

Airport Master Plan - Planning Advisory Committee (PAC) Meeting #4

Date: November 20, 2014 - 8:00am to 10:00am
 Location: Recreation Center, Durango
 AIP Project: Airport Master Plan
 Subject: Alternative Analysis, Preliminary Design, and Costs

In Attendance:

PAC Members

Bob Allen, Allen & Associates
 Jim Davis, La Plata County Public Works
 Gary Derck, Airport Commission
 Mike Foutz, FCI Constructors
 Bruce Geiss, Glacier Club
 Tom Gessel, Mercy Regional Medical Center
 Al Harper, American Heritage Railways
 Marilyn Lang, Realtor
 Greg Munro, LPEA
 Brian O'Donnell, Conservation Lands Foundation
 Steve Parker, Airport Commission
 Lee San Miguel, Town of Ignacio
 Steve Schwartz, Fort Lewis College
 Joanne Spina, La Plata County

Brad Tafoya, Tafoya Barrett & Associates /
 Economic Alliance
 Jim Tencza, La Plata County Planning
 Commission
 Pat Vaughn, Southern Ute Growth Fund Real
 Estate Group
 Tim Walsworth, Business Improvement District
 Jasper Welch, Durango Space
 Bruce Whitehead, Southwest Water
 Conservation District
 Roger Zalneraitis, La Plata Economic
 Development Alliance

City Staff

Kip Turner
 Tony Vicari
 Sherri Dugdale
 Ariel Wishkovsky

Consulting Team

Hilary Fletcher, Jviation
 Dave Nafie, Jviation
 Colleen Cummins, Jviation
 Ben Gonzales, Jviation
 Michael Spitzer, RS&H

1. Welcome/Opening Comments

Kip Turner opened the meeting by welcoming members to the PAC. Each consulting team member introduced themselves to the group. Hilary Fletcher briefly reviewed the Master Plan process and public outreach completed and that which is ongoing.

- Website – www.flydurango.com
- Airport Tours
- PAC Survey
- Outbound Passenger Surveys
- Tenant and User Surveys
- Community Open House (September 18th)
- Civic Presentations
- Focus Groups
- Video Production
- Social Media – Twitter, Facebook, Virtual City Hall

2. Terminal Building Requirements

Dave Nafie reviewed the terminal building requirements (square footage) based upon peak hour enplanements.

3. Technical Observations Per Industry Standards

Dave discussed numerous observations about the Airport and alternatives analyzed to give the PAC a basis for comparison prior to discussing each alternative.

Observations included:

- DRO is projected to add 1.9 percent to 3.5 percent additional passengers each year.
- There are no “low cost” approaches that will satisfy the needs for today.
- The terminal building is undersized for the current demand.
- The parking system capacity is at failure today.
- Additional aircraft apron is required with all obstruction clearances met.

4. Twenty Years of Growth at DRO

Dave reviewed a series of photographs from 1993 through 2013 to demonstrate the growth of DRO over the past 20 years. The photographs revealed the growth of the Airport centered on additional parking, general aviation, USFS, etc. but no changes were made to the terminal despite the continued growth of enplanements.

5. Alternative Review

Dave explained how each alternative was analyzed – evaluation factors. The evaluation criteria were split into two categories – quantitative and qualitative.

Quantitative:

- Complies with FAA safety and design standards
- Maximizes operational efficiency

- Meets the 20 year facility requirements as defined in the Master Plan, plus has room to grow
- Balances benefits and costs

Qualitative:

- Promotes safety and efficiency of airport operations
- Enhances security of airport and airline operations
- Improves customer satisfaction/convenience
- Fosters Durango/Four Corners' image
- Minimizes construction phasing impacts to tenants and users
- Incorporates sustainable design elements where appropriate
- Sensitive to environmental resources

The criteria were developed based upon results of surveys given to the PAC, passengers, airlines, tenants, and business owners.

An overall graphic for the two planning activity levels (PAL) was shown for each alternative followed by detailed terminal area graphics for each. The rough order of magnitude (ROM) costs were then discussed. A side by side comparison for PAL 1 and PAL 2 were presented along with the overall program cost.

Baseline improvements, those needed regardless of alternative selected, which include the airport access road and water system were discussed.

a. Alternative One – Renovate and Expand the Existing Terminal, Expand Aircraft Parking, and Auto Parking

Alternative One is able to meet the needs of PAL 1 and PAL 2 but expansion beyond PAL 2 is limited due site constraints.

