



Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) Meeting Minutes **Updated 12/01/2020**

The PDK Master Plan Citizen Advisory Committee met virtually on Tuesday, July 28 at 5:30 PM.

The Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC)

CAC members are appointed by the Mayors of Brookhaven, Chamblee, Doraville, and Dunwoody and relevant County Commissioners.

CAC Meeting #5 Goals and Objectives:

- Review Impacts of COVID-19 on Aviation
- Review Impacts of COVID-19 on PDK Operations
- Review Environmental Considerations
- Discuss Proposed Master Plan Improvements & Phasing Plan

Members Present: Jamie Dutro (District 2), Cailey Ryckman (Brookhaven 2), Jordon Fox (District 2), Tess Snipes (Stone Mountain), Andrew Heaton (District 6), Dan Zanger (Chamblee 1), Betty Prather (District 3), Chris Lee (Chamblee 2)

Members Absent: Larry Scheinpflug (District 1), Christopher Richard (District 4), Neil Campbell (District 5), Mike Reeves (District 5), Kevin Fowler (District 6), Jennifer McKellon (District 7), Trudy Dean (District 7), Lori Gray (Brookhaven 1), Lee Wiggins (Doraville 1)

Others Present: Airport Director Mario Evans, Korey Barnes of PDK, Jim Duguay of Michael Baker, Joseph Snyder of Michael Baker, Fola Shelton of Michael Baker, Mackenna Perkins of Michael Baker, Donya Edler of Smartegies and Regan Radakovich of Smartegies, Tracie Kleine (Representative of GDOT and TAC), Kathie Gannon (DeKalb County Commissioner, District 6), Tammy Jergovich, Harrison Rogers, Lashun Atwaters and Martha Pacini.

The CAC meeting began at 5:30 PM.

- I. Mario Evans from PDK Airport welcomed the committee to the final committee meeting.
- II. Donya Edler from Smartegies reviewed the housekeeping rules and guidelines of the meeting.
- III. Jim Duguay begins the presentation by identifying that we are currently in the second half of the master plan process and nearing completion. We are currently doing active stakeholder engagement, including presenting information to the technical committees and the citizens advisory committee. We also presented to the airport advisory board a



couple of weeks ago. And on August 4th, we will be presenting a lot of this similar information to the board of commissioners. We are working on our implementation plan, fine tuning our development options, and preparing final deliverables. We do not have an exact date when we will be completed, but we are hoping to be done by the end of this year.

- IV. Next, we wanted to update everybody on how COVID-19 has impacted aviation and provide some of the national trends we are seeing. We are then going to have Korey Barnes from PDK Airport talk through local trends.
 - a. Nationally, in terms of airline traffic, which as you know, PDK does not have any scheduled commercial service, but for perspective, airline traffic is down about 70% from pre-COVID levels. It is recovering very slowly. Some experts say it is going to take probably three years before airline traffic gets to its pre-COVID levels.
 - b. Certain airlines will not be able to recover as well as others and we will probably see some fleet changes with types of aircraft that they use. They will more than likely retire older model aircraft, since there are less passenger passengers to serve.
 - c. [Reviewing slide number 7]. This is a comparison of commercial flights from a recent snapshot of June. On the left is the number of daily airline flights versus the right of what it was a year ago. As you can see there's been a significant decrease in airline traffic nationally.
 - d. Business aviation on the other hand has rebounded compared to pre-COVID levels. [Reviewing slide number 8]. The chart on the top is a comparison of 2019 operations and chart of the graph on the bottom is 2020 operations. As you can see there is a trend line going back up to where the operations were year after year. As of June 14th, we are only down by about 12% from June of last year.
 - e. [Reviewing slide number 9]. This is a comparison of business flights on the left is 2020 and on the right is 2019. You can see the numbers are starting to rebound to pre-COVID levels. In terms of sectors of general aviation:
 - i. Business jet ops were down originally 70%, and now they are down about 30%;
 - ii. Turboprop operations declined 60%, and now they are down only 10%;
 - iii. Piston operations were down 50%, and now they are fully recovered;
 - iv. Helicopter ops rotorcraft operations went down 30%, and now they are fully covered.
 - v. These are the national numbers, not PDK numbers.
- V. Jim invites Korey Barnes to present comparative operations that PDK has seen during the COVID-19 pandemic. Korey begins to review the impact of COVID-19 on PDK operations.



