



**PHOENIX DEER VALLEY AIRPORT
PLANNING ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES**

February 27, 2006
8:30 pm – 12:00 pm
Country Inn & Suites

PAC Member Attendees:	
<i>Member Name</i>	<i>Affiliation</i>
Carl Newman	PHX Aviation Department
Gary Mascaro	PHX Aviation Department
Dean Brennan	PHX Planning Department
Ellen Poole	USAA
Harold Sharp	FAA – DVT Tower
Ken Potts (for Barclay Dick)	ADOT Aeronautics
Harry Wolfe	MAG
Bill Gillies	Luke AFB
Arthur Rosen	AOPA
Ed Chauza	DVT Pilots Association
Roberto Franco	PHX Community Economic Development Department
Tim Gift (for Charles Hood)	Phoenix Fire Department
Ellen Poole	USAA
Ray Dovalina	PHX Street Transportation Department
Denise Yanez	PHX Community Economic Development Department
Dave Tunheim	Honeywell
Alan Kennedy	Phoenix Aviation Advisory Board
Lance Gavin	Deer Valley Village Planning Committee
Absent PAC Members:	
Michael Dixon	PHX Aviation Advisory Board
Charles Hood (Tim Gift attended)	PHX Fire Department
Roberto Franco	Phoenix Community & Economic Development
Margie Drilling	FAA – Airports Division
Barclay Dick (Ken Potts attended)	ADOT Aeronautics
Dan Burkhart	NBAA
Charlie Ellis	Deer Valley Village Planning Committee
Additional Attendees:	
Karen Apple	PHX Aviation Department

Jane Morris	PHX Aviation Department
Becky Gawin	PHX Aviation Department
Gennavieve Breckenridge	PSM ²
Alicia Robertson	PSM ²
John Padilla	Luke AFB
Chris Ewell	Phoenix Planning
Paul Blue	Phoenix Planning
Steve Prieser	Cutter Aviation
Jim Harris	Coffman Associates
Patrick Taylor	Coffman Associates

- **ITEM 1 - INTRODUCTIONS**

Karen Apple welcomed the committee and stated the purpose of the meeting.

- **ITEM 2 – ROLE OF THE COMMITTEE**

Jim Harris of Coffman Associates reviewed the role of the Planning Advisory Committee (PAC) as a non-voting advisory body. All attendees introduced themselves and airport affiliation.

- **ITEM 3 – PAC MEETING “GROUND RULES”**

Coffman Associates would formally present the Recommended Master Plan Concept. All questions, other than points of clarification, would be held until the end of the presentation. At that time each PAC member and those members of the public in attendance would have an opportunity to comment. Any non-master plan related questions would be documented and forwarded to the Aviation Department for follow up.

- **ITEM 4 – REVIEW OF THE MASTER PLANNING PROCESS**

Jim Harris of Coffman Associates provided a brief overview of the Master Planning process. He reviewed the aviation demand forecasts for the airport. Mr. Harris also presented additional information that Coffman Associates obtained regarding the status of the hills to the east of the airport. Several members of the PAC had questioned the conclusion from the previous PAC meeting that a third runway was not feasible. This additional information supported the original conclusion that a third runway is not feasible for the following primary reasons:

1. Hill H-9 (identified on Exhibit D1) is located within the Sonoran Preserve and is an obstruction to the approach slope to a potential third runway. Since the Sonoran Preserve is a voter approved protection area, removal of this hill may require further voter approval.
2. The proposed alignment for the continuation of Pinnacle Peak Road, immediately north of the airport, would traverse the location of a third runway.
3. Commercial development has reduced the potential space available for a third runway and the pressure is high for further development of the private property that would be needed for a third runway.
4. The cost would be at least \$98 million for land acquisition and construction.
5. A third runway may have the effect of increasing noise as the traffic pattern for the airport would likely be increased.

• **ITEM 5 – PRESENTATION OF RECOMMENDED MASTER PLAN CONCEPT**

Patrick Taylor of Coffman Associates presented the recommended master plan concept. On the airside (runway and taxiway system) the following recommendations were made:

- Remove the hill in the Object Free Area (OFA) and Runway Safety Area (RSA) east of Runway 7R-25L.
- Remove 8 feet of runway on the west end of Runway 7R-25L in order to provide the full RSA.
- Overall RSA improvements including grading and culvert redesign to provide an RSA free of ruts or humps.
- Improve airfield signage.
- Relocate landing thresholds on Runway 7R-25L to the pavement ends.
- Relocate Taxiway C from 300 to 310 feet.
- Construct large run-up areas for airfield capacity improvement.
- Upgrade parallel Runway 7L-25R to C-II design standards.
- Extend parallel Runway 7L-25R 1,580 feet east for a total length of 6,080 feet.
- Widen parallel Runway 7L-25R to 100 feet
- Relocate Taxiways A and B from 200 to 300 feet from Runway 7L-25R centerline.
- Approach lighting system for future CAT I approach to Runway 25L
- Reconstruct Runway 7R-25L as needed in the future.
- Acquire through fee-simple purchase a minimum of 63 acres to the east of the airport where the future runway protection zones (RPZ) are located.
- Acquire via avigation easements approximately 26 acres to the west of the airport for RPZ protection.
- The ultimate RPZ for Runway 7L would go over an existing industrial use building. The ultimate RPZ for Runway 25R would cross 7th Street. The FAA Western Region, in the past, has not been supportive of anything in the RPZs (including roads and industrial buildings)

