

MEETING MINUTES



Pensacola International Airport Master Plan
RS&H Project No. 201-0005-001

Date: September 21, 2017
Subject: City Advisory Committee Meeting #3
Prepared For: Public release
Prepared By: Gareth Hanley

Minutes of City Advisory Committee Meeting 9/21/2017 5:30 pm

Attendees:

Dan Flynn, Airport Director
Andrea Kvech, Assistant Airport Director
Alan Bint, Silverleaf Home Owners Association
Duwayne Escobedo, Independent News
Steve Hayes, Visit Pensacola
Scott Luth, FL West Economic Development Alliance
Sam Mathews, Scenic Heights Neighborhood Association
Lara McKnight, Scenic Heights Neighborhood Association
Robin Reshard, Belmont DeVilliers Neighborhood Association
Marilynn Wiggins, Tanyard Neighborhood Association
Jeff Mishler, RS&H (Consulting team)
Ken Ibold, RS&H, (Consulting team)
Gareth Hanley, RS&H (Consulting team)

Invited but not in attendance

John Jerralds
Stephen Greunke
Daxton Gill
Shannon Ogletree, Executive Director-
Office of Economic Development Santa
Rosa County

Meeting Summary:

Dan Flynn opened the meeting and greeted attendees. Mr. Flynn thanked meeting attendees for their participation in the Public Involvement Program for the Airport Master Plan Update. Mr. Flynn encouraged attendees to carefully consider the development alternatives and provide feedback to facilitate the alternatives selection process.

Mr. Flynn introduced Jeff Mishler of RS&H (the consulting team leading the master plan). Mr. Mishler introduced the consulting team.

Mr. Mishler started the presentation by outlining the purpose of the master plan, the master planning process, and the purpose of the City Advisory Committee. Mr. Mishler, Ken Ibold, and Gareth Hanley jointly presented the development alternatives for the key functional areas of the Airport. The purpose of the meeting was to solicit feedback from the City Advisory Committee regarding the alternatives. Stakeholder input will be considered

alongside quantitative analysis in the evaluation of the alternatives and the selection of a preferred alternative.

The presenters noted that the alternatives represented conceptual layout options for future development. Each alternative included differences to encourage debate of the pros and cons of each. The presenters noted that the preferred alternative could be composed of a combination of elements from multiple alternatives. As such, meeting attendees were asked to consider elements of each alternative individually as they potentially could be mixed-and-matched with elements of other alternatives. Selection of an alternative as an intact concept was not required.

Meeting attendees were encourage to ask questions and raise comments throughout the presentation. The following represents key discussion topics during the meeting.

In response to a question from Sam Mathews, Mr. Flynn indicated that the City Council has ultimate decision-making authority to approve the preferred development alternative for the Airport.

In response to a question from Alan Bint, Mr. Flynn indicated that the Runway 35 extension would still be a significant distance (approximately 1,800 feet) away from Summit Blvd.

Steve Hayes asked if the existing runway length results in operational restrictions for takeoff operations today. Mr. Flynn responded saying that some departing aircraft are weight restricted due to the existing runway on certain days due to environmental conditions. This means that aircraft have to reduce fuel load, people, or baggage to decrease takeoff weight.

In response to a follow-up question from Mr. Hayes, Mr. Flynn responded saying that it could take a few years to implement the runway extension. Prior to construction start, the project needs to undergo environmental review, which is a lengthy process to determine what environmental impacts may occur and how to mitigate said environmental impacts, if any.

In response to a meeting attendee, Mr. Ibold indicated that a new instrument approach to Runway 8 or 26 is recommended based on a need for enhanced approach capabilities for aircraft landing in the east-west direction during poor weather. A meteorological analysis was completed to determine the best runway ends for a new instrument approach. This is different from the need for a runway extension, which is based on a need for departing aircraft operations.

In response to a question from Mr. Mathews, Mr. Mishler indicated that the new larger Airbus widebody aircraft (such as Airbus A350) could not be accommodated at the terminal gates. However, these aircraft are not forecast to operate at the Airport. Narrowbody Airbus aircraft (e.g., A319 and A320) are forecast for operation at the Airport and would fit at the terminal gates. The design aircraft for the terminal gates is the Boeing 757, which has a greater wingspan.

A meeting attendee asked about rental car activity at the Airport. Mr. Flynn responded saying that rental car activity has generally increased as passenger activity has increased. Rental car companies have indicated a current need for more ready/return spaces. Transportation Network Companies (e.g., Uber and Lyft) have not affected the rental car industry.

In response to questions from Mr. Mathews, Mr. Mishler indicated that the north expansion of the terminal building would not affect the existing cargo area. Also, baggage could be circulated around the terminal using corridors at apron level and baggage tug vehicles would be able to circulate using the apron service road.

Robin Reshard asked if there is a way to create a sense of place (e.g., iconic architectural concepts) in the terminal building. Mr. Mishler responded saying that it would likely be considered by terminal architects and designers during the design process for improvement to the terminal facility.

In response to a question from a meeting attendee, Mr. Flynn indicated that the currently vacant space on the second level previously occupied by the restaurant would likely become a chilled water system. The current climate control system for the terminal building is near the end of its useful life and replacement to a chilled water system is being considered as a more cost effective method to cool the terminal building.

In response to a question from Ms. Reshard, Mr. Ibold indicated that the 20-year demand for terminal curbside can be accommodated using a single-level roadway as depicted in the Curbside Alternatives. An upper-level roadway would likely be needed at some point beyond the 20-year forecast demand level.

A meeting attendee mentioned that Parking Alternative 1 seemed to make more sense than Parking Alternative 2. Building all surface parking has limited return on investment because it occupies more land than a parking garage. Land area around the terminal is at a premium so reserving land area for other uses by constructing a garage of smaller footprint is good. Most attendees verbally agreed with this assessment and opinion.

Sam Mathews questioned the location of Cargo Alternative 2 due to what he perceived as incompatibility between that alternative and the residential neighborhoods to the northeast of the Airport.

Mr. Hanley summarized the evaluation process and criteria that will be used to assess the alternatives when they are fully developed.

Mr. Flynn thanked attendees for participating and encouraged them to provide further feedback on the alternatives. The alternatives are included in the presentation, which is available for download at <http://www.pnsmasterplan.com/>.

A meeting recording is available separately.

The meeting adjourned at 7:45 pm.