. We are recommending that the airport should have non-precision approaches on the east runway. No changes to runway protection zones, or safety and object free areas. Just provide some instrumentation guidance for the east side runway, which is hopefully going to be the air carrier runway. It is the strongest runway associated with larger aircraft and SkyBridge Arizona.

Airport Representative Tony Bianchi stated hopefully the future air traffic control tower can be built in the coming years.

Committee Member Erik Swanson, Town of Queen Creek asked will having the air traffic control tower on the west side work well enough for the east terminal?

Airport Representative Tony Bianchi responded yes, when you look at the old layout plan, a couple sites were identified on the east side, but when working with the FAA, the FAA said it was to remain on the west side because the entire airport was developed based on the existing tower site. So, they said we will find a good location on the west side and will adjust to what the height needs to be to manage air

traffic safely and successfully to the east side. We did do a siting study through the FAA, and they determined that it would stay on the west side.

Next Steps

Consultant Rep. McFarland stated that tomorrow we will next have a Technical Committee meeting, as well as a public information meeting. The Facilities Implementation Plan and Financial Feasibility Analysis working document will be the focus of the next meeting. The next step is that once the airfield configuration is decided, and the Airport approves, the project team will proceed with the Airport Layout Plan Drawing Set. The project team anticipates that our final committee meetings for both the Stakeholder and Technical Committees will be in September or October of 2019. Following that the project team will compile all the working papers into one draft final document, and that will be provided to the Airport Authority for review and approval. The project team will then submit the Airport Layout Plan to the FAA after the Airport Authority has given approval.