



Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) Meeting Minutes

The PDK Master Plan Citizen Advisory Committee met on Thursday, December 5, 2019 at 6:00 PM at the DeKalb Peachtree Airport Admin Building, Room 227.

The Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC)

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

CAC Meeting #4 Goals and Objectives:

- Review Development Options

Members Present: Larry Scheinpflug (District 1), Jamie Dutro (District 2), Lee Wiggins (Doraville 1), Tess Snipes (Stone Mountain), Cailey Ryckman (Brookhaven 2), Jordon Fox (District 2), Betty Prather (District 3), Chris Lee (Chamblee 2)

Members Absent: Todd Rehm (District 1), Casey Cochran (District 3), Andrew Heaton (District 6), Trudy Dean (District 7), Neil O. Campbell (District 5), Christopher Richard (District 4), Mike Reeves (District 4), Dan Zanger (Chamblee 1), Lori Gray (Brookhaven 1)

Others Present: Airport Director Mario Evans, Jim Duguay of Michael Baker, Fola Shelton of Michael Baker, Mackenna Perkins of Michael Baker, Erika Dorland of Smartegies, Donya Edler of Smartegies, Regan Radakovich of Smartegies and Joseph Robinson (Representative of GDOT and TAC).

The CAC meeting began at 6:10 PM.

- I. Erika Dorland from Smartegies welcomed the committee to the meeting and introduced herself and encouraged others to introduce themselves.
- II. Jim Duguay begins the presentation by identifying where we currently are in the master planning process: development options. We are a little over one year into a two-year project. Since we last met, we have been working on a needs assessment. Tonight, we are here to review some of the development options that we are looking at. These are not necessarily the improvements that the airport will do, but they are the ones we are looking at as part of the master plan process. We will be hosting another public workshop in Q1 of 2020 and hope to be finished with the master plan by the end of summer 2020.
- III. Mackenna reviews the Development Concepts/Alternatives for the Admin Building Redevelopment.
 - a. PDK conducted a feasibility study analysis of the existing admin building. The study took into consideration all of the engineering elements that are currently



existing within the building such as electrical, mechanical, plumbing, safety of the building and the roofing and also compared it to the future needs of the airport and surrounding community. There were a couple concerns of the existing building which lead to the study; the building is not ADA friendly, lack of parking and lack of HVAC control.

- b. The study provided us with 3 different concepts and a parking concept:
 - i. Existing Admin Building and Parking
 - ii. Admin Building Re-Development – Concept 1
 - iii. Admin Building Re-Development – Concept 2
 - iv. Admin Building Re-Development – Concept 3
 - v. Admin Building Re-Development – Parking Deck Concept (First Level)
 - vi. Admin Building Re-Development – Parking Deck Concept (Top Level)
 - vii. Admin Building Re-Development Costs
 - 1. Option A (Full Renovation): \$8 MIL
 - 2. Option B (Partial Renovation & New Addition): \$9 MIL
 - 3. Option C (Full Demo & New Building): \$10 MIL
 - 4. Parking Deck (~200 Cars with 16,000 SF Retail Space): \$7.3 MIL
 - 5. Mario adds that the funding will come from the enterprise fund. This is only a feasibility study as far as the schematic of what the building could look like. When we get closer to the start of the project, all things will be considered when choosing the concept option.
 - viii. Question from committee member: While these improvements are being done, where would the temporary admin building go? What would the Down Wind restaurant do?
 - 1. Joseph answers it has been addressed that they will have temporary trailers located in the north parking lot. The restaurant has not been decided yet, it depends on the status of their lease and when the project actually happens.
 - ix. Question from committee member: When does the Down Wind's lease expire?
 - 1. Joseph answers he does not know the answer.
 - x. Question from committee member: Is the admin building on the historical registry?
 - 1. Joseph answers no it is not.
- IV. Jim introduces the next section of the presentation, SW Quadrant Update and invites Mackenna to review the status and concepts of the SW Quadrant Update.
 - a. For this project, we requested three variances with the city of Chamblee. The first variance request was to increase the retaining wall height from four feet to twenty-four feet, which was approved. The second variance request was to allow



for barbed wire to be included on top of fencing to provide a secure top, which was also approved. We worked with the City of Chamblee to only approve the barbed wire to a certain area so that as you are driving down Clairmont Road there is a tree buffer and you do not have to see the barbed wire. The third variance request was to move the required streetscape from Hardee Avenue and Bragg Street to Dresden Drive so that the community will benefit more from the upgrade since Dresden Drive is driven on more often.

