

Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport Authority (PMGAA) Airport Master Plan
 Airport Master Plan Technical Advisory Committee Meeting #3
 June 26, 2019 / 9:00 AM – 11:00 AM
 Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport Saguaro A/B Conference Room

Attendees	
Name	Organization
James Gullet	Arizona Air National Guard
Brian Towle	Transportation Security Agency
Scott Sveinsson	Arizona Air National Guard/CFMD
Richard Handorf	Arizona Air National Guard/FMD
Suhani Schottenheimer	Allegiant Airlines
Larry Randle Jr.	Textron Aviation
Matt Nebgen	Director of Gateway Aviation Services, Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport Authority
Shea Joachim	Business Development Director, Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport Authority
Rex Girder	UND Aerospace
Chuck Odom	Chief Financial Officer, Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport Authority
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 that consists of:

- ✓ 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 provided guidance on how the master plan will be prepared. In developing a master plan, it is a building block process in completion of a final Master Plan document. The project team presented completed sections a few months ago to this group and others (Stakeholder Committee). The project team received comments before moving on to the next section. The Facility Requirements Determination was published, and feedback was received. We are now in The Development Plan, which includes Alternatives, and following this, we will complete a Financial Plan.

Consultant Rep. McFarland introduced the Project Schedule, explaining schedule milestones with one remaining Technical Advisory Committee meeting likely to be held 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.

Forecasts Aviation Activity Review

Consultant Rep. McFarland presented that there is a substantial increase in number of enplanements forecasted for the 20-year plan. While enplanements are not going to double, the increase is significant. The total operations goes 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 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. McFarland commented that one of the things that the project team looked at was capacity, as it is important for IWA to have three runways. The project team also looked at putting the parallel taxiway on the east side of the center runway opposed to the west side. The taxiway was most effective on the west side. Location is a result of the anticipation of more aircraft operations on the west side than east side. This consideration also included vast improvements to instrument approach capability to both the center and east runways, which is required at this airport. With the good weather IWA experiences, the project team is looking at minimal instrumental approach aid capabilities to the east runway. This will not change any of the land use considerations.

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.

Airport Representative Tony Bianchi pointed out the existing Master Plan planned for an Air Traffic Control Tower, which is currently under design. The tower will have additional height to allow for visibility on the east side in anticipation for future development.

Airport Representative Scott Brownlee, Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport Authority asked about the reasoning behind the alignment of the parallel taxiway on Alternative 1.

Consultant Rep. McFarland stated the parallel taxiways were aligned around the Very High Frequency Omni-Directional Range (VOR). If the VOR is relocated, the parallel taxiway could then be straight.

Rex Girder, UND Aerospace asked if the runways were rated for freight in terms of concrete?

Consultant Rep. McFarland stated the west and center runway pavement was designed for 550,000 pounds, and the east runway pavement was designed for 850,000 pounds. Runway pavement strength must be designed for 740,000 pounds to withstand frequent heavy aircraft operations.

Consultant Rep. McFarland presented run-up area alternatives. On the Airside, the project 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 staff expressed the need for an area outside of the aircraft movement area where runups 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 the run-up area will be adjacent to Taxiway Yankee for general aviation, with a separate maintenance run-up area. Also, the current Compass Calibration Pad is adjacent to SkyBridge Arizona leasehold. Both the Airport and SkyBridge Arizona would have an interest in relocating this. One alternative is in the middle of the west side, adjacent to the terminal, which is not recommended because it removes a significant area with the potential for development.

Landside Alternative – West Side

Consultant Rep. McFarland shared that during terminal considerations, the project team looked at various functional aspects and check-in and ticketing has capacity through the Master Plan period (2038) without improvements. All other aspects need improvement to meet demand through the 20-year planning period. Also looking at parking, the Ray Road Economy lot is big enough to accommodate demand. The Express Lot is already short on capacity now. What should be done on the west side to the passenger terminal support facilities? The Annex, modular buildings housing Gates 1 through 4, has also reached its useful life, and it can be reconstructed or enlarged to some degree. All these potential near-term improvements can be taken into consideration in the Financial Plan. West Side Development was presented with two Alternatives, each having a short-term, mid-term and long-term phase. The alternatives also identify room for additional aircraft parking. With the additional RONs (Remain Over Night) being implemented, more gate space would be available and ultimately prolongs the use of the West Side Terminal.

Airport Representative Tony Bianchi pointed out the past terminal development was divided into phases/buildings that allow for easy repurposing when relocation to the new terminal occurs.

Shea Joachim, Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport Authority asked if, in the alternatives regarding the annex space, the spots identified are truly RON spots or, when repurposed, will be gate spots?

Consultant Rep. McFarland confirmed them as RON positions.

Landside Alternatives – East Side

Consultant Rep. McFarland stated that Phoenix-Mesa Getaway Airport has 36 acres that contains either terminal facilities or terminal support facilities and accommodates 10 aircraft parking positions. Airport staff has been planning for development on the east side, with a spine road through the development area that would connect at Hawes Road and Ellsworth Road. The Airport also is requesting a passenger terminal development reserve area to maximize the amount of non-aeronautical use development area. 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. The concept being recommended is a pier/finger concourse, which can accommodate about 30 gates. The initial construction of 10 gates has already been environmentally approved. Other concepts presented were the linear and curvilinear.

