



**PHOENIX GOODYEAR AIRPORT
PLANNING ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES**

August 16, 2006
1:30 pm – 5:00 pm
Hampton Inn & Suites

PAC Member Attendees:	
<i>Member Name</i>	<i>Affiliation</i>
Carl Newman	PHX Aviation Department
Barney Helmick	PHX Aviation Department
Charles Hood	COP Fire Department
Brian Dalke	City of Goodyear – Deputy City Manager
Barclay Dick	ADOT Aeronautics
Bob May	ATCT (Serco)
Bill Gillies	Luke AFB
Bjorn Suren	ATCA
Peggy Eastburn	Estrella Village Planning Committee
Scott Henrich	Goodyear Resident
Eric Cornwell	Representing Several Property Owners in the Area
John Bombardier	Goodyear Airport Tenants Association
Lee Baumgarten	Phoenix International Raceway
Karen Craver	City of Goodyear - Planning
Alan Kennedy	Phoenix Aviation Advisory Board
Absent PAC Members:	
Margie Drilling	FAA – Western-Pacific Division
R.B. Dean Stapley	AOPA
Gary Gelzer	Goodyear Resident
Dan Burkhart	NBAA
Rob Antoniak	Goodyear City Council
Harry Wolfe	MAG – Aviation Coordinator
Candy Carson	Estrella Village Planning Committee
Additional Attendees:	
Karen Apple	PHX Aviation Department
Brenda Holland	City of Goodyear
Becky Gawin	PHX Aviation Department
Julie Ellegood	PSM ²
Alicia Robertson	PSM ²
Jim Harris	Coffman Associates
Steve Benson	Coffman Associates
Patrick Taylor	Coffman Associates
Kenneth Potts	ADOT Aeronautics

ITEM 1 - INTRODUCTIONS

Karen Apple welcomed the committee and stated the purpose of the meeting. All attendees introduced themselves and airport affiliation.

ITEM 2 - REVIEW OF MASTER PLANNING PROCESS

Jim Harris of Coffman Associates provided a brief overview of the Master Planning process and discussed meeting ground rules. Coffman Associates presented their alternatives analysis. The following issues were presented:

Airport Development Objectives

1. To preserve and protect public and private investments in existing airport facilities.
2. To develop a safe, attractive, and efficient aviation facility in accordance with applicable federal, state, and local regulations.
3. To develop a balanced facility that is responsive to current and long term needs of all general aviation.
4. To be reflective and supportive of both the City of Goodyear's and the City of Phoenix's goals, needs, and plans.
5. To ensure that future development will not negatively impact Luke Air Force Base's mission.
6. To develop a facility with a focus on self-sufficiency in both operational and developmental cost recovery.
7. To ensure that future development is environmentally compatible.

Airside Planning Issues

Capacity Enhancements

- Parallel runway
- High speed and bypass taxiways
- Hold aprons

Maintain current runway length

Meet safety area design standards

Strengthen taxiways

Improved Instrument Approaches

Meeting Runway Safety Area (RSA) Standards

Currently the RSA behind Runway 21 extends beyond Yuma Road and thus does not meet standard. Following FAA direction six alternatives were presented:

1. Clear and grade the RSA: Requires relocating approximately 1,800 feet of Yuma Road and acquisition of at least six acres of land to the east of the airport.
2. Shift Runway: Remove 300 feet of pavement on the Runway 21 end and add 300 feet to the Runway 3 end. May be minor Object Free Area penetration.
3. Decrease Runway Length: Remove 200 feet on Runway 21 end. Not desirable as the full 8,500 feet of runway length is needed.
4. Combination Method: Remove 300 feet of pavement on Runway 21 end and add 200 feet on Runway 3 end. Result is loss of 100 feet of pavement which is not desirable.

5. Implement Declared Distances: Would reduce runway length for operations to and from Runway 3 by 300 feet which is not desirable.
6. Engineered Materials Arresting System (EMAS): Installation of 480-foot EMAS bed behind Runway 21. May be cost prohibitive at and estimated \$5.4 million.

Landside Planning Issues

Separation of activity levels

Aircraft storage development to meet forecast demand

Provide for additional FBO areas

Provide for corporate aviation growth

Access improvements, parking

Identify any necessary property acquisition

Airside Development Alternatives

1. Alternative 1 Theme: Provide a 4,500-foot by 75-foot north side parallel training runway for capacity enhancement and provide all landside development on the south side. RSA deficiency is solved by relocating 1,800 feet of Yuma Road. Add additional High speed taxiways. Meet ARC D-IV design standards. Parallel runway to ARC B-II design standards.
2. Alternative 2 Theme: Maximum build-out scenario with corporate aviation to north and other general aviation to the south. Longer parallel runway to the north measuring 7,200 feet long by 100 feet wide, intended to serve more cabin class jet activity and provide occasional back up to primary runway. Approximately 90 acres of undeveloped land needed for corporate aviation development. RSA deficiency solved through a 300-foot shift of the runway to the west. CAT I approach to Runway 3. High speed and bypass taxiways.
3. Alternative 3 Theme: Develop a south side parallel training runway measuring 4,300 feet long by 75 feet wide to provide capacity relief. Segregate corporate aviation to north on existing property. Other general aviation to the south of the training runway. RSA deficiency solved through declared distances. High speed and bypass taxiways.

Landside Development Alternatives

The landside alternatives are coupled with the airside development alternatives, thus Landside Alternative 1 necessarily requires Airside Alternative 1, for example.