On the landside (facilities, access, parking, apron, etc...) the following recommendations were made:

- Phase-out south side T/shade hangars and redevelop as corporate aviation parcels/public safety parcels.
- Expand airport service hangars, apron, and auto parking to the east and west of the existing terminal building.
- Reconstruct the main south side ramp and taxilanes.
- Plan space for approximately 377 new T-hangars and 300 new shade hangars to the north.
- Plan space for approximately 190 new box/executive hangars to the north.
- Plan a north side area for airport businesses (FBOs) with space for upto 12 larger conventional hangars.
- Provide self fueling island and aircraft wash rack.

• **ITEM 6 – PRESENTATION OF THE CAPITAL PROGRAM**

A 20-year capital needs program (CNP) was presented in short (0-5 years), intermediate (6-10 years), and long (11-20 years) term planning horizons. Short term priority development items are estimated to require a total investment of approximately \$93 million. Of this total \$88.2 million is eligible for FAA funding. The remaining balance is divided between the City of Phoenix – Aviation Department and the Arizona Department of Aeronautics (ADOT).

The intermediate term CNP would require an investment of approximately \$31.6 million. Of this total approximately \$29 million is eligible for FAA funding. The long term projects are estimated to cost approximately \$10.6 million with \$10.1 million eligible for FAA funding.

A Five year capital improvement program (CIP) was developed to identify priority projects that could be undertaken if certain financial constraints were assumed. The CIP assumed that \$1.5 million per year would be available from the FAA and \$1.5 million would be available from ADOT.

Analysis of the operating revenue and expenses for the previous four years at the airport was presented. From an operating standing point the airport has averaged a net positive balance of \$1 million per year. For each of the previous four years, the airport has average more than \$2.2 million in capital improvement outlays. Since 2004, DVT has a combined net negative balance of \$4.8 million.

• **ITEM 7 – PRESENTATION OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION**

This appendix is intended to bring to the attention of the City of Phoenix any potential “red flags” that the recommended development plan could raise from an environmental

perspective. There are no environmental issues that would prevent the development of the recommended concept but further environmental documentation would be necessary for specific projects.

Noise contours, which are a representation of the extent of hazardous noise levels generated by aircraft traffic at the airport, were generated for the existing condition and the long term condition based on the forecasts. Currently the 65 DNL extends beyond airport property by approximately 1000 feet on each end of Runway 7R-25L. By the long term, the 65 DNL extends approximately 2,000 feet off each runway end. Much of the exposed areas are recommended for acquisition by the airport. All other exposed areas are zoned for industrial/commercial development and the new airport overlay district restricts incompatible land uses, such as homes, from the vicinity of the airport

- **ITEM 8 – PRESENTATION OF THE AIRPORT PLANS**

This appendix includes the technical drawings associated with the recommended plan. These drawings are submitted to the FAA once the plan is adopted by the City of Phoenix. The FAA will verify the technical accuracy of the plans and will utilize the plans to support funding decision for the airport. Any project considered for funding by the FAA must be included on the airport layout plans.

- **ITEM 9 – DISCUSSION AND COMMENTS**

After the presentation each person in attendance was invited to present comments. The following is a summary of those comments and questions (as well as answers where appropriate):

Carl Newman – Phoenix Aviation Department: Carl thanked all the PAC members. He said that the time spent on the plan development was valuable in order to be assured that an appropriate plan is recommended. Carl indicated that no decision as to who (public v. private) will develop future hangars has not been made.

Alan Kennedy – Phoenix Aviation Advisory Board: Alan described the role of the PAAB, shared his cell number (602-793-9488), and made himself available to anyone needing to discuss aviation issues. He thanked all those participating in the process and said that the group planning process is very positive.

Q – Alan Kennedy: Who owns the Land that you want to do the expansion on? Is that something that we would want to own?

A – Patrick Taylor: The land to the east is owned by the Arizona State Land Department. It is recommended by the FAA that the airport own it. If fee-simple ownership is not feasible then aviation easements should be pursued.

Q- Alan Kennedy: Do they anticipate supporting F-35 training at Luke Air Force Base and how would it affect the airspace.

A - Bill Gillies – Luke Airforce Base: The government determines when and where that will happen but about 20-25% of our inventory may end up consisting of them.

Q - Alan Kennedy: What types of planes are excluded from the Deer Valley taxiways?

A – Patrick Taylor: All general aviation aircraft from the single engine piston aircraft up to the largest business jet can utilize Deer Valley. The tower will direct any larger aircraft to appropriate areas of the airfield. For example when a Gulfstream V lands it would be limited in where it could taxi.

