

MEETING MINUTES



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

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

Minutes of Technical Advisory Committee Meeting 9/21/2017 1:30 pm

Attendees:

Dan Flynn, Airport Director
Andrea Kvech, Assistant Airport Director
Rebecca Oberto, Pensacola International Airport
Meredith Crawford, Escambia County Attorney Office
Rob Danforth, Enterprise Holdings
Mike Deaton, FAA Air Traffic Control Tower
Steve Giles, Pensacola Aviation Center
Bill Hafner, VT MAE
Katie Hill, Pensacola Aviation Center
Andrew Holmer, Escambia County
Bill Hudgens, Pensacola Aviation Center
Juan Lemos, Escambia County
Scott Meader, Delta Air Lines
Sherry Morris, City of Pensacola
Tony Perez, Innisfree Jet Center
Jeff Mishler, RS&H (Consulting team)
Ken Ibold, RS&H, (Consulting team)
Gareth Hanley, RS&H (Consulting team)

Invited but not in attendance

Kevin Hoffman, UPS
Scott Walters, FDOT
Todd Cox, FDOT
Pedro Blanco, FAA ADO
Chastity Clark, FAA ADO
Caitlin Cerame, West Florida Regional
Planning Council
Georgette Corliss, OHM Concessions
Group LLC
Sam Frontera, Heliworks
Robert Jolley, FAA TRACON

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 Technical 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 Technical Advisory Committee regarding the alternatives. Stakeholder input will be

considered alongside quantitative analysis in the refinement and evaluation of the alternatives and the selection of a preferred alternative. Mr. Flynn stressed that it was important for local and regional planners to help identify conflicts and incompatibilities with other planning documents such as the City and County Comprehensive Plans.

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 encouraged to ask questions and raise comments throughout the presentation. The following represents key discussion topics during the meeting.

Mr. Flynn indicated that the change to FAA design criteria was the reason behind many of the alternatives that reflect the need for airfield modifications.

Mr. Mishler confirmed that the proposed instrument approach for Runway 35 would likely also be a PBN/RNAV approach, in response to a question from Mike Deaton.

Mr. Flynn indicated that the Airport could choose to upgrade the existing localizer approach to Runway 26 to an ILS with the installation of a glideslope. This could be done instead of implementation of PBN approach for Runway 26; however, the FAA would not support procurement and funding of the ILS approach.

Scott Meader indicated that the air carriers would likely be able to fly a PBN approach; however, it depends on equipment across the fleet. Bill Hudgens indicated that many GA users also would use PBN approaches.

Mr. Mishler described the added benefit of PBN is that equipment installation at the Airport could support PBN approaches to all runways. Whereas, installation of traditional ILS equipment is required for each runway end for which ILS approaches are desired.

In response to a question from Mr. Meader, Mr. Mishler confirmed that small regional jet aircraft could still be served by the passenger boarding bridges, despite the proposed reconfiguration of the aircraft parking positions.

In response to a question from Mr. Meader, Mr. Mishler indicated that expansion to the baggage makeup and holdroom space would be included as a “baseline” terminal improvement that would be included in all of the terminal alternatives.

Mr. Meader asked about concessions sales and activity since the recent revamp. Mr. Flynn indicated the food and beverage outlets are doing well. Concession operators complain about lack of seating, especially for the Beach House. Grab-and-go restaurants like Chick-fil-a were designed without seating with the intention that patrons would eat in the holdrooms. News and gifts concessions have experienced industry-wide stagnation due to the proliferation of electronic devices and their permitted use on aircraft.

In response to a question from Mr. Meader, Mr. Mishler indicated that additional baggage claim presentation length is required. That can be accommodated by: 1) reconfiguring the

existing devices to increase presentation length, 2) moving the back wall closer to the apron, and/or 3) adding a new device with a building expansion to the north.

Mr. Hudgens asked if new industry trends like autonomous vehicles been considered in the preparation of curbside alternatives. Mr. Ibold indicated that ridesharing and autonomous vehicles have been considered; however, these industry trends have a greater impact on parking and cell phone lot use rather than impacts to curb usage.

Mr. Flynn asked the planners representing Escambia County and the City of Pensacola to review the parking alternatives to determine if there are incompatibilities with existing planning documents.

Mr. Deaton asked if the parking garage expansion would be taller than the Hyatt Place hotel and if it would create any obstruction issues. Mr. Flynn responded saying that it would not be as tall as the hotel and it would not results in any obstruction issues based on previous evaluation of a six-level garage at that location. However, Mr. Mishler indicated that further analysis needs to be conducted to determine if there are obstruction impacts to the proposed PBN/RNAV approaches to Runway 8.

Mr. Deaton noted that some GA development would include converting Taxiway C to a taxilane upon the completion of a new north/south parallel taxiway on the east side of Runway 17-35. He stated that keeping Taxiway C as a taxiway north of the parking apron would be beneficial to Air Traffic Controllers.

Mr. Hudgens wanted clarification of the FAA's position regarding the use of marked helicopter parking areas as tiedown spots for fixed-wing aircraft during periods when helicopters were absent. The GA alternatives differ in where they designate helicopter parking, and some of the options include re-use of part of the existing GA apron near Pensacola Aviation. An FAA determination on this issue would assist in the evaluation of the alternatives.

Mr. Hudgens indicated a general approval for the saying that the general aviation alternatives provided a good basis for consideration. Mr. Hudgens also expressed interest in implementing a self-serve Avgas fuel station. He indicated that the location depicted in Alternative 2 is not ideal; however, a station is desired.

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 3:30 pm.