- b. The variance requests have been approved and we are currently at the funding stage.
- V. Jim reviews the East Ops and Inert Landfill Area.
- a. The existing VOR, which is the radio-based navigation aid is being decommissioned by the FAA. All of the navigation aids in aviation are converting to GPS so the FAA is phasing out all of the ground-based facilities. With the removal of the VOR, there will be more of an opportunity to build in this area since there will not be constraints that were originally there with the VOR being located in that area.
 - b. In the 1990's, an inert landfill was started on the property. An inert landfill is a landfill where natural materials such as tree stumps, mulch and bricks from torn down buildings is dumped. This was buried with a thin layer of soil. This creates challenges for any type of construction in the area. It will cause an increase in cost due to geotechnical testing and more compactable soil that will have to be brought in in order to build on the land.
 - c. The east ops area can be developed rather quickly.
- VI. Jim reviews the VOR Area Alternatives (Alternatives A, B & C)
- a. There are 3 possible alternatives we are looking at to develop in the VOR area. This is really the only area we have the opportunity to build anything new on the property.
 - b. The airport has been in discussion with a non-profit group about building an aviation museum at the airport. We have been asked to identify potential locations for the museum as part of the master plan. They would prefer to have a hangar be a part of the museum to store vintage aircrafts.
 - c. Jim reviews the different t-hangar layout options.
 - d. Question from committee member: Approximately how long does it take to build the t-hangars?
 - i. Jim responds that it depends on the area. The areas that are up to grade and flat we can build them rather quickly. The landfill area will be more challenging.
 - e. All of these plans are conceptual, and we are just trying to show the ideas we have come up with thus far.



- f. Question from committee member: For the corporate hangars, what size aircraft can fit in those?
 - i. Jim answers the corporate hangars are 100 by 120 so that could hold 1 or 2 jets depending on the size of the jets.
- g. Question from committee member: Is there any options for businesses to go there instead of the museum or t-hangars?
 - i. Jim answers that purpose of the concepts is to determine if aeronautical demand can be accommodated at the airport. Aeronautical business could be an option.
- h. There are also costs that we will have to consider when choosing one of the alternatives and phasing schedule will have to be put in place.
- i. Question from committee member: What about the fueling for the t-hangars?
 - i. Jim answers that ideally there will have to be fueling on the side and we have not explored options for that, so that will need to be something we look into.
- j. Question from committee member: What is the approximate percentage increase of fuel that will have to be on site?
 - i. Jim answers that that has not been decided. Normally the fuel is sold on site by the use mixed operators here. Mario would work on lease agreements and then decide fuel storage from there. A typical corporate hangar uses 12,500-gallon tank, if they provided fuel themselves there would be above ground storage tanks near these hangars. This all depends on the type of leasing agreement. We will evaluate the fueling access further.
- VII. Jim reviews the Hangar Capacity Based on Forecast Demand at PDK Airport.
- VIII. Jim reviews the North Runway Protection Zone (RPZ) Redevelopment.
 - a. RPZ Reduction and Potential Land Use Changes
 - i. In the RPZ's we do not want new development that causes congregation of people.
 - ii. There is a possibility the RPZ size will decrease and what this does is reduces the land restrictions in the area where the current RPZ is. The airport bought this land in the 1990's, so they will have the option to sell or lease the land to be redeveloped. We are proposing the land be used for non-aeronautical land use, which means it could be used for non-aviation purposes in the future. Although, it would have to be compatible with noise and height, so it could not be anything too tall or receptive to noise such as hospitals, schools and residential. It could be a park or retail as well. For a park, there should not be any bird attractions.
 - iii. We will work with the City of Chamblee for the best use of the land.



- iv. The airport has had some issues with people using some of the vacant land north of the RPZ. Mario has been in discussion with the City regarding the vacant land.
- v. Mario adds that he has been working with the City because there has been a lot of dumping going on, homeless people, soccer games so we have been working with Chamblee PD to secure and guard the area. This will leave us with the possibility to use the land for non-aeronautical purposes as revenue for the airport. The City of Chamblee has already expressed interest in expanding their public works facility that abuts the property.
- b. Approach Lighting Upgrade
 - i. On the north side, we are looking to upgrade the approach lighting. We want to convert the system to add flashing strobe lights that will be pointed up towards the flight path. The lights help pilots see the runway easier. The new approach lighting could potentially lower weather minimums.
- c. Existing Sanitation
 - i. The County stores extra waste bins, trucks, an underground fuel tank and has admin offices on the site. This site is too close to the runway and does not meet FAA standards. In order to uphold safety standards, we have evaluated the land surrounding the airport to relocate the facility. We are trying to find the best option, so it is not a disturbance or eye sore to the community driving down the road. One of our ideas is to relocate the sanitation site to the area that will be available once the RPZ is adjusted (on the north side). Mario has been speaking with the sanitation department to discuss the possible relocation of the facility.
 - ii. We do not think that the decision will happen until after the master plan is over.
 - iii. Feedback from committee member: I don't not think that is the best option, Chamblee is trying to revitalize their downtown so they would likely not prefer to have the sanitation site moved there. It seems like there is better use of that land. DeKalb does have a site off of Buford Hwy where they store mulch, so I am not sure why it could not go there instead?
 1. Mario responds that he has already spoken with the sanitation Director and have looked at that area. They already lease both of those areas from us. The one you are referring to is the transfer station where all the trash from the north side of the county is brought on a daily basis where it is transferred to tractor trailers and hauled off to the landfill. Chamblee has already been in talks



