

## MEETING NOTES:

---

**Project Number:** RS&H 210-000-5000

**Meeting Date:** June 22, 2017

**Meeting Place:** International Room, Gerald R. Ford International Airport (GFIA)

**Participants:** Master Plan Update Advisory Committee (MPAC)

**Subject:** Third Meeting

---

### The following is a summary of the Third Master Plan Update Advisory Committee Meeting:

- Jim Gill, AAE, IAP, CPA, President & CEO of the Gerald R. Ford International Airport Authority (GFIAA), welcomed all in attendance and introduced Roy Hawkins, Airport Planning Engineer. Mr. Hawkins and master plan consultants – Jeffrey Mishler, Delia Chi, and Gareth Hanley, of RS&H, Inc. – conducted the meeting.
- The Authority thanked everyone for attending and stressed the importance of their participation in the Master Plan Update process. The majority of members were in attendance including representatives from local planning agencies - Cascade Township, Gaines Township, City of Kentwood, and City of Grand Rapids. Meeting attendees were encouraged to add comments and ask questions during the presentation.
- This MPAC meeting was the third of six meetings that are scheduled to occur over the master plan update period of 18 months. The fourth meeting is scheduled for Thursday, September 28, 2017, to discuss alternatives for future airport development.
- A PowerPoint presentation consisting of the following six agenda items was discussed with the MPAC: Introductions, Master Plan Process Review, Report on Facilities Requirements, Report on Project Survey Efforts/AGIS/Exhibit A, Schedule Review, and Master Plan Update Next Steps.
- The presentation generated several questions pertaining to the facility requirements that are summarized below:
  - A question was asked about occurrences of runway incursions at GFIA. There is not an excessive number of runway incursions at GFIA; it is Airport policy to do all it can to eliminate or mitigate the risks for incursions, where possible. Reconfiguration of key taxiway pavement areas would reduce the likelihood of runway incursions, affecting how aircraft operators use the airfield. Elimination of some airfield pavement would also enhance airfield safety and would make maintenance activities more efficient. The airfield would be strategically reconfigured as pavement becomes due for reconstruction/rehabilitation, if necessary.

- A question was asked about the standards issue associated with the holding aprons. The analysis indicates that existing taxiway holding aprons may be insufficiently sized. Additionally, the holding aprons do not conform to recently updated FAA design standards.
- A question was asked about whether terminal space requirements were mandated by the FAA. Unlike with airfield requirements, space requirements for terminal areas are somewhat discretionary and up to local decision making to meet a desired level of service (e.g. delays, congestion). This can vary from airport to airport. Both industry and GRR usage preferences were considered in the requirements for GFIA.
- A comment was made that facility requirements are somewhat one-dimensional in its assessment of space deficiencies. While technical in nature, requirements are determined generally based upon existing facility equipment usage (e.g. how airlines off-load bags onto common use baggage devices). The next phase will focus on finding solutions to resolve space deficiencies and other considerations such as cost, environmental impacts, or construction feasibility.
- A question was asked about the space allocation considerations for the area in front of the baggage claim devices. The baggage claim frontage requirements only consider passengers standing directly in front of the device to retrieve baggage as a target desired level of service. The number of passengers per device changes based on the design day gated flight schedule throughout the planning horizon.
- Actual future demand and policy decisions will drive Federal Inspection Services (FIS) expansion. Implementation options, such as a potential to section off secure baggage claim areas for international passengers, will be explored in alternatives.
- A question was asked about private vehicles using the outer curb. Private vehicle drop off and pick up on the outer curb occurs though occurrences are infrequent. Private vehicle use of the outer curb most often occurs during peak periods when the inner curb becomes congested.
- A question was asked about the efficiency of the City of Grand Rapids having an island which includes the Terminal Building. This is a topic for discussion in the Alternatives phase of the project.
- A comment was raised about Transportation Network Companies (TNC) (e.g., Uber, Lyft) at GFIA. TNCs are not currently under agreement with the Authority; therefore, they are not legally allowed to pick up from GFIA – currently only drop-offs are allowed. The Authority is working to establish an agreement with TNC operators, which will presumably result in increased demand and use of TNCs.
- A question was asked about the current Level of Service (LOS) for the terminal curbside. The existing terminal curbside operates at LOS C. The International Airline Transport Association (IATA) and Airports Council International (ACI) define Airport Level of Service (LoS). Airport Level of Service (LoS) provides “an aggregated guidance framework for the

planning of new terminal facilities as well as for monitoring the operational service performance of existing facilities. Rated "A" (overbuilt) to "F" (fail), LoS "C" represents the boundary between optimum space utilization and waiting time and sub-optimum conditions.

- A question was asked about landside areas that are of particular concern for safety issues with pedestrians and cars. There are not any notable pedestrian safety issues. However, pedestrian safety and overall landside safety can be enhanced, especially as it relates to pedestrian access to Patterson Avenue-Oostema Boulevard/44<sup>th</sup> Street intersection and to the West Michigan Aviation Academy and access to the economy parking lot. All these come to a nexus at the Terminal Building.
- A question was asked about the existing parking capacity identified in the parking analysis. The analysis does not include the East Lot or Auxiliary Lot in the calculation of existing parking supply. However, these areas may be used to accommodate future parking demand, as necessary.
- A question was asked about the analysis assumptions regarding parking pricing modifications. The parking requirements analysis assumed that the existing parking pricing is held constant throughout the planning period. However, adjusting parking pricing can be a mechanism to influence demand for parking in the future.
- A comment was raised that the valet parking service is a modest revenue generator for the Authority. The valet operation occupies a prime location today and the alternatives will consider different relocation options in alternatives phase.
- A question was asked about the master plan's focus on transit. The master plan considers the transit operation at GFIA from a high level. The primary goal is to provide sufficient dedicated space to accommodate bus parking at the terminal.
- A question was asked about GFIA's regional competition for general aviation (GA) activity. The forecast of aviation activity for GFIA considers the competition for GA activity in the region. Regional GA competition plays more into individual, recreational aircraft owners as opposed to corporate GA. Typically, recreational GA users are more sensitive to rates for fuel and facilities than corporate GA. GFIA has less regional competition for corporate GA because the location and facilities are better suited for high profile clients. That said, Muskegon County Airport and West Michigan Regional Airport present the most competition to GFIA of the airports in the region.
- A question was asked about the backup power capabilities for GFIA critical functions. Two substations serve GFIA – one acts as the primary power source and the other is a secondary power source. An automatic throw over switch allocates power to GFIA in the event there are issues with the primary substation. The terminal building is also equipped with two emergency backup generators. FAA has an emergency generator for the Airport Surveillance Radar site and another for the Airport Traffic Control Tower. Another backup generator supplies power to the airfield lighting system in the event of an outage.



11011 Richmond Ave  
Suite 900  
Houston, TX 77042

☎ 713-914-4455  
✉ 713-914-0155  
[rsandh.com](http://rsandh.com)

- Facility Requirements provide the planning parameters that will be used to develop Alternatives in the next phase of work.
- Presentations and meeting notes of previous meetings are available on the Master Plan Update website, [gfa-master-plan-update.com](http://gfa-master-plan-update.com), and will be updated as the Master Plan Update process continues.