

Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport Authority (PMGAA) Master Plan
 Airport Master Plan Technical Advisory Committee Meeting #4
 October 23, 2019 / 1:30 PM – 3:30 PM
 Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport Saguaro A/B Conference Room

Attendees	
Name	Organization
Bob Draper	Director of Engineering - Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport Authority
Brian O’Neill	Executive Director - Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport Authority
Brian Sexton	Community Relations Manager - Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport Authority
Chuck Odom	CFO Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport Authority
Don Kriz	Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) – Aeronautics Division
Doug Mack	Air Traffic Control Tower Manager- SERCO
Kyler Erhard	Federal Aviation Administration (FAA)
Ryan Smith	Director of Communications - Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport Authority
Scott Brownlee	Deputy Director - Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport Authority
Tony Bianchi	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
Don Arthur	Unison Consulting, Inc.
Brian Drake	Unison Consulting, Inc.

Introductions and Opening Remarks

Tony Bianchi, Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport Authority (PMGAA Rep. Bianchi) opened the meeting by welcoming the committee to the fourth Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) meeting.

Review of Public Survey Input

PMGAA Rep. Bianchi presented the results of the Master Plan Survey to the group. The seven-question survey was distributed in mid-June 2019 to gain feedback from the TAC members and the general public regarding Airport utilization, user preferences, outreach and related feedback. The survey was housed on the project website, sent to TAC member members and publicized to the general public and yielded around 200 responses:

1. *How many times have you, or members of your household, utilized Gateway for air travel in the last 5 years?* The highest percentage of respondents utilize Gateway often or have not yet utilized Gateway for air travel.

Don Kriz, Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) – Aeronautics Division (TAC Member Kriz) asked if survey results have been compared to any comparable survey or information gained by Phoenix Sky Harbor International Airport. *PMGAA Rep. Bianchi* stated this has not been done. *Brian O’Neill, Executive Director - Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport Authority (PMGAA Rep. O’Neill)* added that customer use is very different between the two airports. One serves a high number of business travel, and the other is utilized mainly for non-business travel. It would be difficult to compare this type of information from the two to gain useful insight.

2. *What would be the largest factor in why you utilized, or would utilize, Gateway for your air travel?* The largest factors identified in responses were airline destinations and proximity to one’s home. Surprisingly, affordability came in last of the three choices.
3. *In regard to airport parking, which is more important to you?* Survey results showed that respondents valued low cost parking over proximity to terminal. Results of this answer differ from the previous question where affordability did not rank as high. These results help to inform the airport on how to best expand parking options for users.
4. *How do you travel to/from the airport when departing or arriving on a flight?* The highest number of respondents use their personal vehicle, which also indicates users are utilizing airport parking. Results also showed that 25% of responders use a Ride Share option. Airports across the county are showing a decline in parking utilization and an increase in the use of Ride Share. With Ride Share being available at Gateway only for a couple of years thus far, it is something to keep an eye on to be able to accurately measure and accommodate parking and curbside needs.
5. *How do you typically follow news and events related to Gateway Airport?* The largest number of respondents follow Gateway via social media outlets, which is on trend with the way people are currently gaining information in general. Additionally, 25% of respondents are not following Gateway at all for updates.
6. *In general, can you share your overall impression of Gateway?* Most respondents commented positively to this answer. The largest specific request received through this question was for additional destinations and airlines. Some concerns raised by respondents include:
 - Lines and crowds during peak times
 - Baggage claim wait times
 - Lack of concession space
 - Additional overflight noise from continued growth
7. *Looking into the future, what would you like to see accomplished at Gateway over the next 10-20 years?* The most popular responses include expansion of airlines service and destinations, new or expanded terminal facilities, and enhanced parking options and circulation. Additionally, 14% of respondents preferred little to no additional growth due to concerns regarding noise.

Airport Master Planning Advisory Meeting Agenda

Mark McFarland, Mead & Hunt, Inc. (Consultant Rep. McFarland) provided an overview of the meeting agenda that consisted of:

- Introductions and Opening Remarks
- Review of Public Survey Input
- Project Approach and Schedule
- Review of Forecasts of Aviation Activity and Critical Facility Needs
- Conceptual Development Plan
- 20-year Capital Improvement Project List
- Airport Layout Plan Drawing Set
- Next Steps

Consultant Rep. McFarland reminded the TAC members that the Airport Master Plan is a document that, at completion, we want to anticipate what we think will happen at the airport over the next 20 years. We want to influence what we want to happen during that same time period. Stakeholders will help to influence what we want to have happen.

Project Approach and Schedule

Consultant Rep. McFarland reviewed the project approach stating that the FAA provides guidance on how the Master Plan will be prepared. It is a building block process where the inventory, forecasts, facilities needs determination, development plan formulation and the financial plan are prepared. One of the final steps, the Financial Plan has been prepared and will be reviewed with the group today. The project has been a 16-month process that began in March 2018 and is approaching substantial completion.

