

MEETING MINUTES



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

Date: December 19, 2017
Subject: Technical Advisory Committee Meeting #4
Prepared For: Public release
Prepared By: Gareth Hanley, RS&H

Minutes of Technical Advisory Committee Meeting 12/19/2017 1:30 pm

Attendees:

Dan Flynn, Airport Director
Andrea Kvech, Assistant Airport Director
Rebecca Oberto, Pensacola International Airport
Belinda Zephir, Pensacola International Airport
Meredith Crawford, Escambia County Attorney Office
Rob Danforth, Enterprise Holdings
Mike Deaton, FAA Airport Traffic Control Tower
Andrew Holmer, Escambia County
Robert Jolley, FAA TRACON
Juan Lemos, Escambia County
Scott Meader, Delta Air Lines
Sherry Morris, City of Pensacola
Allison Schilling, OHM Concessions
Dave Timmons, Paradies Lagardère
David Wood, West Florida Regional Planning Council
Jeff Mishler, RS&H (Consulting team)
Ken Ibold, RS&H, (Consulting team)
Gareth Hanley, RS&H (Consulting team)

Invited but not in attendance

Pedro Blanco, FAA ADO
Chastity Clark, FAA ADO
Todd Cox, FDOT
Sam Frontera, Heliworks
Bill Hafner, VT MAE
Kevin Hoffman, UPS
Bill Hudgens, Pensacola Aviation Center
Scott Walters, FDOT

Meeting Summary:

Jeff Mishler of RS&H (the consulting team leading the master plan) opened the meeting, greeted attendees, and introduced the consulting team. Mr. Mishler thanked meeting attendees for their participation in the Public Involvement Program for the Airport Master Plan Update. Mr. Mishler encouraged attendees to provide feedback throughout the presentation.

Mr. Mishler outlined 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 evaluation of 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 recommended alternatives.

The presentation depicted each alternative including the pros and cons of each that represented the evaluation results. A quantitative matrix summarized the evaluation results for each functional area. Discussion of each functional area concluded with the recommended alternative. In some cases, the recommendation was composed of a combination of elements from multiple alternatives.

Dan Flynn asked if the Rough Order Magnitude (ROM) implementation cost for Airside Alternative 2 included relocation of the Airport Surveillance Radar. Mr. Flynn felt that the ROM cost did not sufficiently capture the high cost associated with relocating a Navigational Aid (NAVAID).

Mike Deaton suggested an alternative to the proposed removal of Taxiway C north of Runway 8-26 and Taxiway D1. Mr. Deaton indicated that general aviation aircraft can exit Runway 8-26 at Taxiway C when landing from either direction. Therefore, maintaining access to the south for Taxiway C would support an efficient operation for general aviation users. Larger commercial service aircraft cannot slow sufficiently to exit at Taxiway C to the north; therefore, maintaining the portion of Taxiway C north of Runway 8-26 has limited benefit. Mr. Deaton, recommends maintaining Taxiway C segment south of Runway 8-26 and Taxiway B3 to support the efficient runway exit operations.

A meeting attendee asked about the level of environmental analysis that would be required to implement a new instrument approach procedure. Mr. Ibold indicated that a Categorical Exclusion, Short Form Environmental Assessment (EA), or standard EA would likely be performed. The need for an Environmental Impact Statement is unlikely.

A meeting attendee was concerned about potential land acquisition that may be required to support the larger Runway Protection Zone (RPZ) for the new Performance Based Navigation (PBN) / Area Navigation (RNAV) procedure identified for Runway 8 in Airside Alternative 2. Mr. Hanley indicated that the ROM cost did not include estimate of land acquisition. Land acquisition cost is unknown and has not been determined yet.

Andrew Holmer indicated that it is usually not feasible to acquire the land within the protection areas off the end of the runway. Mr. Holmer referenced a previous situation where the County worked with the Navy in adjusting a runway protection area. Implementing a change to the future land use designation may be the only method in which to resolve noncompliant existing uses.

Sherry Morris indicated that implementing a new instrument approach procedure (and the associated larger RPZ) may result in adjustment of the Airport Transitional zoning in the City's Comprehensive Plan. The City is entering an update cycle, which allows the Planning Services to efficiently update the Comprehensive Plan to reflect the recommended development alternative identified for the Airport.

Mr. Mishler indicated that ROM costs will be determined with the recommended airside alternative at a later date. An estimate of the land acquisition costs will also be determined, if the new instrument approach procedure for Runway 8 is identified.

Scott Meader asked if details about the operation of the larger outbound baggage make-up area have been determined. Mr. Mishler indicated that operational details of the configuration and carousel assignments would be determined in the design process with stakeholder input.

Mr. Meader asked about the operational benefit associated with the split baggage make-up area as depicted in Terminal Alternative 3. A split operation may result in an efficient tug operation due to the dispersed demand during the peak departure period. However, there are challenges associated with transporting the bags to the north make-up area from the screening area. Additionally, having make-up areas in two locations may result in reduced operational flexibility for airlines to accommodate departure changes or departure delays.

Mr. Deaton expressed concern that the terminal area expansion would compress the terminal apron. Additionally, removing Taxiway A7 without replacement reduces the number of access points from three to two. Mr. Deaton is concerned these conditions may result in apron and airfield congestion, especially while departing aircraft undergo pushback/power-up operations, which temporarily obstructs the taxiway.

Several meeting attendees mentioned that impact to localized roadway access and broader corridor roadway capacity would be evaluated prior to the implementation of the larger cargo facility. However, Airport Boulevard is currently designated as an "Emerging SIS" corridor in the Florida Department of Transportation's Strategic Intermodal System. Therefore, cargo development adjacent to Tippin Avenue aligns with State and regional plans to accommodate growth in the region.

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, at request.

The meeting adjourned at 2:45 pm.