



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

May 1, 2006  
1:30 pm am – 5:00 pm  
Country Inn & Suites

<b>PAC Member Attendees:</b>	
<i>Member Name</i>	<i>Affiliation</i>
Carl Newman	PHX Aviation Department
Gary Mascaro	PHX Aviation Department
Dean Brennan	PHX Planning Department
Margie Drilling	FAA – Airports Division
Harold Sharp	FAA – DVT Tower
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
Harry Wolfe	Maricopa Association of Governments
Ellen Poole	USAA
Ray Dovalina	PHX Street Transportation Department
<b>Absent PAC Members:</b>	
Michael Dixon	PHX Aviation Advisory Board
Charles Hood	PHX Fire Department
Dave Tunheim	Honeywell
Dan Burkhart	NBAA
Paula Penner	Deer Valley Village Planning Committee
Allen Murphy	Deer Valley Village Planning Committee
<b>Additional Attendees:</b>	
Karen Apple	PHX Aviation Department
Jane Morris	PHX Aviation Department
Becky Gawin	PHX Aviation Department
Julie Ellegood	PSM <sup>2</sup>
Alicia Robertson	PSM <sup>2</sup>
Kip Linse	USAA
Ray Boucher	ADOT Aeronautics
Denise Yanez	PHX Community Economic Development Department
John Padilla	Luke AFB
Mike Hanson	Luke AFB

Jim Harris	Coffman Associates
Steve Benson	Coffman Associates
Patrick Taylor	Coffman Associates

- **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 the City of Phoenix General Plan.
  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

- Third parallel Runway
- High Speed Exit Taxiways
- Hold/Bypass aprons
- Extension of 7L-25R

Meet safety area design standards

Improved Instrument Approaches

**LANDSIDE PLANNING ISSUES**

Separation of activity levels

Aircraft storage development to meet forecast demand

FBO areas

Access improvements, Parking

Property acquisition

Terminal Buildings needs

Helicopter operations

Meet Runway Safety Area requirements

- Hill in Runway 25L RSA should be removed

- On Runway 7R either shorten runway 8 feet or move service road 8 feet west.

### **Third Parallel Runway Possibilities**

- Largest practical runway to “fit” to the north is 4,500 x 75 feet.
- Significant penetrations to 20:1 approach surface to east end of third runway. Potential social impacts as houses are on other side of some hills. High cost to lower hills led to elimination of this possibility from further consideration. As a result alternatives presented show a two runway system

### **Runway/Taxiway Separation**

- Need 400 feet from Taxiway C to Primary Runway, only 300 currently available. Analysis of design for 100-foot wingspans (G-V) necessitates a shift of only 10 feet to 310 feet.

### **Capacity Constraints**

- Computer model of capacity indicated indicates that the FAA prescribed limit for delay (4 minutes on a 24 hour average) will be reached during the scope of this plan
- The balance between based aircraft and capacity is approximately 80 percent of previous maximum capacity or approximately 527,000 operations.
- Approximately 80 percent of forecast demand can be accommodated, thus landside facility development reflect a reduction in the number of based aircraft to be stored through facility development presented.

### **Airport Development Alternatives**

- Alternative 1 Theme: The development theme of Airport Development Alternative 1 is to locate corporate aviation to the south of the runway system and smaller general aviation aircraft to the north of the runway system. Improvements are then made to the primary runway to serve those larger and more sophisticated aircraft. The existing parallel runway is maintained to accommodate smaller aircraft operations as well as training operations.
- Alternative 2 Theme: The theme of Airport Development Alternative 2 is to provide maximum airfield capacity expansion while limiting any new facility construction to currently undeveloped areas. An extension of the parallel runway and expansion of its capabilities is considered since corporate aviation operators would then be located on the north side of the airfield.
- Alternative 3 Theme: This alternative provides for a moderate upgrade of the parallel runway and a mixed landside development pattern. The runway is upgraded to accommodate a portion of the smaller business jets, as a back up to the primary. The landside development reflects the need for additional airport service facilities on the south side. The north side is a mix of facility needs, including areas for airport services, T-hangars, executive hangars, and corporate aviation parcels.

### **Landside Development Alternatives:**

- All landside alternatives meet revised need for storage facilities. The development of executive hangars is introduced to accommodate some of the individual aircraft storage needed that would otherwise be accommodated by T-hangars.
- Corporate Aviation Parcels satisfy a portion of the need for multi-aircraft storage.

### **ALTERNATIVES DISCUSSION COMMENTS**

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

Carl Newman – PHX Aviation Department

- Need to clarify in the presentation the runway safety areas of 600 feet versus 1,000 feet. The safety area will be 1,000 feet regardless off each end of the runway.
- The fact that the smaller hills can be mined takes care of the CAT I ILS issue, but does not take care of the larger hills impact on a third parallel runway.
- Fuel efficiency is needed in general terms.

Gary Mascaro – PHX Aviation Department

- Define more clearly what is considered in revenue enhancements.
- Increasing the length of the shorter runway allows to airport to stay open to more operators in the event of a closure of the longer runway.

Dean Brennan – City of Phoenix Planning Department

- The land east of 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue is State Trust Land.
- The hills immediately to the east are intended to be mined, but the time frame is unknown.

