

**PAC Meeting #2:** November 10, 2016

**Meeting Participants:**

Pangborn Airport: Trent Moyers, Tina Stadther, Ron Russ  
Port of Chelan County: Mark Urdahl  
Consultant Team: Damon Smith, Jeff Smith, Charla Skaggs  
PAC Members: Lori Barnett, Donn Etherington, Stephen Neuenschwander, Lisa Parks, Jack Snyder

**Members of Public in Attendance:**

Wayne Massing  
Timothy Kyker  
Greg Brizendine  
Jessica Richardson

**Meeting Agenda:**

1. Master Plan Status/Events
2. Working Paper #1 Finalization
3. Initial Forecast Overview
4. Next Steps

**Meeting Notes:**

Summary of PAC Meeting #2 discussion topics and action items (Q: Question, A: Answer, S: Statement):

Introduction

S: Reviewed meeting agenda and purpose. (Damon Smith)  
S: Reviewed meeting ground rules. (Charla Skaggs).

Working Paper #1 Finalization

S: Introduced inventory chapter updates, user survey findings, and EAT web inputs. (Jeff Smith)

Initial Forecast Overview

Q: What information is needed and what the associated cost is for a 20-year timeframe forecast?

A: Noted that the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) creates high-level terminal area forecasts. Added that the Master Plan works to pull in local information, and build from the

bottom up. The FAA serves as an official forecast until the Master Plan is complete; then the FAA will insert the Master Plan forecast into their documents. Master Plan forecasts must go to FAA for approval. If the Master Plan forecasts deviates from the FAA more than 10-15%, they will ask for more information to support that conclusion.

S: Emphasized PAC members' responsibility to identify forecast influencers (community, industry, etc.), scenarios (low, medium, high parameters, and FAA guidance), forecast approach (influencers, scenarios, and methods). (Jeff Smith)

S: Explained the upward forecast influences such as large geographic EAT commercial service to the PAX catchment area, regional socioeconomic expansion trends, and positive FAA terminal area forecasts for EAT and the region. (Jeff Smith)

Q: What does growth look like?

A: Growth, per FAA Terminal Area Forecasts, looks like two to three percent in enplanements. Reference presentation slides for charts and historical and projected rates of change.

Q: We have never been at the level of FAA projections. Is there a way to identify what happened during dips and peaks trendline? We need to factor the departure of SeaPort. Why did Alaska Airlines transfer to larger aircrafts?

A: We can analyze the Compounded Annual Growth Rate (CAGR) as a way to identify the trendline. There has been a continued passenger growth since Alaska transitioned from the Q200 to the larger Q400 aircraft.

Q: Is there an assumption that there will never be a smaller aircraft in the Alaska Airlines fleet?

A: Yes, based on current orders.

Q: If we cannot fill existing flights, it will be difficult to add frequency, but could we see another airline coming in to take away from Alaska?

A: Yes, but likely to supplement Alaska service.

Q: Why do we have such leakage?

A: It is not absolutely certain; there are multiple factors. This data is not currently available.

Q: Consider sending a questionnaire that asks about smaller airplanes, etc.

A: A questionnaire is not always a reliable tool to capture this, or other traveler sensitivity information.

S: Considered infrastructure improvements needed to assist FedEx (non-air) operations to grow at the airport.

S: Where do we want to focus growth?

S: Flights to Portland (PDX) would generate additional revenue, but would require improvements to the terminal building.

Q: Can we have an Origin and Destination (O&D) analysis in lieu of flying to PDX? Perhaps a survey could help?

A: We talked to project stakeholder in the Wenatchee Valley to determine if that is possible, and why or why not. The Airport is working with an airline consultant, outside of the master plan, on airline service analysis and promotional efforts.

Q: Are we comfortable not having a forecast that matches the Terminal Area Forecast (TAF) or should we adopt the TAF? What is the benefit?

A: It doesn't take any effort to match the TAF, and we do not need to build a case with the FAA. Fewer meetings do not affect funding. Operational differences do not significantly affect EAT airfield capacity. We will not have to act upon this, but there will be more activity and potentially more people to complain about the activity.

A: Snow removal operations can be impacted by the forecasts, if over the 40,000 annual operations threshold.

Q: Is the trend in General Aviation going down?

A: Yes, but segments of the GA industry are going up. Private pilot services are going down, but business flights are going up. This trend could change, and it could form flying clubs. We need to look at changing the regulations.

S: Noted that it is easier to fly out of EAT than other airports. Chelan may be an interesting destination, and it has a good service area.

S: Noted that that for the passenger building seating capacity at EAT must be considered for Allegiant or others to come into the Airport. The staff that works the counter and does baggage might need to change also.

Q: Is there an increase in activity because of forest fires? Are these included in projections?

A: We have talked to USFS about this issue. They believe they will keep two or three here over the year. They bring in 10-12 aircraft through the year, depending on fire season severity, but they do not plan to keep them here year-round. We might need to repair ramp space or find additional places to lay down and increase fuel capacity. We may need to prepare for bigger and more intense fires in the future and consider the needs of the airport. During a low fire season the USFS typically has approximately 2,000 aircraft ops. For a more severe fire season, EAT could see as many as 10,000 ops per fire.

Q: Are we basing additional USFS aircraft?

A: It's not likely that EAT will see large transport USFS aircraft operating or based here.

S: Noted two based planes a year is average

Q: What is our vacancy percentage?

A: Two hangar units are usually empty. The airport only owns a portion of the hangars; others are owned or leased privately for an extended period. EAT's option to provide hangars is not required by FAA or the general market. It's possible that EAT could recruit some business from Cashmere, but that may not be the right use of limited airport capacity or capital dollars.

Q: Why would aircraft move here?

A: EAT doesn't want to build additional hangars unless there is a demonstrated opportunity for return on investment.

S: Noted that there may be huge potential in GA for gliders and small aircraft and additional uses of the Miss Veedol; here could be reversal of the trend seen over the last several years. Cashmere is a "bugger" to get in and out of for GA. But the problem is that EAT has no cross runway. There's no solution for that.

Q: We don't want to park aircraft outside often. There are more restrictions, and it's happening nationwide. Does Chelan County support Cashmere airport?

A: We don't think so.

S: Noted that it could be possible to find other funders through business contacts.

S: Noted that Waterville and Quincy Airports are not seeing much building.

S: Noted that not much is going on at Waterville. Six hangar leases, registered aircraft. Phil

Johnson sold his business. Space is available, land leases only. Issue is least \$300 per year with no other services.

## Action Items:

### PAC Actions:

- Review and provide initial comment to Airport Team on the PAC Meeting #2 Forecast Presentation at November 10 meeting.
- Review and provide comments on PAC Meeting #2 Summary to [masterplan@pangbornairport.com](mailto:masterplan@pangbornairport.com) by December 9.
- Review and provide comments on 'draft' Working Paper #2 (Forecast Chapter) to Airport Team via email to [masterplan@pangbornairport.com](mailto:masterplan@pangbornairport.com) by December 19.
- Notify Airport Team of any information that might impact the Airport Master Plan

### Project Team Actions:

- Provide 'draft' Working Paper #2 (Forecast Chapter) to PAC for review by December 9.
- Coordinate Forecast review and approval with FAA
- Identify opportunities and coordinate events for public engagement
- Prepare Working Paper #3 (Facility Requirements and Initial Alternatives Analysis)
- Schedule PAC Meeting #3 (Facility Requirements and Initial Alternatives Analysis)

## Pangborn Airport Master Plan Development: Key Milestones

