



## Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Meeting Minutes

The PDK Master Plan Intergovernmental Coordinating Committee met on Thursday, December 5, 2019 at 2:00 PM at the DeKalb Peachtree Airport Admin Building, Room 227.

### The Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)

*The TAC is comprised of airport users with substantial knowledge of technical aspects of the airport. Members are appointed by airport management and will include corporate pilots, flights schools, PDK - Airport Association, FBOs, airport leaseholders, airport businesses, PDK Air Traffic Control Tower, National Business Aircraft Association, Aircraft Owners & Pilots Association, and tie down/t-hanger tenants. Staff from the FAA and the GDOT are also invited.*

### TAC Meeting #4 Goals and Objectives:

- Review Development Options

**Members Present:** Tracie Kleine (GDOT), Joseph Robinson (GDOT), Harry Nuttall (Major Leaseholder), John Church (Major Leaseholder), Greg Christopher (Major Leaseholder), Dan Emin (Flight School 1), Dr. James Frank (T-Hanger)

**Members Absent:** Trey C., Chris Primrose, Patrick O'Neil (Major Leaseholder), Evanthe Papastahis (Flight School 2), Greg Voos (NBAA Rep), James Storm (FAA Facilities Rep), Russell Fagan, Patrick Whitmore (FBO – EPPS), Lexis Crosby (PDK ATCT), Howard Joe (T-hanger), John Barnett (PDK Pilot Association Rep), Shane Dale (FBO – EPPS), Lori Bell (AOPA Rep), Mark Clark (Tie Down 2), Randy Carpenter (Tenant), Barbara Bowman (Tie Down 1), Paul Reynolds (Atlantic FBO), Joe McCarty (PDK Pilot's Association)

**Others Present:** Airport Director Mario Evans, Jim Duguay of Michael Baker, Fola Shelton of Michael Baker, Joseph Snyder of Michael Baker, Mackenna Perkins of Michael Baker, Erika Dorland of Smartegies, Donya Edler of Smartegies and Regan Radakovich of Smartegies.

The TAC meeting began at 2:05 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. 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 (Second and Third 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.
- 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 and Bragg



- Streets 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 repurpose 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. All of these plans are conceptual, and we are just trying to show the ideas we have come up with thus far.
  - e. 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. 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 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, 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.
  - 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. 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 hangers, they could charge a monthly premium to the tenants.
- 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.
- XII. Question from committee member: Referring to the RPZ diagram, what is the benefit to the airport for moving the RPZ?
  - a. Jim answers the airport owns 20 acres of land in that area that would become available after altering the RPZ and the Airport would be able to earn revenue from leasing the land which would in turn be reinvested into maintenance and improvement of the airport.

The TAC meeting was dismissed at 2:38 PM.