Terminal Development

Consultant Rep. McFarland presented the three Terminal Development alternatives. All three alternatives show the terminal development on the east side end of the airport, with future non-aeronautical development to the southeast and a section of aeronautical development with airfield access west of the spine road. The three alternatives show three different terminal design options. The Pier-Finger Terminal Design with 28 gates for Alternative 1, the Curvilinear-Pier Design with 28 gates for Alternative 2, and the Linear-Pier Design with 28 gates for Alternative 3.

Airport Representative Tony Bianchi pointed out the alternatives developed through this study are adjusted from what is on the current ALP. These alternatives are a seismic shift and are resetting expectations regarding the number of gates with the future terminal development, west side development for non-aeronautical revenue, and locating the terminal closer to those using it via the Loop 202 and Hawes Road.

Scott Sveinsson, Arizona Air National Guard/CFMD stated the Air National Guard is currently planning to relocate their Papago Park operation within 10 years. A space of 100 acres would be needed to relocate this operation, and there is anticipated funding from the Air National Guard Bureau to facilitate this relocation and development. In the near term, the Air National Guard is looking for C-12 aircraft space to utilize.

James Gullet, Arizona Air National Guard added the Air National Guard is ultimately planning to locate the C-12 and Blackhawks at the same facility. The Air National Guard is interested in a hangar lease at Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport.

Bob Draper, Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport Authority suggested that the spine road that was being shown be further east as it would provide more flex space. The road should not determine how the land would be utilized.

James Gullet, Arizona Air National Guard asked about the size of the aeronautical development section east of the spine road.

Bob Draper, Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport Authority said the area is 57 acres.

Consultant Rep. McFarland asked if Air National Guard needed airfield access for their planned relocation and development.

Scott Sveinsson, Arizona Air National Guard/CFMD confirmed they do.

Scott Brownlee, Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport Authority informed the group that the alternatives are conceptual and can be modified to accommodate future development.

Brian O'Neill, Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport Authority stated that the Airport is reserving around 200 acres for the passenger terminal and is ready to begin development east of that location for non-aeronautical development. The best amount of land between the taxiway and the future spine road needs to be determined for the best use of the area. If the road is adjusted, the best approach is to identify the area as flex space on the ALP to accommodate the capability of aeronautical or non-aeronautical development.

Airport Representative Tony Bianchi asked *Brian Towle, TSA* if they had any preferences regarding the future terminal design.

Brian Towle, TSA indicated centralized screening for the security checkpoint is preferred over multiple checkpoint locations. The layout and location of the security checkpoint is of most interest to the TSA.

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 systems for the center runway being on the west side of the center runway. We are recommending that the airport has only visual approach aids on the east runway, and they be improved slightly to 1-mile minimums, no precision instrument approaches. No changes are proposed to runway protection zone, or safety, or 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 stronger runway pavement associated with larger aircraft and SkyBridge Arizona.

Airport Representative Tony Bianchi asked if there was any additional feedback from attendees.

Rex Girder, UND Aerospace stated that large freight companies are utilizing more modern aircraft that are lighter. Extension to the western most runway is vital to cargo operations. Users will not want to land on the east runway and taxi the length it requires to utilize facilities.

Larry Randle Jr., Textron Aviation stated the run-up areas are a vast improvement and will ensure less time back and forth.

Shea Joachim, Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport Authority asked what is the need for the dual parallel taxiway east of Taxiway Charlie?

Consultant Rep. McFarland explained with the future development on the east, the plan reserves the room for the taxiway system in anticipation for potential future use.

Shea Joachim, Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport Authority asked if this was best approach for the area, as it provided for future aeronautical development further from airfield, which is anticipated to be utilized sooner than the future terminal.

Bob Draper, Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport Authority explained the first parallel is to allow aircraft to exit the runway as soon as possible, and the second parallel is to enable aircraft to access locations as needed.

Rex Girder, UND Aerospace added that the dual parallel taxiways were an efficiency measure. *Brian O'Neill, Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport Authority* asked how the aeronautical designated area shown on the alternatives can be developed, if a taxi lane for access would accommodate operational needs of the area and access to the airfield.

Consultant Rep. McFarland stated the dual parallel taxiway, aeronautical development, and airfield access will be looked at closer when the project moves towards the technical development of the ALP.

Bob Draper, Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport Authority commented another option is to provide a taxi lane on the outside of the taxiway that accesses the runway. This is a more cost-effective option as well due to pavement amount and costs.

Shea Joachim, Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport Authority asked if there were any airfield inefficiencies that resulted in aircraft stacking up and the need for a dual taxiway system on the west side.

Rex Girder, UND Aerospace answered there is not this situation as the volume of operations is not there, and the way the airfield is designed accommodates immediate access to and from the runways.

Brian O'Neill, Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport Authority commented that developments will need to be prioritized as financial planning moves forward. The aeronautical and non-aeronautical development on the east side is critical to support the future facilities and passenger terminal.

Next Steps

Consultant Rep. McFarland stated we will next have our final Stakeholders and Technical Committee Meetings. The Facilities Implementation Plan and Financial Feasibility Analysis, which is the next working document, will be prepared as a part of this process, and that is the last working document. Once the airfield configuration is finalized and approved by the Airport, the project team will proceed with developing the Airport Layout Plan. The project team anticipates our final Stakeholders and Technical Advisory Committee meetings in either September or October of 2019. Following that, we will compile all the working papers into a draft final document, and that will be provided to Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport Authority for review and approval. Once the Airport Layout Plan has been developed, we will submit it to the FAA upon Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport Authority approval.