Review of Forecasts of Aviation Activity and Critical Facility Needs

Consultant Rep. McFarland stated the forecast has been approved by the FAA and reviewed components of the forecast with the group. The forecast projects increase in anticipated enplanements, total operations and based aircraft. The numbers shown below reflect that all the current available runways at Gateway are needed to accommodate forecasted activity.

Forecast Category	Present	2023	2028	2038
Enplanement	763,542 (2018)	924,667	1,022,420	1,245,211
Total Operations	288,921 (2018)	316,712	333,028	369,744
Total Base Aircraft	109 (2017)	121	126	139

Consultant Rep. McFarland summarized the critical facility needs considerations that included:

- Identify potential needs and benefits for runway extension(s)
- Identify benefits for placement of parallel taxiway improvements
- Consider the benefits of improved instrument approach capabilities
- Passenger terminal
 - Short-term focus on demand driven improvements for existing terminal building
 - Long-term focus on relocated terminal
- Vehicular access and parking

- Short-term focus on demand driven improvements for existing terminal area
- Long-term focus on relocated terminal including support facilities
- SkyBridge Arizona - incorporate adopted recommendations into master plan
- General aviation and industrial aviation – continue to program for demand driven facility expansion and improvements

In reviewing the passenger terminal requirements, existing functional areas are currently meeting the demand, and will continue to do so for the short term. Forecasts indicate that, due to increased activity around 10 years and beyond, some existing terminal functional areas will be deficient. This shows a long-term need to plan for a future east side terminal to meet growing activity at Gateway.

Conceptual Development Plan

Consultant Rep. McFarland presented the preferred conceptual development plan to the group. The existing runways are adequate in length. The east runway, which has the strongest pavement, may require a short extension to accommodate SkyBridge forecasted aircraft usage. As shown on the previous plan documents, extension of the west runway will be necessary to clean up airfield geometry. Additional taxiways are also proposed to keep the airfield operating efficiently and safely. The east end runway is proposed to gain improvements of a 1-mile visual minimum approach. General aviation and industrial aviation will continue to be demand driven, and development parcels will be identified.

The preferred conceptual development plan shows the SkyBridge proposed development on the landside, west end. Additionally, some parcels have been identified on the landside, west end for development along with the terminal annex redevelopment and the future air traffic control tower. However, there is not a lot of area remaining on the landside, west end. On landside, east end, the preferred conceptual development plan shows a future 28-gate passenger terminal to accommodate future capacity needs that will be phased to be implemented 10 gates at a time. Landside access facilities were reviewed to determine how the terminal will be supported by known access points connecting with the regional roadway system. A spine roadway is proposed that will connect access to the east side via Ray Road/Hawes Road and Ellsworth Road. This roadway will also support access to the proposed non-aeronautical development area.

A section of area near the taxiway system has been identified for future aeronautical development. The ASR-8 is currently located in this area. Gateway continues coordination with the FAA to determine the potential of relocation of the ASR-8 to support airport and City of Mesa development in the area. A substantial amount of the proposed east side development can proceed without disruption to the ASR-8 critical area radius. *PMGAA Rep. O'Neill* informed the group that Gateway has had discussions with the FAA in the past about possible relocation of ASR-8. This will not only benefit airport development but also for future planned development for the City of Mesa. The Rittenhouse Auxiliary Airfield has been identified as a potential new location for the ASR-8. The possibility of raising the ASR-8 is also under discussion. However, the preferred action is to relocate ASR-8 away from the airport.

PMGAA Rep. Bianchi asked the TAC members if they have any input on the preferred conceptual development plan. *TAC Member Kriz* likes proposed taxiway improvements. *Doug Mack, Air Traffic Control- SERCO (TAC Member Mack)* supports additional exits off the runways along with the removal of the Taxiway Papa curve. *Kyler Erhard, FAA (TAC Member Erhard)* advised to move taxiway connector entrances outside the middle third of runways, exits are permissible in this area. *TAC Member Erhard* asked about the new center taxiway adjacent to the VOR. *Consultant Rep. McFarland* confirmed and pointed out the location of the VOR between the west and center runway causing the taxiway jog. If the

VOR is no longer needed and removed prior to construction of this taxiway, then the jog is not necessary. *Chris Hacker, Mead & Hunt, Inc. (Consultant Rep. Hacker)* added that the project team reviewed the list of facilities due for decommissioning, the VOR is still listed to remain active, and the jog shown on the preferred conceptual development plan satisfies the 250-foot safety area required for the taxiway.

20-year Capital Improvement Project List

Consultant Rep. McFarland advised the group that Chapter 6 identifies the proposed capital improvement projects, when they are anticipated to take place, and estimated pricing based on 2019 cost estimates. Pricing inflation was added in the financial plan presented later in Chapter 7. The capital improvement plan is most defined during the first five years. The plan also includes project lists for the 6- to 10-year timeframe, 11- to 20-year timeframe, and beyond 20 years. *Consultant Rep. McFarland* also presented a phasing plan map showing location of the projects along with color coding for the timeframe in which they are planned to take place.

