

CAC – August 3, 2011 Kick-Off Meeting Meeting Notes

Introduction – group

The CAC members, airport management, and consultant team gave introductions. CAC members were invited to also describe their interest(s) in the airport.

Members in attendance were:

Hasan Tahat	Cathy Reed	Marissa Gifford (URS)
Joan Davenport	Lee Rimmel (YAT)	Ross Widener
Buck Taylor	Robert Peterson (YAT)	Jeff Louman (HLA)
Peter Verbrugge	John Yarnish (URS)	
Dick Woodin	Rob Osmanson (URS)	

Consultant’s Presentation – John Yarnish, URS

A description of the master planning process and why the Board was initiating this study was presented. This is summarized as follows:

An Airport Master Plan is the study of an airport that describes the short-, intermediate-, and long-term need for facility development necessary to meet demand, maintain existing service levels, and comply with FAA Design Criteria. Principal issues to be addressed include:

1. **Runway Length:** The current Master Plan recommends a future extension of Runway 09/27 from 7,603 feet to 10,160 feet. The basis for this recommended extension will be reexamined during the master plan update.
2. **Airport Safety Overlay:** The existing ASO will be revisited with the recommendations from this plan. If it is recommended to increase the ASO, this may increase the potential for conflict with local citizens and developers.
3. **Potential Turf Runway:** General aviation activity at YKM includes substantial use by small single-engine aircraft. The owners and operators of these aircraft have expressed a desire for a short, turf runway to allow for operations separate from those of larger aircraft.
4. **Comprehensive Plan Integration:** The AMPU needs to be updated to integrate with the Yakima Comprehensive Plan and with current airport development plans.
5. **Terminal Area Planning:** A detailed terminal area analysis is necessary to assure future passenger levels can be accommodated regardless of the terminal’s location. The AMPU will map out the proper method for making needed short-term improvements to either upgrade existing facilities or to respond to increased demand.
6. **Environmental Compliance:** The environment will be given full consideration in all AMPU recommendations. Project costs, schedules, and approvals are all affected by the need to ensure environmental processes, approvals, permits, and other requirements are fully considered.
7. **Coordination:** Airport users, agencies responsible for decision-making and members of the community must be included in the planning process. A key to successful airport planning is to ensure current information is distributed and understood and opinions are sought and acted upon.

When completed, the scope will result in a current and approved Airport Layout Plan (ALP) drawing set and a Master Plan report. The ALP set will graphically depict existing conditions at the airport as well as proposed capital improvements. The Master Plan report will describe the steps taken to arrive at decisions concerning the improvements depicted on the ALP. Included in this report will be an inventory of existing conditions, a 20-year forecast of aviation activity, determination of short-, intermediate-, and long-term facility requirements, the identification and analysis of alternative airport development plans, a recommended action plan, and the development of an implementation schedule for those recommendations. These will include the graphic displays shown on the Airport Layout Plan drawings, a phased implementation plan, and a detailed Airport Capital Improvement Plan (ACIP).

Committee Discussion – group

John Yarnish thanked the committee for completing and sending questionnaires. Marissa Gifford (URS) described the “dot voting” exercise for the CAC: one question from the surveys was selected for a dot voting exercise (“Three items that need the most improvement”). CAC members were invited to review the summaries of survey results on boards, and were each given three stickers to use on the board for the exercise; they were directed to place the dots next to the items on the list they felt the most strongly about. The results of the dot voting exercise are listed below. All responses that received at least one dot are listed.

Three areas that need the most improvement

1. Need more daily flight/connection options (7 dots).
2. Financial independence/security of the facility (5 dots).
3. Zoning – protecting the airport while allowing proper future development (Part 77) (4 dots).
4. Terminal services and amenities (i.e. restaurant, lounges, shops, espresso, gift shop, travel agents, internet access, kiosks, kids play zone, newsstands) (2 dots).
5. More flights in and out to different locations (2 dots).
6. Airport Safety Overlay (ASO) (2 dots).
7. Long range planning for needed impacts to wetlands and floodplain: mitigation strategy could reduce future costs (2 dots).
8. Limited flight availability (1 dot).
9. Unpredictable travel (1 dot).
10. Property around airport/land acquisition – protecting what we have for growth (1 dot).

CAC members were also encouraged to view the survey results from the TAC and see how the results differed. Major differences in the TAC results included a focus on general aviation, runway improvements, and making the permit process easier for development on/near the airport.

Discussion of Project Mission – group

John Yarnish described the goals of the project and asked a question of each CAC member: The project (master plan update) would be a success if: (blank). CAC members were encouraged to respond. This will form the basis of the CAC’s mission statement for the master plan update. The following ideas were received:

The project (master plan update) would be a success if:

- a projection of future City/County growth is used to guide airport development
- future airport growth goals meet the viable growth of the community

- the airport provides regular and reliable service to the community
- it leads us to an updated version of a 1st-class regional airport that fits in and is compatible with the surrounding community
- it includes safe aviation service
- it includes environmental review and a pro-active plan to mitigate environmental impacts
- airport operation (and potential expansion) is compatible with the surrounding community
- goals are:
 - clear
 - supportable
 - realistic/feasible

Wrap-up and Questions – group

It was suggested to change the name of the group (from Citizens Advisory Committee) to reflect the presence and contributions of the agencies on the committee. Therefore, we suggest changing the group’s name to the “Community and Agency Committee”. The committee will continue to be referred to as the “CAC”.