- a. Reviewing the specific operations PDK has had since January through the pandemic. February 1st through April 30th, we saw a 30% decrease in our traffic. And in extending that from January to May, there was a 17% decrease from our 2019 average. Our itinerant and a local operations saw a large decrease in operations. Medivac saw a small decrease, but medivac made up a lot of our general operation, especially our curfew ops. As you'll see, the operations started to show an increase when May came around.
 - b. [Reviewing slides 13-22]. Reviewing month by month, in March, we saw a 24% decrease from March 2019, which we are going to take as our normal operation. Itinerant was down 33%. The local operations were down, and our curfew ops were down 15%. The line graph shows how the operation starts to decline. We have a linear trend line to show how 2020 compared to 2019 and has decreased overall. April was our hardest hit compared to 2019, we had a 56% decrease in operations, itinerant and local both down by 50% and 60% respectfully. And the curfew ops took a significant hit down 42%. And as I previously stated, the medivac flights made up a majority of those curfew flights. And again, there is the graph showing our April operations from 2019 and April 2020. You can see towards the tail end of April we started to kind of recover just a little bit into May. And May, while we were still down 25%, itinerant was down 28% and local ops were down 17%, but they were starting to slowly increase, as I said before. And again, the graph shows the operations compared to each other. And the trend of 2020 continuing to increase. Showing May compared to April 2020. April was our hardest hit month, you can see in May we were up 94% in our operations, itinerant traffic, which is most of our corporate and jet traffic was up 68%, and our local and including those flight schools were up 193%, and our curfew ops are backup 30%. And the trend line there for May 2020, you can see it is continuing to rise closer to what we consider as normal. We are still experiencing an increase back to what we consider normal. June was 12% higher and our operations compared to May itinerant was up 7%. And as Jim said for the national piston traffic, which is a lot of our local traffic, it has fully recovered and is back up 21%. This June total operation is still 6% lower than what we consider to be normal operation. The local traffic and our curfew traffic is up 10% compared to June 2019. So, as Jim said, it has fully recovered. And again, there's that graph just to show you how Maine compare to one another.
- VI. Jim thanks Corey and reviews why general aviation has recovered much faster during the COVID-19 pandemic.
- a. Drawing some conclusions on why general aviation is recovering much faster than commercial scheduled airline traffic:



- i. companies that have corporate travel bans but have access to corporate aviation are allowed to travel much easier with them. Most corporate aircraft only carry a small number of people.
 - ii. general aviation terminals do not have areas of crowded public spaces.
 - iii. there is not just corporate travel in the general aviation, there are a number of uses that really have no impact from COVID-19, such as medivac, cargo delivery, public safety functions, various patrols, survey work, firefighting, etc. Those operations are continuing.
 - iv. and that's why you see general aviation operations, such as turboprops, pistons, and helicopters fully recovered.
 - b. I wanted to give a shout out to one of PDK's prominent private charities based at PDK, Angel Flight. Their primary mission is to provide medical transportation for people in financial need. During this time, Angel Flight has been speeding up supplies or testing kits between testing facilities and helping in getting results back quicker. There has also been a swell of pilots to volunteer, to do this. It is a great example of how general aviation reacts in the time of crisis.
- VII. Jim introduces the next section: Environmental Considerations.
 - a. We are going to review how the plan and environmental considerations work together during creating the plan. Any projects that we propose in the master plan that include federal funding have to follow what's called the National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA). This law was passed in 1970 and it requires that all federally funded projects to have a form of environmental review in accordance with that law. At airports, these are the categories of environmental review:
 - i. There is a CATEX, which is short for categorical exclusion. There are a number of projects that are small in scale or just administrative type projects that require very little environmental consideration, but they still have to be documented.
 - ii. CATEX checklists is where one or two environmental categories are likely show some signs of impact. And so that is more of a CATEX with some specialized studies in certain areas where we know there might be impact.
 - iii. One of the most common categories of environmental considerations is an environmental assessment. Those are done for larger projects, such as a runway extension. That environmental assessment involves a full analysis of the range of alternatives that could be done or should be evaluated for that project before it's cleared environmentally. And normally this falls through all the NEPA categories at some level and those are provided to the decision makers to evaluate projects that include federal funding. Oftentimes there is also opportunities for public



reviews, such as the public open house and also consultation with regulatory agencies, such as the EPA state EPD, and historic preservation office.