Costs for renovating the existing structure are high partially due to the fact that the building needs to remain operational during the renovation/expansion. Dave also noted that the high cost for PAL 2 is mainly due to a parking structure, estimated at \$25 million. Dave noted that other possibilities exist for parking; however, the parking structure which would allow easy access to the terminal better represented Durango. Remote parking can still be considered should a parking structure be deemed not feasible.

b. Alternative Two – Construct New Terminal Adjacent to the Existing Terminal, Expand Aircraft Parking Apron, and Auto Parking

Alternative Two is also able to meet the needs of PAL 1 and PAL 2 but similar to Alternative One, expansion beyond PAL 2 is limited due to site constraints. PAL 1 costs are lower as constructing a new terminal allows for the existing terminal to remain operational without phasing impacts. However, auto parking would be impacted by new terminal and thus some phasing would be necessary to accommodate the parking needs. As in Alternative 1, a

parking structure would be required to meet PAL 2, thus the cost for PAL 2 is approximately two-thirds the cost of PAL 1.

c. Alternative Three – Construct New Terminal, New Aircraft Parking Apron, and New Auto Parking on East Side of Runway

Alternative Three involves moving the terminal facilities to the east side. This alternative has the lowest terminal costs as no phasing would be necessary. However, the total cost is driven up as access to the east side would be required as well as a new parallel taxiway, apron, and auto parking. The alternative meets both PAL 1 and PAL 2 and allows for expansion beyond the planning period on both the east and west sides.

Discussion followed and PAC comments included:

- How large would the actual ground footprint be in each of the alternatives?
 - PAL 1 requires 110,000 square feet of which 60 percent would be on 1st floor and 40 percent on second.
- Which of the alternatives provides the capability for future expansion?
 - Each alternative is capable of meeting today's needs up through PAL 2. However, only Alternative 3 allows for expansion beyond PAL 2 without moving something (USFS base, GA, parking) to east side.
- How many spaces would be in the parking structure?
 - Planned for 1,000 spaces.
- Is it feasible to construct a remote parking lot in the business park located along Airport Road?
 - The challenge with remote parking is need to operate a shuttle service which places the airport into a ground transit business. Preliminary costs to operate a shuttle service range from \$2-3.5 million to initiate (construct lot, buy shuttles, etc.) and \$1.5-3.0 million to operate each year.
 - The initial cost to build remote lot is cheaper but on-going costs and inability to charge passenger a higher rate to park may make the parking structure a better option for the long-term.
- Does the City of Durango have any plans to run a transit line to the airport? Would such a service reduce the need for additional parking spaces on site?
 - The Federal Transit Authority (FTA), which operates the city's transit, will not fund transit to DRO as it is outside city limits. Thus, any transit to DRO would be 100 percent rider funded, which would most likely be cost-prohibitive to users.
- How would alternative 3 impact AMPT's business?
 - The new development would not directly impact AMPT. However, due to improvements to access it would probably enhance their operation.
- Would alternative 1 impact commercial operations during construction?
 - No, but comes at a price as need to construct temporary areas to maintain level of service.
- Is the potential value of the existing terminal factored into alternative 3 as a way to offset costs?
 - No, not at this time. However, it is considered in the evaluation criteria (cost versus benefit) and if it becomes the preferred alternative the financial plan would incorporate into the analysis.

- Could you build alternative 2 and then eventually build alternative 3 when needed?
 - Yes. However, the cost to build Alternative 3 when needed would be in addition to the cost of Alternative 2, thereby doubling the investment needed.
- Is the dollar amount that local taxpayers will be asked to contribute factored in to each of the proposed alternatives?
 - No, not at this time. Once a preferred alternative is selected a financial plan will be done which will analyze costs and funding possibilities.
- Will Aviation break down the unique funding sources for each alternative? Local, FAA, CDOT, PFC, airport revenues, etc.
 - No, the study is designed to follow FAA Master Plan methodology which provides that the financial plan is conducted on the preferred alternative once selected from an analysis of all selection criteria. .
- Aviation must present a full funding breakdown on all three alternatives in order to understand the local funding burden before we make a recommendation.
 - It is understood that the PAC would like to see a financial plan for all three alternatives. Because of FAA Master Plan methodology, the project is designed for the financial plan to be completed on the preferred alternative, chosen from an evaluation of all selection criteria. The City/County will take the PAC's comment into consideration and advise the Airport accordingly.
- Are the physical boundaries on the west side completely immovable? US Forest Service, General Aviation, shifting the runway to the east.
 - Yes and no. The topography limits expansion on west side. Of course, it is possible to modify but would come at an extremely high cost. Moving the USFS and/or GA would be an adaptation of Alternative 1 or 2 and can be looked at as part of alternatives.
 - Shifting the runway to the east is not feasible due to high cost associated with it.
- Run a multi-part series in the newspaper to take the public through the entire process.
 - Issues today
 - Alternative 1
 - Alternative 2
 - Alternative 3

6. Concept Visualization

Michael Spitzer reviewed a similar project, Duluth International Airport's new terminal to give the PAC an understanding of what is involved in the terminal building and its development. Following the review of the Duluth plan, Michael reviewed several concept visualizations graphics for DRO.

