



**UNIVERSITY PARK AIRPORT
SUSTAINABLE MASTER PLAN
ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING SUMMARY**

April 2, 2014 - 11:00 AM

Project: University Park Airport Sustainable Master Plan

Location: General Aviation Terminal Building, University Park Airport, State College, Pennsylvania

The attached report represents this writer's interpretation of items discussed during the meeting. Any corrections or additional information should be brought to our attention for clarifications.

Attendees:

Helen Alters, Joseph Beigle, Sam Bertolino, Adam Brumbaugh, Doug Erickson, Ron Filippelli, Robert Finley, Rick Harner, Gail Hurley, Bob Jacobs, Trish Meek, Jim Meyer, Katie Ombalski, Lori Pagnanelli, Ralph Stewart, Gordon Turow, Bryan Rodgers, Emmanuelle Humblet, Autumn Ward, Mark Breukink, Zachary Puchacz

Items:

- Bryan Rodgers welcomed all in attendance to the meeting.
- Mark Breukink reviewed the meeting agenda and provided an update on the current status of the project.
- Autumn Ward provided an overview of the sustainability planning process and discussed the sustainability goals that have been established for the Airport. Sustainability strategies to identify, screen, and recommend initiatives for the Airport were also discussed. Autumn concluded with a review of the next sustainability planning steps which includes the development of a measurement performance system as well as the development of an implementation and monitoring plan.
- Mark explained that the original projections of aviation demand prepared for the sustainable master plan were developed prior to the announcement of service to Chicago O'Hare by United Airlines. To account for the increase in passenger traffic from this new service, the enplanement projections for the Airport were revised. Mark presented the revised enplanement projections to the committee, noting that they had been approved by the FAA.
- Mark reviewed the infrastructure demands at the Airport and presented alternatives to address needed improvements. The following provides a summary of each facility need, the alternatives that were developed to improve each infrastructure item, and any comments that were received from the committee:
 - **Wind Coverage** – Mark discussed that the orientation of Runway 6/24 provides 94.38 percent wind coverage in a 10.5 knot crosswind, which is slightly less than the FAA's

recommended 95 percent coverage. While a closed crosswind runway is available to improve wind coverage, a number of environmental and financial challenges as well as challenges to meet FAA design standards such as compliant runway safety areas (RSAs) would need to be overcome to open the runway or to construct a new crosswind runway.

- **Runway Length** – Mark explained that the length of Runway 6/24 appears adequate to meet the runway takeoff and landing distance requirements of commercial airline aircraft types anticipated to operate at the Airport during the planning period if serving existing markets. Mark noted, however, that additional runway length should be considered if non-stop flights to destinations in Florida or west of the Mississippi are initiated. Mark presented the following alternatives to the committee that offer options to increase the length of Runway 6/24:
 - An 800 foot extension at approach end of Runway 6
 - An 800 foot extension at approach end of Runway 24
 - 800 feet extensions at both ends of Runway 6/24 for a combined 1,600 foot increase in runway length

It was suggested by the committee that two additional alternatives, each illustrating a single 1,600 foot runway extension at either end of the runway, be considered. The committee also inquired about potential aircraft noise impacts as a result of a runway extension. Mark explained that any potential noise impacts are anticipated to be minimal since the alignment of the runway would not change and that any significant changes in aircraft noise impacts would remain on Airport property.

- **Taxiway System** – Mark presented a taxiway system alternative that illustrated the following improvements that are needed at the Airport:
 - An increase in the width of Taxiway A from 50 feet to 75 feet to accommodate the landing gear widths of Taxiway Design Group (TDG) 5 aircraft, which are expected to increase operations at the Airport during the planning period.
 - Removal of connector taxiways that provide direct access between aprons and Runway 6/24 to reduce the potential for unintentional runway incursions.
 - Removing closed pavements to reduce pilot confusion when taxiing.
- **Commercial Airline Terminal Apron** – Alternatives illustrating changes that would be necessary to the commercial airline terminal apron so that it can accommodate six parking positions of larger commercial aircraft types that are anticipated to operate at the Airport during the planning period were presented to the committee. Mark explained that additional commercial airline terminal apron space would be necessary if six aircraft power out parking positions are desired; no additional apron space would be necessary if four

power-out parking positions are converted to push-back style aircraft parking.

