

Henderson Executive Airport
Master Plan Update
Technical Advisory Committee Briefing
01/28/2021 – 9:00am PST

Attendees

Attendee	Organization
James Chrisley	CCDOA
Jen Lopez	CCDOA
Ben Czyzewski	CCDOA
Bruce Daugherty	CCDOA
John Howard	CCDOA
Raul Valdez	CCDOA
Jared Raymond	FAA
Ricky Sanchez	FAA
Paul Sallach	All In Aviation
Eric Trombley	Henderson Hangar Owners Association
Larry Galarza	Rocky Mountain Aviation LLC
Jon Hanf	Serco (HND Contract Tower Operator)
Kurt Haukohl	NV DOT
Mike Dmyterko	Coffman
Dan Laliberte	Ribeiro
Elizabeth McQueen	Kimley-Horn (KHA)
Kory Andryscik	Kimley-Horn
Colin Wheeler	Kimley-Horn
Andrew Scanlon	Kimley-Horn
Joe Clayton	Kimley-Horn

Meeting Summary

- Jen Lopez (CCDOA) opened the meeting and went over the general purpose for the meeting.



- Elizabeth McQueen (KHA) provided an overview of the meeting agenda and explained that significant feedback from past meetings had indicated there was strong interest in hangars, apron space, and run up areas, which led to the creation of this additional meeting.
- Ms. McQueen discussed the evaluation process for each runway configuration and length alternative, providing an overview of each concept and how they ranked according to the evaluation criteria, with Alternative 1A as the preferred alternative.
- Paul Sallach asked if 1A would impact the F row of hangars.
 - Ms. McQueen responded that precise impacts are being investigated at this time
- Ms. McQueen presented on the aircraft parking alternatives and explained that the concepts are meant to elicit feedback from the meeting participants, which would inform the configuration of apron and hangar areas in future alternatives.
- Ms. McQueen and Andrew Scanlon (KHA) provided an overview of the Mathematical Optimization Concept that would yield the full amount of required hangar and apron space over the planning horizon.
- Ms. McQueen next presented the next aircraft parking concept, which aimed to maximize the amount of Commercial Hangar Development space. Mr. Scanlon provided additional information on that concept, an Apron Maximization Concept, and one that maximized Community Hangar Development.
- In response to the Mathematical Optimization Concept:
 - Mr. Raymond asked if an apron analysis had been done yet as part of the Master Plan.
 - Jen Lopez (CCDOA) described the Master Plan process that has been completed so far, which included the determination of apron demand over the next 20 years based on forecast aircraft operations over that time period.
 - Mr. Raymond also wondered if orienting the rows of hangars on the southeast apron would provide more room for aircraft to move between the hangars.
 - Mr. Scanlon explained that there are terrain and drainage issues in that area and that orienting aircraft hangars or apron spaces perpendicular to a runway is typically the most efficient use of space.
- In response to the Community Hangar Development Concept:
 - Dan Laliberte explained that many aircraft owners want new hangar development but due to the cost of creating a hangar and meeting fire standards, hangars would cost more than users would expect to pay and demand quickly diminishes. He estimated that between McCarran and Henderson airports, there is demand for two new large hangars per year based on the types of individuals that would need such infrastructure.

- Jared Raymond (FAA) was concerned that having aircraft tie downs near hangars for larger aircraft could cause operational issues between the different aircraft types. He preferred separating the two as much as possible.
- Ms. McQueen transitioned to run-up area concepts, acknowledging that this had been identified as an important topic in past meetings. She explained that none of the concepts to be presented were particularly ideal and encouraged feedback from meeting participants on what could be improved.
- Mr. Scanlon explained run-up Concepts 1 through 4, which evaluated placing such an area on the north apron, south apron, and on the inboard and outboard taxiways between the two runways.
- In response to the run-up area Concepts:
 - John Hanf (Serco - HND Contract Tower Operator) was strongly opposed to the run-up Concepts that involved placing the run-up areas between the runways. He stated that this would drastically increase workload for Air Traffic Control (ATC) but acknowledged that ATC would adapt to such a scenario if they had to, though it would not be a favorable situation.
 - A meeting participant asked if the runup area could be developed without an island portion.
 - Ms. Lopez replied that run-up areas have to include the island portion as part of updated FAA design standards from around 2012.
 - Mr. Raymond proposed putting a run-up area on the north apron area or one on the south apron area in conjunction with a blast fence.
 - Ms. Lopez was in favor of a north apron run-up area and Mr. Howard felt that placing the area in this location would be the best option from an ATC workload and safety perspective despite causing a longer taxi distance for pilots. Ms. Lopez also indicated that the south run-up area with a blast fence was favorable.
 - Mr. Hanf asked how many aircraft could be in the run-up area at one time.
 - Mr. Scanlon replied that some options could accommodate two while others could accommodate one.
 - Mr. Hanf replied that during busy periods, such as during special events, there would be a logjam of aircraft on the ramp as they wait to access the run-up areas as shown.
 - Mr. Raymond was concerned about placing run-up areas near the first 1,000 feet of the smaller runway given that this is a high-energy area with increased potential for confusion and incursions.
- Ms. McQueen said that this meeting was the start of a longer conversation and that this feedback would be taken into account as preferred alternatives are identified and developed.

She invited participants to provide feedback to the project team and reminded meeting participants of methods to do so.

- Mr. Scanlon briefly provided an overview of the F hangar area and how Alternative 1A would impact the space, namely that the hangars would be very close to the Taxiway Object Free Area (TOFA).
 - Mike Dmyterko proposed reducing that TOFA area to the dimensions needed for the actual critical aircraft, or a larger D-III aircraft that would still allow for that reduction.
 - Andrew replied that this may be considered a nonstandard condition that could require a modification of standards (MOS) from the FAA.
- Ms. McQueen concluded the meeting by inviting meeting participants to continue providing feedback throughout the process and said that more information would be presented at the next meeting on February 23rd.