Discussion:

- How did Duluth fund their new terminal? How have other communities funded terminals?
- Can you identify a failure model? Show us a community that did not choose to expand aviation facilities in the face of growing demand and suffered consequences.

7. Timeline / Next Steps

Dave provided a brief overview of upcoming items including review of Working Paper Two which has been posted on the website for review and comment. Comments are due by December 30, 2014.

8. Alternative Matrix Exercise

The PAC was divided into tables to complete the matrix. A facilitator was at each table to assist with questions. The results of the exercise follow on the next page. A total of 16 matrixes were returned. Several criteria do not add up to 16 responses as not all criteria were evaluated by all respondents.

Comments received during the matrix exercise follow these meeting minutes.

9. Timeline / Next Steps

Hilary closed the meeting by thanking the PAC members for their participation and emphasizing the PAC's role in representing the community, as this will be vital to the success of the Master Plan. Kip also expressed appreciation for everyone's participation.



	Alternative 1			Alternative 2			Alternative 3		
	More Ability to Meet	Some Ability to Meet	Less Ability to Meet	More Ability to Meet	Some Ability to Meet	Less Ability to Meet	More Ability to Meet	Some Ability to Meet	Less Ability to Meet
	√	□	X	√	□	X	√	□	X
QUANTITATIVE									
Complies with FAA safety & design standards	7	4	5	9	7	0	16	0	0
Maximizes operational efficiency	0	2	13	4	10	1	12	3	0
Meets the 20 year facility requirements, plus room to grow	2	2	12	5	6	5	15	1	0
Balances benefits and costs	1	4	10	4	6	4	6	5	4
QUALITATIVE									
Promotes safety and efficiency of airport operations	3	8	4	7	8	0	14	1	0
Enhances security of airport and airline operations	2	8	5	4	10	1	10	5	0
Improves customer satisfaction/convenience	3	3	9	8	4	3	12	1	2
Fosters Durango./Four Corners' Image	2	7	5	6	8	0	11	2	1
Minimizes construction phasing impacts to tenants and users	1	2	13	3	9	4	13	1	2
Incorporates sustainable design elements where appropriate	3	5	7	8	5	2	12	2	1
Sensitive to Environmental Resources	5	6	3	5	7	1	4	6	4
Totals:	29	51	86	63	80	21	125	27	14

PAC #4 COMMENTS RECEIVED

Issues to consider:

- Funding sources FAA/CDOT/Bonding Fees, Parking
- City/County Bonding Capacity
- Phasing of Master Plan
- Keep both – one west and one east option

We still need a financial feasibility for comparison.

We need to compare costs options 2 and 3 for the community to consider.
Need to understand financial feasibility.
Question in whether we can afford any option.

Please provide likely “local” cost of Alternatives 2 and 3 before a preferred alternative is selected.
Please have a definitive analysis of transit in the Master Plan (I agree with conclusion, but please make sure it is addressed.)

Please address the preferred entry sequence of new access road.

- Gas Station/Convenience Commercial
- Long Term Parking
- Rental Cars
- Close-in Parking
- Terminal with good front door/drop-off appeal

Must give us Net \$\$ for each alternative.
Look at cost to relocate general aviation and U.S. Forest Service to east side.
Must know revenue from old facilities.

Ability to Phase Costs should be considered.
Cost/Bond/Tax for two options should be considered.

Definitely need cost approach for two plans.
Need to understand subsidy for each - cost/funding defined by user/city/county/ bond, etc.
Level of funding - how stable is it; i.e. current article in Herald about loss of airport funding.

Talk about low cost operation. For who?

Must provide financial analysis on at least two alternatives; including #3.

I believe the \$25M parking structure in Alternatives 1 and 2 will be very problematic. If 1 or 2 is selected I suggest discussion occur with Durango Industrial Development Foundation (DIDF) for possible opportunities for providing parking for not only customers but also for rental car companies.

Look at 309A – that is the access road for Farmington.

Need local financing costs.

Discuss revenue potential with each option.