- with their public works facility and their downtown redevelopment and have not had a problem with the proposed option of moving the site there. We have had these discussions with the city manager and economic development director and have gotten thoughts on it what it could possibly look like, but everything is still in the planning phases.
2. No one wants to have the transfer station in their backyard, so it is a challenge to find a location to relocate to within the county.
- iv. Question from committee member: It looks like the “c” area is heavily wooded, that would be one of my concerns is tree loss in the area? I know that the “e” area there is not much around it so it would probably make more sense than tearing down a lot of trees.
 1. Jim answers that that is good input and that there is also a landscaping business located near that area that may be a potential location to place the site next to. We are going to have to work with Chamblee on where the site should be located. Chamblee would also have to reevaluate zoning of the land currently within the RPZ if the land became available to redevelop.
 - d. Sanitation Relocation Alternatives
 - e. Sanitation Relocation
- IX. Jim reviews Miscellaneous Improvements.
- a. T-Hanger Replacement
 - i. The airport currently owns 4 t-hangar spaces (in area depicted) and Epps owns 3 t-hangar spaces. The manufacturer no longer produces the t-hangars that are currently on the property. The airport would like to replace all of the t-hangar spaces in the area with more up to date facilities.
 - b. Shade Hangar (Upgrade) & North Ramp Shaded Tiedown
 - i. There have been several requests for shade hangars from the pilots. Shade hangars are a cheaper version of a t-hangar, the shaded feature would be an extra value to the tiedown tenants. We are looking at the north ramp as a possible location. If the airport does install the shade hangars, they could charge a monthly premium to the tenants.
 - ii. Question from the committee member: Is there any reason not to put them in?
 1. Jim answers cost. They are not very common.
 2. Joseph adds that this is something we are looking to do sooner rather than later. Mario has been trying to get them installed for



some time now. They are just struggling to locate a manufacturer and installer in the area.

- X. Mackenna reviews Long Term Pavement Maintenance and Schedule and Costs.
 - a. The state puts together a pavement evaluation, which is where they assess all pavement on the airfield. They assign a pavement condition index (PCI) value, and the PCI value determines when the pavement needs to be replaced and the repair method proposed.
 - b. The schedule and costs allow us to analyze the pavement evaluation and extend it over a 20-year analysis. This provides an overall look as to how we can prioritize the pavement improvements and repairs over the next 20 years.
- XI. Jim address next steps.
 - a. We are going to continue reviewing the options.
 - b. Public Workshop will be hosted early next year.
 - c. Obstruction Analysis/Approach Improvements
 - d. Implementation Plan Cost (Cost, Feasibility, Environmental Considerations, and Phasing)
 - e. Be on the lookout for meeting materials and meeting minutes that will be uploaded to the website.
 - f. Question from committee member: Who makes the decisions on which concepts to move forward with?
 - i. Jim answers the county commissioners and the airport will make the decision and we will present the preferred option to the public and gather the communities' input. All of the alternatives will be presented to the county.
 - g. Question from committee member: What is the next submission to the FAA and GDOT?
 - i. Jim answers the draft report. GDOT is in the loop with everything we have been working on. They will provide input and feedback on the report submitted.
 - h. Question from committee member: Is a communication plan going to be a part of the master plan?
 - i. Erika answers overall airport communications improvements are being considered. The airport is working actively to try and figure out the best approach to it. We have been brainstorming a lot of ideas for recommendations.
 - ii. Jim answers that this is an on-going improvement process.
 - iii. Mario adds that it is an on-going commitment to the community and to everyone that we are trying to improve our communication program. I have been talking with the CEO's communication team. This week 3 different communications have been sent out regarding the PDK airport



including information for the next Advisory Board meeting, a possible surge event around the SEC Championship event and other announcements. The CEO's communication department has been sending out on their platforms as well as on Next Door to the neighborhoods that have been requested to be sent to, and the Airport's Facebook and Twitter pages.

- i. Question from committee member: What is the status of the environmental round table and who are you trying to get to be a part of it?
 - i. Mario answers someone from EPA, FAA and EPD. The federal and state level are involved, as well as the southern region FAA and GDOT representatives.
- j. Question from committee member: Has there been any movement on the environmental study that is supposed to accompany the master plan?
 - i. Jim answers that Mario has talked about doing additional air quality analysis and we are talking with the FAA to see what they want us to do. Because the improvements identified in the master plan are potentially eligible for federal funding, they are subject to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). NEPA has around 14 different criteria including air quality, noise, wetlands and hazardous materials, etc. When the master plan is approved, it is approved on condition, called a "Conditional Approval." Before any of the projects subject to federal funding are implemented, they have to go through additional environmental review and clearance. Which is a more detailed study of all of the specific items within NEPA.

The CAC meeting was dismissed at 7:29 PM.