

MEETING NOTES:

Project Number: RS&H 210-000-5000

Meeting Date: January 31, 2018

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

Participants: Master Plan Update Advisory Committee (MPAC)

Subject: Fifth Meeting

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

- Jim Gill (President/CEO), and Roy Hawkins, Airport Planning Engineer welcomed all in attendance and began the meeting with introductions. Mr. Hawkins and master plan consultants – Jeffrey Mishler, Gary Logston, Kevin Ashton, Delia Chi, and Gareth Hanley of RS&H, Inc. – conducted the meeting.
- This MPAC meeting was the fifth of six meetings that are scheduled to occur over the Master Plan Update process. This meeting focused on the recommended plan for future airport development and potential phasing. The sixth meeting is tentatively scheduled for the March/April time frame to discuss the completion of the Airport Layout Plan (ALP) and Financial Feasibility Analysis.
- A PowerPoint presentation consisting of the following eight agenda items was discussed with the MPAC: Review of Previous Work, Recommended Terminal Plan Phasing, Comprehensive Airport Simulation Technology (CAST) Terminal Simulation Model, Recommended Landside Plan Phasing, Overview of Master Plan Phasing, Land Development Sites, AGIS/Exhibit 'A', and Next Steps.
- The presentation generated significant discussion and questions pertaining to the recommended plan for future airport development and phasing. A summary of this discussion and questions follows:
 - A question was asked about the Airport's growth rate and the current enplanement level of 1.4 million enplaned passengers (MEP) for Calendar 2017 and the time frame for concourse construction. The consultant explained that the design and construction is based on trigger points. MEP will be used as a trigger point as opposed to designation of a specific year and will demonstrate when growth is needed. The next trigger point for anticipated concourse expansion is 1.6 MEP. It was noted by committee members that at the current growth rate the airport would likely see 1.6 MEP by 2021.
 - A question was asked regarding the impact of a Federal Inspection Station (FIS) to the existing building. The consultant explained that the FIS is planned for construction on the

northeast side of the existing building and is not in conflict with any existing concourse or future terminal /concourse expansion.

- A question was asked concerning the ability to increased concession space in the terminal. The consultant explained that there are sufficient areas to accommodate concession spaces when concourses are lengthened/widened or the terminal is expanded on both the landside and secure side. Future Concourse C provides many options for concession expansion. There is also potential for reuse of the area in vicinity of the existing baggage claim once the baggage claim expansion is fully shifted to the east side of the building.
- A comment was made regarding the future of the Airport receiving international service since FIS could occur at any moment. While the timing for an FIS is unknown, the GFIAA is evaluating the potential for an FIS in the short term. Although the baggage claim table implies FIS development is long term, it was noted that the FIS could occur at any time.
- A question was asked about increasing airfield capacity. The consultant indicated that based on forecasts the current airfield configuration had sufficient capacity for beyond the 20-year Master Plan Update time frame. Also noted was that GFIAA has chosen to retain the Ultimate Runway configuration on the ALP. It was noted that the ultimate Runway 8L/26R has been on the ALP since 1959 and should remain.
- A question was asked about relocating the baggage claim to the east end of the terminal building. The consultant explained that the baggage claim installation is level of service (LOS) driven. In the ultimate configuration, the baggage claim would be on the east end with ticketing and screening on the west end. Additionally, the FIS would share a carousel(s) with the ultimate baggage claim built-out. It was noted that the current Gateway Phase II project included moving baggage screening behind the wall into the former ticket office areas at both ends of the terminal. The terminal would remain this way until expanding the west end of the terminal when additional ticketing and screening will be necessary. Until that time baggage claim expansion would be a phased effort extending the existing baggage claim devices and adding new devices to the east end of the terminal. These efforts would meet the needs of the ultimate terminal configuration.
- A question was asked if the anticipated impacts of autonomous vehicles were considered in reference to the long-term parking alternatives. The consultant indicated that the facility requirements analysis do not consider how and if autonomous vehicles may impact the demand for parking at the Airport but recognize the importance of continuing to monitor the technology. The GFIAA has released a Request For Proposals to evaluate the Transportation Network Companies (TNC, e.g., Lyft and Uber) and parking situation at GFIA and will consider the topic of autonomous vehicles. It was also noted that autonomous vehicle technology may be decades out due to safety concerns, programming, infrastructure and cost.
- A question was made about what enplanement levels triggered demand as the PowerPoint (PPT) slides were indicative of forecast horizon years. The consultant acknowledged that MEP is what triggers demand and that PPT slides would be updated to include both MEP trigger levels and potential planning horizon years.