- iv. When one of these forms of reviews is submitted, in the case of Georgia, it is submitted to GDOT on behalf of the FAA. The outcome where no significant impact is found is called a FONSI. If that is not found then the airport will continue an EA and perform further investigation on whatever impacts are concerned, create mitigation plans, or change the direction of the project to mitigate potential impacts.
 - v. The environmental impact statement is a very large form of environmental review, which is only used for very large projects, such as building a brand-new commercial airport.
 - b. [Reviewing slide number 28]. These are the categories that in an environmental review, the airport has to evaluate. These are part of NEPA; air quality cleaning, such as historical resources, biological resources, impact to plants, endangered species, impacts to water resources, such as wetlands, noise, and changes to land use. Every project that is recommended in the master plan is going to receive federal funding and will be reviewed in these categories before they can be implemented.
 - c. That is one thing that is important for everyone to understand what a master plan actually is. When the master plan is submitted to GDOT and FAA for approval, once the plan is approved it is called a conditionally approved plan. This means that the airport doesn't have carte blanche to just build everything that's on the map master plan. They still have to go through environmental reviews of some of those things that I discussed previously. So normally when we submit what's called the airport layout plan, which is the blueprint of the airport for approval, the approval the airport gets back, says "these developments are found to be within the FAA safety and design standards, and we agree with the efficiency of these improvements." And then it will say this ALP is conditionally approved based on following the requirements of NEPA.
 - d. I think the important point here, is that once the airport master plan is submitted and complete, there is still work to do on the environmental side before a project can be implemented.
- VIII. Jim introduces the next section: Summary of Proposed Master Plan Improvements & Phasing Plan. Reviewing the separate phasing plan document, Jim addresses the following points:
- a. Our proposed improvements in the master plan have been put into four different timeframes. The first is zero to five, second as six to 10, and the third is 11 to 20. Opportunistic means, we are not sure when that will happen.
 - b. The following are zero to five years or short-term proposed updates:



- i. Approach lighting system. We are proposing to add five separate lights to the end of the existing approach lighting system. This will allow potentially lower minimums at the airport and improve safety during IFR conditions.
 - ii. Relocating the county sanitation site is a high priority because of its location in the runway safety area and the runway object free area. We have included it within the first five years. There has not been a solid choice for where the site will be relocated. There are also some power poles that need to be relocated for obstruction purposes.
 - iii. As far as creating t-sheds, which is basically just a shaded ramp parking space, we looked into that and it turns out it is way too expensive. We are now proposing to build t-hangars over the North East tie-downs.
 - iv. The County owned t-hangars behind Epps, we are looking at a refurbishing and replacing those hangars in the near term.
 - v. In the center of the airfield, there is an ongoing project to remove pavement that is creating hazards and installing pavement to remedy that issue.
 - vi. The VOR is going to be shut down. We don't have an exact date, but we would like to in the near term, explore the idea of building hangars in that area. They would attach to runway 927 and the access is still to be determined.
 - vii. The Southwest quad development and the Dresden Drive streetscape improvements, these are all short-term projects.
- c. The following are six to 10 years or intermediate term proposed updates:
- i. We are looking at additional hangar development on the East side, near Buford highway, as well as East side on the former approach and on runway 27. We are looking at building taxiway connectors to serve those areas.
 - ii. In the airport administration area, we want to rehab or overlay airport road. In the five to 10-year timeframe, we will make a decision, as far as what we are going to do with the admin building, as far as renovating or replacing it and building a parking back behind the air traffic control tower.
 - iii. On the north end by signature, we are looking at rehabilitating corsair and flightway drive.
- d. The following are 11 to 20 years or long-term proposed updates:
- i. Connecting the taxiway to the approach end of two right.
 - ii. Completing the full parallel taxiway to the primary runway.
 - iii. One thing that is still being considered is potentially relocating the tie-downs that are in front of the park. The first row of tie-downs is in the



actual object free area. There has been some input from the community as far as not wanting airplane exhaust pointed into the park. One idea is to move them to the North along sixth street. Environmentally, however, you are just moving airplane exhaust from one place to another because there are businesses over there, but it is not a park at least. And also, you'd have to consider that these tie-downs are used by flight schools and now where would their classroom facilities be.