- **Commercial Airline Terminal Building** – Mark explained that the capacity of the commercial airline terminal building appears adequate to meet projected peak hour demand during the planning period. However, Mark stated that the introduction of new airline service during peak periods of demand, such as by a narrow-body aircraft, may necessitate the need for an expanded passenger holding area. Mark presented an alternative to increase the size of the passenger holding area by expanding into the space currently occupied by the viewing lounge. Mark noted that the need for a new commercial airline terminal building in the future will be dependent upon increases in peak hour demand.
- **Commercial Airline Terminal Parking** – Mark explained that additional public, rental car, and employee vehicle parking will be needed at the commercial airline terminal during the planning period. Mark presented two (2) parking alternatives to the committee that propose to expand parking on existing Airport property adjacent to the public lot also utilized for rental car ready/return parking and across Fox Hill Road on land purchased by the Centre County Airport Authority.
- **Landside Access** – Mark presented a landside access alternative to the committee that illustrated options to provide more direct access to the Airport from Interstate 99 (I-99). A relocation of Fox Hill Road to create more aeronautical development area at the Airport was also presented to the committee. It was mentioned from the committee that the proposed routes of the roadways presented in the alternative were in proximity to heritage sites, source water protection areas, game lands, and a fish hatchery. Mark mentioned that the potential impacts to these areas would be evaluated in further detail as part of an environmental review that would be required prior to the design and construction of any landside access roadway project. The committee mentioned that direct access from I-99 to the Airport was not a high priority on the list of potential projects from the Centre County Metropolitan Planning Organization and that several environmental challenges would need to be overcome to implement this alternative.
- **General Aviation Development** – Mark explained that it is projected additional apron space and hangars will be needed at the Airport to meet general aviation demand that is projected for the planning period. Mark presented five (5) alternatives that illustrated varying configurations of apron expansions and hangar development at the Airport and noted that an area adjacent to the Air National Guard facility would be ideal for an aircraft manufacturing facility or aircraft repair center. The committee asked if the location of the building restriction line (BRL) or boundaries of Federal Aviation Regulation (FAR) Part 77 surfaces would impact the areas proposed for future aeronautical related development. Mark explained that while there is a potential for structures to exceed allowable heights

due to the changes in topography in these areas, it is not anticipated that this will preclude development if properly coordinated with the FAA.

- **Air Cargo Facilities** – Mark explained that a more centralized location for air cargo processing is needed at the Airport and presented an air cargo apron expansion alternative. A proposed air cargo expansion alternative was presented to the committee that would be capable of parking four (4) Cessna 208 Caravan aircraft which are currently utilized to transport FedEx air cargo at the Airport. It was suggested by the committee that aircraft larger than the Cessna 208 Caravan could potentially provide air cargo services at the Airport in the future.
- **ARFF / SRE Alternatives** – Mark explained that the existing Aircraft Rescue and Fire Fighting (ARFF) building and Snow Removal Equipment (SRE) building are undersized to meet equipment storage demands. The following three sites were presented to the committee that should be considered for the construction a new consolidated ARFF / SRE facility:
 - The site of the existing SRE building
 - At the corner of the commercial airline apron near the site of the existing ARFF building
 - At a site adjacent to the existing fuel farm facility north of Taxiway A
- Mark discussed the next steps of the project which include:
 - Identification and development of the sustainability initiatives
 - Evaluation and revision of the development alternatives based on comments received from the committee and the general public
 - Preparation of the recommended development plan
 - Preparation of the financial analysis and capital improvement plan (CIP)
 - Preparation of the airport layout plan (ALP)
 - Public officials meeting and public involvement meeting
- Mark thanked all for attendance and mentioned an electronic version of the committee presentation would be made available on the Airport's website at www.universityparkairport.com.

Respectfully submitted,
MEAD & HUNT, Inc.

Zachary Puchacz
Planner, Aviation Services