

**Henderson Executive Airport
Master Plan Update
Planning Advisory Committee Briefing
11/17/2020 – 1:30pm PST**

Attendees

Attendee	Organization
Shane Ammerman	Clark County
Roben Armstrong	CCDOA
SundayLee Cabrera	CCDOA
Ben Czyzewski	CCDOA
Bruce Daugherty	CCDOA
Mike Dmyterko	Coffman
Stephanie Garcia-Vause	City of Henderson
Dallas Holmes	Seven Hills Master Board
Jeff Jacquart	CCDOA
Jennifer Lopez	CCDOA
Elizabeth McQueen	Kimley-Horn (KHA)
Andrew Powell	City of Henderson
Shaari Stark	Inspirada Community Association Board
Kimberly Sullivan	CCDOA
Mark West	Anthem Highlands HOA
Colin Wheeler	Kimley-Horn (KHA)
Sonya Wilson	CCDOA
Majed Khater	CCDOA
Joe Clayton	Kimley-Horn (KHA)

Meeting Summary

- Jennifer Lopez, (CCDOA), opened the meeting and emphasized that the feedback received in past meetings has greatly influenced the Master Plan Update process.
- Elizabeth McQueen, (KHA), addressed the focus on feedback during this meeting, invited participants to make comments at any point or ask about technical questions, and provided an overview of the agenda.
- Colin Wheeler, (KHA), provided an overview of the updates to the facility requirements, reminding participants of how they are developed, and pointed out that frequent events in the Las Vegas area can influence the actual facility needs.



- Andrew Scanlon, (KHA), provided an overview of the approach to developing the basis for the Airport Layout Plan, including the multiple steps towards a recommended development plan like finalizing the airside and landside areas, which act as the foundation for other stages in the Master Plan.
- Joe Clayton (KHA) conducted a roll call, including PAC participants, CCDOA, and the consulting team.
- Mr. Scanlon provided an overview of runway length requirements and the critical aircraft (Gulfstream G650), explaining how that had influenced the runway concepts presented.
- Mr. Scanlon continued with an overview of feedback received during previous TAC and PAC meetings, the common elements of all runway concepts presented in this meeting, and various limitations to expanding the airport.
- Mr. Scanlon provided an overview of each runway concept for number of runways, orientation, and length, describing their respective pros and cons and soliciting feedback and questions from participants after each individual concept.
- Jeff Jacquart (CCDOA) commented on Runway Concept 1 Runway Protection Zones (RPZs). Currently the RPZs are located within DOA property. In Concept 1, the RPZ on the north of the primary runway extends beyond the airport boundary. He suggested that be listed as a Con for that concept, especially if it were to encompass roads in its final design.
- Mr. Jacquart also recommended confirming the existing RPZs shown on the exhibits vs. the RPZs on other historical airport documents.
 - Mr. Scanlon said to keep in mind of the changing Airport Reference Code (ARC), and that the size of the RPZ depended on the classification at the time of the historical drawing to which Mr. Jacquart referred. He also explained how the ARC has changed.
 - Mr. Scanlon provided an overview of the design critical aircraft and how that is determined.
- Ms. Lopez reiterated that the development of the initial runway concepts was conducted in accordance with FAA guidance and that the concepts Mr. Scanlon was reviewing were not recommended alternatives but were part of a larger due diligence effort.
- Mr. West asked about the RPZ to the south and if the planned commercial development (gas station) would be impacted.
 - Ms. Lopez reiterated that John Howard and others evaluate proposed development from a Part 77 obstruction perspective.
 - Andrew Powell (City of Henderson) pointed out that the RPZ to the south appeared to be wholly contained within BLM lands.

- In response to the single-runway configuration:
 - Mr. Jacquart mentioned that a con of this concept is that one of the commitments included in the EA for the two-runway configuration was that the airport would put the majority of traffic on the westernmost runway to keep noise further away from Seven Hills. He pointed out that the runway in the single runway configuration would be moving the runway and operations further east, also shifting the noise footprint closer to Seven Hills.
 - Mr. Jacquart noted that while he is not a facility planner, he wondered how there could be any appetite for going from a two-runway to one-runway system, especially considering periods of maintenance and major runway reconstruction.
 - The County noted that this concept shifts the RPZ over the roadway.
 - Shane Ammerman (Clark County) noted that Jared Raymond from the FAA spoke during the last PAC meeting about incompatible land uses within the RPZ, including roads. He asked specifically about Sunridge Heights. He asked if that was still happening.
 - Andrew Powell (City of Henderson) commented that the City would very much like to proceed with Sunridge Heights. He also noted that the RPZ for this concept would encompass privately-held and City-owned property.
 - SundayLee Cabrera (CCDOA) discussed that the County staff was in conversations with the FAA and perhaps, the road could be depressed.
 - Mr. West commented that in his opinion, it would seem like a detriment to the airport to go from two runways to one. It could also introduce capacity concerns and moves the runway closer to areas of residential development.
 - Mr. Powell reiterated that he would anticipate pushback from Seven Hills on this concept.
- Mr. West asked if the project team had considered a canted-runway configuration.
 - Mr. Scanlon provided an overview of a 13-degree canted runway configuration. He noted that it would certainly have challenges considering approved development to the north and south
 - Dallas Holmes (Seven Hills) noted recently approved three- and four-story high-density residential development that would be most likely be impacted by this configuration.
 - Mr. Jacquart noted that this configuration may require sound attenuation and buy outs of those aforementioned residential projects. He thought this was a step back from agreements made in the EA.
- Mr. Scanlon provided an overview of the proposed evaluation criteria that could be used to evaluate the alternatives that are going to be developed, addressing how these items have been consolidated and adjusted based on feedback from previous PAC and TAC meetings.
- A question was asked by Mark West: Is 'Economic Benefit to the Local Area' one of the evaluation criteria?
 - Ms. McQueen responded and explained that this is an important factor to consider and it may be best to add an explanation of the economic benefits of airport development in

the narrative section of the Master Plan Update rather than a criterion to compare and contrast proposed alternatives.

- Ms. McQueen concluded the meeting by facilitating feedback from the participants about the planning process, providing an overview of next steps including the next meetings that have been scheduled.