TAC Member Mack commented the midfield taxiway around the VOR is much needed. *PMGAA Rep. Bianchi* added that this is identified as a Phase 1 project (within 5 years) with the other midfield taxiway anticipated to be implemented in Phase 2 (6 to 10 years).

Don Arthur, Unison Consulting, Inc. (Consultant Rep. Arthur) presented the financial analysis framework, which is developed to identify the likely funding sources for the planned capital improvement projects. To complete the financial analysis, the team reviewed Gateway's financial framework, airline rates and charges, and conducted an analysis of historical trends in revenues and expenses and projections of future revenues, expenses and cash flow. Once all information is collected, a funding plan is developed for the capital improvement program. The financial information collected from Gateway includes:

- Audited financial reports for Fiscal Year (FY) 2014 – FY 2018
- Revenue and expense budgets for FY 2019 and FY 2020
- Electronic files showing airline rates and charges calculations
- Current Airports Capital Improvement Program on file with the FAA
- Passenger Facility Charge (PFC) applications, FAA PFC Final Agency Decisions, and PFC reports
- Information on airport tenants
- Development and lease agreements
- Additional information in response to follow-up requests

From all this information the team developed the capital improvement program funding plan. The plan is for the first 10 years of planned projects. The process included evaluating the eligibility of each project for the various funding sources along with the estimated availability of these funding sources. The top funding sources identified include the FAA Airport Improvement Program (AIP) grants, PFCs and ADOT funding. Member government contributions were also considered. The member governments collectively provide \$4.06 million a year. Of this amount, \$2.1 million is allotted to maintenance type projects not included in the capital improvement plan such as pavement management. This leaves \$1.9 million a year for capital projects. The team also evaluated potential funding sources for project projected to take place beyond 10 years, which included the operating fund (revenues received minus the expenses), rental car customer facility charges, and lease revenues.

Brian Drake, Unison Consulting, Inc. (Consultant Rep. Drake) continued the presentation of the funding plan with presentation of the plan sheet detailing each project cost and funding source estimate. Project

costs differ than those included in the capital improvement plan, in Chapter 6, as escalated project costs. For all AIP-eligible projects, the team assumed 91.06% of the project cost will be funded by AIP entitlement and discretionary funds except for the Terminal Annex Redevelopment Design and Construction (A8). Additionally, the project funding is estimated to receive 4.47% in ADOT grants and 4.47% in member government contributions.

Consultant Rep. Drake also presented the sources and uses of capital funding, which summarizes the funding plan. AIP funding is estimated to be roughly 59% of the total funding plan. The summary also shows that runway and taxiway projects are the highest use of funding at 60% of the total. *Scott Brownlee, Deputy Director - Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport Authority (PMGAA Rep. Brownlee)* asked if only 60% AIP funding is projected for the Terminal Annex Redevelopment Design and Construction (A8) because it is a terminal project. *Consultant Rep. Drake* confirmed. *Consultant Rep. Drake* presented a breakdown of the airport's operating fund. Projections were based on the year 2020 budget and projected out to the year 2030, which shows growth in aeronautical and non-aeronautical revenue. Overall the projected revenue is anticipated to grow 2.6% per year. The operating fund breakdown also shows a modest cost per enplanement due to landing fees growing by only 3% every other year and the terminal fee remaining the same.

TAC Member Rep. Kriz provided insight on how ADOT allots funding. *PMGAA Rep. Brownlee* verified no state local grants were considered to develop the funding numbers presented. *Chuck Odom, Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport Authority* added that the team took a conservative approach in developing the funding numbers for the plan. *TAC Member Kriz* confirmed ADOT programs to ensure to match all federal state local requests.

Airport Layout Plan Drawing Set

Consultant Rep. McFarland informed the group that the project team is nearing the completion of the Airport Layout Plan (ALP) drawing set. The Future Conditions ALP was presented to the group. *PMGAA Rep. Bianchi* asked *TAC Member Erhard* if the FAA will want to see the delineation between aeronautical and non-aeronautical use for SkyBridge on the ALP. *TAC Member Erhard* confirmed it should be included on the land use plan sheet.

Next Steps

Consultant Rep. McFarland presented the next steps in the Master Plan process:

- Comments on draft work products due by October 30, 2019
- Presentation of Master Plan Recommendation to Senior Staff – November 12, 2019
- Materials (Including Executive Summary) Ready for Distribution to PMGAA
- Presentation of Master Plan Recommendations to PMGAA Board November 19, 2019
- Finalization of Master Plan Draft Final Report (compilation of all working documents)
- Finalization of ALP Drawing Set
- Submittal of ALP to FAA for Review and Approval