1. Landside Alternative 1: All development is on the south side with the area central to the runway system reserved for high activity uses such as FBO operations. The areas immediately to the sides of the high activity area are corporate aviation parcels, typically a medium activity area. Executive and T-hangar facilities are then located farther away from the central ramp area as they are low activity areas. Space is available for an aviation related employment center.
2. Landside Alternative 2: Corporate aviation is segregated to the north in order to separate activity levels but to also provide quick access to the parallel runway, which at 7,200 feet in length can support most corporate aviation aircraft. The acquisition of 90 acres of land would be necessary to accommodate airport services hangars and the corporate aviation parcels. On the south side is a centrally located airport services area with Executive and T-hangars set back from

- the high activity central ramp area. This alternative provides the largest area of the three alternatives for a large aviation related employment center.
3. Landside Alternative 3: This alternative designs landside facilities around the south side parallel training runway. On the south side an airport services area is centrally located to the parallel runway. Executive and T-hangars are then located to the side of the high activity areas. The location of the parallel runway would necessitate the relocation of the tower to the north side of the airport. Set to each side of the relocated tower are high activity airport service areas. Then set to the sides of the high activity areas are corporate aviation parcels. Space for a south side aviation related employment center is also provided.

ITEM 3 - ALTERNATIVES DISCUSSION COMMENTS

PAC members were asked to provide comments on the draft alternatives which are included below:

Karen Craver: Prefers Alternative 3. Can what we want be accommodated with the current property line?

Coffman Associates: Alternatives 1 and 3 show that forecast demand and a capacity relieving parallel runway can be provided without significant property acquisition.

Lee Baumgarten: Initially preferred Alternative 2. Is there a north side entrance off Yuma Road? What is the status of the environmental cleanup of the airport?

Coffman Associates: Yes there is a north side access road from Yuma Road. Monitoring wells and extracting well have been in place for over 15 years. The environmental “plume” is greatly reduced leading to development possibilities on the airport property previously affected. Lee also responded to Eric Cornwell’s question about the cost of a replacement tower by saying that a replacement tower would certainly cost less than acquiring 90 acres of land to the north.

Eric Cornwell: Represents several property owners totalling 1,200 acres immediately north of airport. Asked how much a control tower costs. Asked about Scottsdale’s safety area, do they have 1,000 feet. Interested in promoting development of their land that caters to corporate aviation operators. Try to attract businesses to locate on their land and fly in and drive to their business.

Coffman Associates: \$2-4 million for a tower. Scottsdale provides 1,000-foot RSAs through declared distances.

Barney Helmick: How much larger would the airport overlay disclosure map be with these alternatives. Barney also explained the procedure of large aircraft taxiing on the runway due to a lack of pavement strength on the taxiway.

Coffman Associates: Almost no change since the previous public airport disclosure already considered a parallel runway.

Bob May: Alt 1 leads to too much runway crossing. Would need to launch and recover from primary and utilize parallel for touch and go’s. High speed exits on primary and on all parallel taxiways. Significant capacity may not be realized. Alternative 2 would provide limited capacity improvement and there is a need for a training runway not

necessarily a second long runway. Much prefers alt 3. Goodyear does not need a big runway for capacity improvement. Alt 3 runway will suffice. Noise should be considered, as such Alt 3 will keep noise to west and south. Taxiing will be more efficient with limited runway crossing. Capacity improvement would likely be realized.

Bill Gillies: Luke wants to be in the process when airport pursues instrument approaches. Need to designate an airspace area for training ops and to keep pilots away from fighter jets.

Scott Henrich: Initially liked alternative 2, not prefers alternative 3. Do RPZs beyond airport property need to be acquired?

Coffman Associates: They are recommended for acquisition or an avigation easement. But the footprint of the RPZ to the east is actually reduced and pulled back from the existing building when shifting the runway.

Peggy Eastburn: Concern about money and effort related to property acquisition. Prefers Alternative 3 as it fits well with Goodyear planning efforts.

Eric Cornwell: The City of Goodyear is involved with planning of the 1,200 acres to the north of the airport.

Charles Hood: Plan should identify any designated public safety space.

Carl Newman: Runway Shift for RSA solution and Alternative 3 landside development.

Becky Gawin: Alternative 3 if supportive of City of Goodyear plans and objectives.

Barclay Dick: Wanted clarification of combo method.

Coffman Associates: Remove 300 feet on Runway 21 end, add 200 feet on Runway 3 end. Reduces runway length by 100 feet.

Bjorn Suren: Prefer Alternative 3 even though there may be more taxiing for their Lufthansa training activity. Seems like the most efficient alternative.

Brenda Holland: Concerned about runway crossings of Alt 1. Leaning toward Alternative 3. Concern with potential bump in Yuma road.

Brian Dalkes: Interested in an entrance from Bullard. Rail traffic is expected to increase with new installations in Buckeye thus an entrance off 85 may not work well. Minimize impact to land owners. The need for a parallel runway for capacity improvements is important. Separation of activity levels in Alternative 3 is a good approach. Aero Turbine (formerly TIMCO) is an important business to City of Glendale. Tower should be moved. Can the parallel runway be longer if tower is moved? Always keep Luke's mission in mind when developing. Keep in forefront Luke's mission.

Coffman Associates: Note: Further analysis has indicated that unless the parallel runway can be 5,500 feet in length to accommodate some business jets as a back up to the main runway then there is no significant capacity improvement to a longer parallel

runway. Even with the relocation of the tower, 5,500 feet for a parallel runway wouldn't fit and a parallel runway of 4,300 feet would easily accommodate most training traffic.

Kenneth Potts: Declared distances – have you had conversations with the FAA?

Coffman Associates: Yes, the FAA prefers a physical solution to RSA issues.

Implementing declared distances is near the bottom of the list of solutions, even though it may be the least expensive.