- e. The following are opportunistic projects:
 - i. This merger area is where the potential museum is going to be. It will come in off of Buford highway. It is definitely a speculative project and we have it shown so we can save some room, if that happens.
 - f. Jim reviews the cost of the various proposed improvements. Costs are displayed for both airside and landside.
- IX. Jim address upcoming steps:
 - a. Draft technical report and airport layout plan.
 - b. BOC update.
 - c. Public workshop.
 - d. BOC/GDOT/FAA review and approval.
 - e. Be on the lookout for meeting materials and meeting minutes that will be uploaded to the website.
- X. Comment from committee member: Could move sanitation station to unincorporated DeKalb.
 - a. Mario answers that is a tough one. As you know, that has been there for over four decades, I believe, way before my tenure, as airport director at PDK. It will be a hard one to move because no one wants the transfer station nor the sanitation lot in their backyard. We have come up with a couple of different options of where we can relocate it because it still would have to be on County property. So therefore, we are looking at other areas of where we can utilize the service. The rest of unincorporated is on the North end, so that is just a tough nut to crack though.
- XI. Question from committee member: Will there be a probable decrease in AIP funding and how will it impact the proposed timing of the projects?
 - a. Mario answers no, we don't anticipate AIP funding reducing actually we believe, from what we are hearing from the FAA, the AIP funding will stay the same if not increase.
- XII. Question from committee member: When can we see the full draft of the technical report with ALP?
 - a. Jim answers we can't give you a date, but we are shooting by the end of the year to have that report ready. We are working very hard on getting those ready right now, so we hope to have it done by the end of the year.



- XIII. Question from committee member: Will you be fixing the hump on runway 34? It may a safety issue.
- a. Mario answers that is an FAA issue, when we get airport inspections it gets checked every year, no more than any other runway in the state. When we get to rehabbing runway 1634, that will be looked at and addressed at that time.
- XIV. Question from committee member: There seems to be an increase in traffic over the Merry hills in Unincorporated DeKalb. Has there been a change?
- a. Mario answers I would say no. I'm not looking at any flight traffic, it could just be an anomaly of pipeline in that area. If you can email us your question, we can let Korey Barnes, our airport noise analyst, investigate that further. Any times that you have any questions about traffic and operations, we do a very good job of investigating and reporting back and showing you the actual flight tracks. It's not only PDK flying over DeKalb County, there are other airports that do fly over the DeKalb County.
- XV. Question from committee member: When you remove the tie-downs on the North ramp and replace them with t-hangars, where will the current tie-down tenants be relocated?
- a. They will have first opportunity to go into the new t-hangars, when we get to that project. We have a long waiting list, we have over a hundred people, so if we could build 50, that means those 50 that are on the tie-downs, will have the first right to go into those t-hangers if they so choose to. And if not, that is a proposal that we have, it is not a set project for us, but we are looking into it.
- XVI. Question from committee member: What is the total proposed added number of PDK-based aircraft by aircraft type?
- a. Jim answers there are currently 355 based aircraft at PDK, and our master plan projects a demand for 487 aircrafts. Essentially over a 20-year period.
- XVII. Question from committee member: Have you looked at "T sheds" with solar panels to help lower the cost and make them more affordable for lease?
- a. Mario answers solar panels actually increase the cost. There is what is called a glare study that needs to be conducted in order to approve any solar panels at the airport. Every glare study that we have completed was turned down because of the glare of the solar panels to the aircraft flying in and out of the airport. We would love to do a solar project, but unfortunately, we cannot get past the glare study.
- XVIII. Question from committee member: How will the new nextgen navigation system effect flight path connection over specific neighborhoods?
- a. Jim answers when you say next gen, that means to me, conversion from ground based NAVAIDs to satellite based NAVAIDs. As far as PDK goes, that's basically what you're saying there. The current approaches are being the ones that were ground-based navigator approaches were just converted to GPS and it's basically the same approach you are just using different technology. There are no plans to



change flight paths for arrivals and departures based on next gen. There has been a history of the airport looking at routing arrivals and departures down Buford highway and up and down Peachtree Industrial, those studies came back and showed that was not going to be a reduction and the main reason is that there are lots of people who actually live along those roads in apartments. There has also been continued residential development in those areas as well.

- XIX. Question from committee member: Any progress on lowering the minimum for the 21 Left ILS from 400 feet to 200 feet?
- a. Jim answers yes, we are making progress toward that. There are approximately 30 something trees in the North RPZ that are affecting minimums, and it will take the airport some time to remove those.
- XX. Question from committee member: When do we expect the master plan to be completed?
- a. Jim answers it will be complete by the end of the year.
- XXI. Question from committee member: Will we get to vote on the master plan recommendation before it goes to the board of commissioners for vote?
- a. Jim answers no, the committee is an advisory committee. It is not a voting board. You are welcome to share your thoughts with the board of commissioners when it comes to that.
- XXII. Question from the committee member: When is the BOC presentation?
- a. Jim answers I believe it is on August 4th at 9:00 AM.

The CAC meeting was dismissed at 6:18 PM.