Denise Yanez – Phoenix Community Economic Development: The north and northeast valley is growing substantially. There will likely be many potential new airport users as this development continues.

Harold Sharp – FAA DVT Tower Chief: Pleased that the City of Phoenix has adopted the new Airport Overlay District into their zoning. Wants “hammer heads” (aircraft run-up areas) as soon as possible to alleviate congestion on the runways and taxiways.

Gary Mascaro – DVT Airport Manager: Informed the PAC of the formation of the new Deer Valley Chamber of Commerce. Said that updated information on the pavement strengths at the airport would be forth-coming and should be included in the ALP. Gary said the RFP for the new self-serve fuel island is out. Gary said that FAA reimbursement for previous land acquisition should be in capital program. Jim Harris indicated that the capital program does reflect those reimbursement funds.

Q – Gary Mascaro: What are the triggers to landside development?

A – Jim Harris: Primarily based aircraft growth (waiting lists) and operations.

Art Rosen – AOPA: Art began by complimenting the job Gary Mascaro has done since becoming the airport manager. Art then had the following comments:

- It is impossible to separate piston and jet operations.
- Are the T-hangars and shade hangars paid for? (If so then all revenue generated from them is profit.)
- Disagrees that the south side hangars are a maintenance issue.
- Says that not enough hangars are available in the total provided. (Note: the plan calls for a total of 1,521 hangar positions and 1,554 are provided.)
- Opposes privatization of hangars.
- Art said that the jet guys don’t like to come to DVT due to the heavy mix of smaller aircraft.
- Wants to see an ILS approach not just a GPS approach because many owners of smaller aircraft are unable to afford the avionics to use GPS.
- Wants run-up areas immediately.
- Art thinks the current requirement that FBOs have a flight school should be eliminated.
- Art thought that the non-standard RSA at DVT was grandfathered in by the FAA. (Note: This is not true. RSA at all airports must be provided and modifications of standard for RSA are not granted by the FAA.)
- Art said the self-serve fuel island is not on-line yet. (Note: Will be on-line in 2007)

Q – Art Rosen: How would instrument approaches to DVT affect Luke Air Force Base operations?

A – Bill Gillies: This is an airspace issue and would have to be coordinated by tower staff. The impact is unknown but aircraft in the vicinity should contact RAPCON.

Ray Dovalina – Phoenix Street Transportation Department: The Pinnacle Peak alignment depicted in the master plan is accurate to the best of his knowledge. Ray also indicated that purchase of aviation easements for the RPZ could be nearly as expensive as fee-simple purchase.

Ellen Poole – USAA: Express appreciation for being invited on the PAC and had no further comments.

Dave Tunheim – Honeywell: Concerned that the upgrade to the parallel runway won't help jet traffic due to the hills to the east. (Note: Obstruction evaluation indicates that the runway will be able to accommodate business jets and all general aviation. Concerns of helicopter operators should be addressed in the plan. Dave thought the location of a maintenance blast fence should be identified.

Tim Gift – Phoenix Fire Department: No comments.

Bill Gillies – Luke Air Force Base: Bill thanked the City of Phoenix for inviting him onto the PAC. Bill voiced concern about the crowded airspace in the area. He thought that an ILS approach to the airport could further contribute to the crowded airspace. There should be more formal designation of training airspace in the area.

Ed Chauza – DVT Pilots Association: Supportive of the airside concept generally but may be concerned about the timeframe. Concerned about potential privatization of hangar development. New north side tie-down positions should be shown if they are made available. Ed had some questions about the capital outlay as reflected in Tables 6B and 6C. (Karen Apple indicated she could provide further info on what the capital outlays were.)

Q- Ed Chauza: Will the South Side Hangars still be available after the expansion?

A –Patrick Taylor: Yes

Dean Brennan – Phoenix Planning Department: Dean thanked the City of Phoenix – Aviation Department for including the planning department. Dean thanked the consultants.

Becky Gawin – Phoenix Aviation Department: Said the airport is focused on addressing the FAA Runway Safety Action Team recommendations and capital improvements.

Jane Morris – Phoenix Aviation Department: Thanked all PAC participants. She reminds the group to also include the neighborhood in their decision and to keep them informed so that there are no major surprises to the community.

Steve Prieser – Cutter Aviation: Jet fuel sales are up 70 percent over last year. Safety on the ramps would be enhanced by separating of larger aircraft from smaller aircraft to the greatest extent possible. Cutter would like to expand its operations and construct new hangars in the immediate term. Scottsdale is saturated from the pilot perspective and pilots indicate that they consider DVT to be “an oasis”. He stated that opposed to what others might say, jets do enjoy coming to DVT and that the amount of money that they spend on jet fuel brings in a substantial amount of income for the airport. He stated that pilots enjoy the airport because it is less congested and conveniently located near the freeways. He agrees with expanding the runways in order to further accommodate these jets. Cutter has also been approached by aircraft owners for hangar space, which they are currently unable to provide.

- **Item 10 – Adjournment**

Jim Harris again thanked the PAC for their thoughtful and active participation.