Harry Wolfe – Maricopa Association of Governments

- MAG has identified the third runway alternative in its regional airport system plan (RASP).
- This was based upon long range forecast demand, and Deer Valley was in the growth pattern, but did not include any detailed evaluation of the feasibility.
- Based upon the alternatives analysis presented here, maximizing the capability of the two runways we have is a good way to proceed.

Ray Boucher – ADOT Aeronautics

- Widen the parallel runway to 100 feet to meet Category C standards. Facility Requirements exhibit was apparently misprinted with 75 width.
- Likes separation of B and C type aircraft. Trying to locate corporate aircraft on side of airport minimizes the need for C-II taxiway clearances.

Art Rosen – AOPA representative

- He defines GA as small aircraft users. The larger aircraft are corporate aviation.
- Disappointed with corporate jet on cover of workbook.
- Thinking in wrong direction if planning for four percent of airport operations.
- General aviation left Sky Harbor.
- Flight schools – cut operations in half.
- Location is the reason Deer Valley Airport is doing so well. There is no other place for general aviation.
- General aviation aircraft shipments are up 37 percent.
- Only way to keep the airport viable is with the third runway alternative.
- The hills need to be removed for safety, and with the mineral content in the hills, they should cost the airport zero dollars to remove.
- Cave Creek Road is the only safe place for a pilot to land east of the airport now.
- Extension of the current north parallel runway is imperative for safety for small airplanes due to density altitude and heat. North runway was used just for training before the north hangars were put in, now it is used for more than that.
- Noise is becoming an issue. Need a noise study.
- Has not seen major corporate jet traffic at this airport. The only time the airport gets an influx of jet traffic is during the golf tournament, the Barrett-Jackson car show, and when the President is in town.
- Aesthetics – Need to get the south ramp “rent-a-wreck” planes off the field.
- Concern that moving small airplanes to north side will prevent public from using the restaurant in the terminal building.
- Do parcels for corporate jets pay back as well as small hangars. Get significantly fewer corporate jets in the same area.
- Cost of moving half the airport from the south side to the north side is not cost effective for a few corporate jets.
- America West no longer is using the VOT at Sky Harbor. That equipment should be moved to Deer Valley Airport.
- Report barely touches on taxiway exits. We need more exits on the north runway as well as high speed exits on the south runway.
- No run-up area on for Runway 7L. It needs a bullpen for aircraft to hold waiting their clearance.
- Don’t want to see privatization of future hangars, other than corporate hangars. Should develop a new rate structure for new hangars separate from the current hangars.
- Need an ILS approach to the south runway. Need a ground-based approach.
- Need training space for flight schools.

Ray Dovalina – City of Phoenix Street Transportation Department

- What kind of existing or future street access will get modified?
- What will airport trip generation numbers look like?

- What is the drainage perspective with regards to on-site to off-site drainage?

#### Harold Sharp – DVT Tower

- Need more concrete.
- Got to get aircraft to and from the runways. Limited access and run-up areas reduces capacity, currently for the south side.
- Need large run-up areas and bypass taxiways at all ends or all runways.

#### Margie Drilling – FAA-Airports Division

- Rising fuel costs is going to have an impact on general aviation industry. Fuel costs are going to play a big part in corporate aircraft growth.
- The runway safety area team (RSAT) recommendations should be noted in the Master Plan. Also note the features that have been incorporated into the Master Plan concept.
- Change of role for Runway 7L-25R to ARC C-II and longer runway will need more justification than just as a back-up runway.
- FAA likes the idea of separating categories of aircraft (corporate to the south and small GA to the north).
- FAA pockets are not deep, need realistic development.
- Declared distances are low on list, and least supported by FAA. May support other safety area alternatives, even if they are more expensive.
- In summary of Alternative 3, under ability to meet program requirements, it should be noted that FAA does not support declared distances.

#### Bill Gillies – Luke AFB

- If you reduce the number of proposed corporate hangars and replaced with more small GA hangars, what would be the difference in activity?
- Concerned about where to put all the aircraft in the airspace. Where are they going to blend everyone. Corporate traffic would be held out longer. Operational issues of increased aircraft and the mixing of corporate and small GA affects all.
- If you put in a CAT I approach, please include Luke AFB in its planning and design.
- North Valley radar would improve efficiency.

#### Ed Chauza – DVT Pilots Association

- Headwalls of drainage structures are a safety hazard. Need to be removed from areas around runways.
- Differentiate shades from T-hangars on charts. Can see the differences in the tables, but not visually on the charts.
- Fuel farms are a function of the FBO now. Need self fueling in the plan.
- Still concerned with vehicle parking. It is in the wrong areas.
- Delay and wait times are much greater than four minutes. Grid lock is not uncommon. Need to focus on this more.

- There is a problem with the interface of Deer Valley and Luke Air Force Base.
  - Military airspace needs to be emphasized, as well as training space for flight schools.
  - At Deer Valley we also have warbirds that need to be factored in as a separate class of aircraft.
  - The very light jets will be another class to factor in.
  - ASOS need to be automated.
- 
- **Item 3 – Adjournment**

Next PAC meeting is tentatively scheduled for August 2006. Meeting location is to be determined.