- A question was asked about whether revenue generation was considered in the terminal and Concourse A additions. It was explained that areas for revenue generation are included in both of the Concourse A and Concourse C additions. It was also noted that the Concourse A addition would include bathrooms, food and beverage, and concession areas.
- A comment was made about reaching 1.6 MEP by 2021 which led to discussion about when the parking structure would be needed. The consultant explained that a parking structure would be needed in 5-10 years. It was noted that design for the structure would need to start within 5 years and that the ATCT must be relocated before construction.
- A comment was made regarding the possibility of a smaller parking structure to address the near term parking issues since the Airport Traffic Control Tower (ATCT) would not be built in time. GFIAA Staff commented that it may not be feasible to relocate the ATCT prior to the need for construction of a 6-level parking garage at the north lot location. It was requested that the consultant team identify alternatives to accommodate parking demand in the near- and mid-term in the event that the ATCT is not relocated in time. The east lot parking location was also reviewed.
- A question was asked concerning the possibility of developing an underground parking structure. GFIAA Staff explained that although there may be sufficient space, it could become a challenge due to issues with utilities. However, the possibility does exist.
- A question was asked about building a parking structure with fewer than six levels in order to maintain the ATCT in place. GFIAA Staff explained that while it is possible, a parking structure with fewer levels would not be economical. It was noted that when constructing a parking structure adding additional levels at a later date is not optimal financially.
- A question was asked about how far west the proposed non-aeronautical development (north of Oostema) would extend. The consultant explained that the development would extend to Patterson Ave.
- A comment was made regarding the net change (gain/loss) of airfield pavement. The consultant team was asked to report on the issue as it would be helpful for the Authority to understand the impacts for maintenance and snow removal purposes.
- A question was asked about why high-speed exit taxiways for Runway 8R were eliminated. The expansive paving in that area is characterized by the FAA as a "hot spot" /expansive pavement area and will need to be redesigned per new FAA guidance. In addition, it is not a heavily utilized taxiway. It was also noted that the north/south runway separation standards for the parallel taxiway would place the high-speed taxiway so far east it was not efficient.
- A question was asked about a change in design for aircraft holding areas near runway ends and if that was the reason for the recommended removal of the holding apron near the north end of Taxiway B. The consultant responded indicating that FAA standards for holding apron design has changed in recent years. A "flow-through" layout is now standard.

The existing apron areas do not meet the new standard and are deemed expansive pavement. Further, the utility of holding aprons is replaced by dual taxiways at each runway end. This offers the same functionality for departing aircraft to bypass other aircraft, while providing air traffic control with the enhanced ability to stage departures from two points.

- A question was asked about the disposition of the wetland areas located on Airport property. Wetland areas need to be mitigated when areas are needed for development since wetlands are wildlife attractants. It is anticipated that existing wetland areas would be replaced and mitigated off-Airport property. It was noted that wetlands mitigation for the wetlands on the airfield would be included mitigation as a project. Specifically the three large wetlands should be investigated.
- A question was asked if a consolidated deicing pad was considered. It was noted that a deicing apron is not necessary. The treatment facility completed in 2015 meets MDEQ water quality requirements and that the new apron project includes automated collection systems. The existing storm system captures all three FBOs, the freight area and the air carrier apron and delivers stormwater to the treatment system. It was noted that corporate tenants efficiently deice inside their hangars and if necessary they have the ability to use vehicles to collect spent fluid at their aprons.
- A question was asked about the school administration's concerns for the safety of the students at the West Michigan Aviation Academy due to the proximity of the airport and the threat of terrorist activity at the airport. Academy representatives indicated that the administration was not overly concerned. The Academy has a good working relationship with the Airport Authority and agreements in-place to share resources in case there is an incident at either facility. The Academy also engages with GFIAA police and fire department officials on a regular basis to promote preparedness.
- A question was asked about the relocation of Ground Service Equipment (GSE). The consultant explained that service providers in Building 401 would be relocated to building 402 and building 401 would be removed for Concourse C. GSE would utilize the area adjacent to building 402 until such time as Concourse C would be extended. At that time a GSE facility would be constructed in the area at the east end of the east parking lot. Also, a seasonal GSE storage area is identified on the 20-year plan located adjacent to the west end of the FEDEX building.
- A question was asked about if the Master Plan has considered removing the City of Grand Rapids island annexation. GFIAA Staff explained that the Authority has a good relationship with the City of Grand Rapids and Cascade Township. However, the Authority is not actively seeking a change and is impartial on the matter. If the City of Grand Rapids and Cascade Township wanted to make a change, the GFIAA would participate but it would be up to those municipal entities to initiate the discussions. The FAA does not have a preference either way since the Authority is identified as the sponsor and ultimate responsibility for GFIA. It was also noted that this is not identified as an issue to be addressed in the master plan update process.

- A question was asked about whether a mechanism existed to utilize airport property as non-aeronautical development. It was indicated that the Authority would be required by FAA to complete and receive a non-aeronautical land release for a parcel before it could issue long-term leases for use of property to outside developers. However, the Authority will not sell any property except for necessary highway and road right-of-ways. Further, retaining control of the land keeps options open to reclaim use of the property if needed in the future.
- A question was asked regarding FAA coordination with other Federal agencies during the review of the Airport Layout Plan. FAA reviews the document internally, amongst the different lines of business within the FAA. However, the FAA does not coordinate with other federal agencies at that time. Projects on the ALP will undergo the review by the applicable agencies (e.g., environmental review with the Environmental Protection Agency) at the time of implementation.
- A question was asked about when and if the Authority Board will review the ALP and Master Plan documents. It was explained that the Master Plan project scope includes briefing meetings with the Board. Two of four scheduled meetings have been held to-date. Additionally, this is the primary mechanism for the Board to provide comment to Authority staff and the Master Plan team. The final Master Plan recommendations will be presented to the Board as an opportunity to provide comment prior to submittal to the FAA for review and approval of the Airport Layout Plan.
- There was additional discussion on the Board approval of the Master Plan, specifically if an "action" must be taken by the board. The FAA is the ultimate arbiter of the ALP approval; however, Authority staff was unsure if some sort of Board approval is required to certify the Master Plan and ALP documents as a result of transition from a county department to an authority. Authority staff will research and provide a response to the question.
- Presentations and meeting notes of previous meetings are available on the Master Plan Update website, gfa-master-plan-update.com, and will be updated as the Master Plan Update process continues.