

Juneau International Airport Terminal Master Plan
Project Committee Meeting
February 4, 2005

Agenda

1:30 Meeting Opening

Roll Call & Old Business- George Davidson

- George took roll of project committee members (see attached roll sheet). In addition a sign-in sheet was circulated.
- Final handouts, Tasks 1,2,3 to be hand delivered by February 11, 2005
- Keep binders for future handouts

New Business:

1. Introduction: Tony Yorba, Jensen Yorba Lott, Inc

- Tony described the goals of today's meeting. They are: to review the typical funding sources for airport development projects as presented by Ken Sura of Axis Consulting; review the conceptual building plans as presented by Joe Barden of HNTB Inc.; review the conceptual site plan options as presented by Tom Middendorf, of DOWL Engineers; and review the preliminary "order-of-magnitude" costs for each of the options as presented by Tony Yorba (JYL).
- He reviewed the project priorities established by the Project Committee at the previous meeting.
- He reviewed the upcoming project schedule and noted the following tentative meeting dates: February 18, March 8 and March 22 for the final meeting.

2. Airport Financing Overview, (Ken Sura, Axis Consulting):

- Ken Sura (via telephone) reviewed key issues pertaining to Airport Funding.
- Ken described the typical funding sources used at airports to finance capital improvements. They include Federal Aviation Administration entitlements for passenger and cargo activity, discretionary funds, Passenger Facility Charges (PFC's), revenue bonds (typically used for large capital projects such as a major terminal project), and special facility bonds (usually repaid by an individual airline or other airport user for exclusively used facilities).

- He described two types of airport/airline financial agreements: the first is a residual agreement wherein the airline(s) assume the risk and costs of financing the capital improvements and usually have a large role in deciding what projects are funded. The second type of agreement is a compensatory agreement wherein the airport assumes the risks and determines solely what is funded. The airline's financial responsibility is limited to the portion of the airport they actually use. Ben Mello, JNU Airport planner, noted that Ken's presentation was available online at the Airport's website at: http://www.juneau.org/airport/terminal_study/pdfs/2005/financial-powerpoint-presentation.pdf

3. Description of terminal conceptual plans (Joe Barden, HNTB):

- Joe Barden presented three terminal options, noting that in general, they all include demolishing and replacing the north wing of the existing terminal and renovating and expanding the east terminal (1984 addition). The new north wing would be smaller and allow more efficient use of the facility than does the existing structure. The current JNU terminal building totals approximately 80,000 square feet. Concepts A and B increase the terminal by about 30,000 to 35,000 square feet. This expansion is necessary to meet the space required by the year 2025. All of the proposed options assume the existing mechanical space on the second floor would be relocated to the building roof. Also Ben Mello stated that all concepts depict a parking garage, but that does not mean that the Terminal must be built with the parking garage. He also stated that the current space allotted for parking will not be able to adequately service the amount of parking projected for the Future (2015 and beyond) and that either a parking structure needed to be built or other lands be purchased for automobile parking.
- Concept A: this concept is based on a revised terminal curb front that consists of three segments for passenger drop-off or pick up. The curb front of this concept is organized by the three main public areas within the terminal- the Part 135 (local) carriers, the Part 121 (national) carriers, and the baggage claim area. The following are comments provided by the Project Committee:
 - a) There is interest in using the FIS area for other purposes when it is not needed for an international flight. Potential sharing of the facility with cruise ship passengers was one suggestion.
 - b) Joe explained the FIS area is shown in a single level portion of the building with the capability to add a second level later. It would likely be constructed (larger or smaller) to fit the size of aircraft serving Juneau at the time of construction.
 - c) Splitting the vertical circulation within the terminal is a good idea.

- d) Each of the options provides an area for baggage storage and receiving at the north end of the Part 135 area, which was well received by Committee members. Concern was raised as to whether or not this would be acceptable to TSA. Andy Herman reported that discussions with TSA indicated this area would be acceptable, based on current security requirements.
 - e) There is interest in a landside loading dock for the restaurant and other terminal users.
 - f) Some individuals suggested that space for a Part 135 walkway/pier be provided that would protect passengers from inclement weather and enhance passenger safety.
 - g) There may be the potential to develop the (proposed new) Aurora Room next to the gates as a combination meeting room and overflow area for VIP's, special groups, etc.
 - h) Alaska Airlines is not presently interested in a Boardroom at JNU.
 - i) Alaska Airlines was concerned that the amount of lobby and public greeting space at the TSA checkpoint might be inadequate. Joe Barden noted that the new escalator at the south end of the baggage claim area would enable many passengers to likely exit directly down to the baggage claim area using this escalator, by-passing the security checkpoint area completely. These passengers would instead be met at the bottom of the escalator in the baggage claim area.
 - j) Some individuals questioned the size of the parking garage, and whether it should have two or three levels.
 - k) Alaska Airlines has concerns about the financial feasibility of constructing the garage. The high price of steel has caused the cancellation of construction of a new garage at another large airport. FAA funds cannot be used to construct a garage. Joe noted that financing the garage may require a combination of parking revenues, city funding, federal funding, and potentially rental car funding. The rental car operators' national management, who would have the final say, have not yet been asked if they are interested in occupying and paying for space in a new garage.
- Concept B: this concept is organized around a continuous, curving façade that separates the landside from the building. It is likely the most complex Concept to construct because it requires the most demolition of the existing building. Public comments on this concept include the following:
- a) Many individuals questioned the location and size of the FIS area. The FIS location in Option A is better because its location on the end of the building makes it more flexible and expandable.

- b) The FIS space in the Terminal building should be planned for potential widebody aircraft use, but not built for it until the demand is present. FIS space has both potentially high capital costs and ongoing maintenance and operations costs that would have to be funded by other Airport tenants.
 - c) Many of Juneau's summertime visitors are elderly and should not have to walk long distances. The bus parking area for cruise passengers should therefore be moved closer to the building.
 - d) The Committee member representing the FIS noted it is difficult to share FIS space and maintain proper security. Currently, the airport has about 500 annual international flights, primarily by small carriers.
- Concept C: this concept uses the existing 1984 terminal to the extent practical. However, this concept does not fully address all the needs previously prioritized by the Project Committee. This Concept is the least expensive of the three. Comments on this concept included the following:
- a) Joe Barden noted that this concept does not meet the forecast space requirement, does not expand the FIS area, provides less upper level circulation space and less tour group space, and it uses some of the Part 135 apron for bag makeup building space.
 - b) The question was raised whether the National Weather Service, currently located in a temporary modular structure, would be accommodated in the new terminal?
 - c) A question was raised whether offices could be developed on the parking structure as an option? This space could be included but there seems to be no advantage to locating offices on the parking structure compared to locating them in the terminal.
 - d) Additional office space could be added to the second level if needed.
 - e) Ben Mello asked if all of the concepts could include some sort of pier system for the restructuring of how Part 135 operations occur. The consultants stated that they would look into this possibility.
- Tom Middendorf presented the landside alternatives, noting that the best components of each alternative could be added to the other alternatives to create the best alternative. Each alternative incorporated different access options from Shell Simmons, curbside frontage configurations, and access to parking. A lot for Part 135 baggage delivery and possibly a landside truck dock was shown on the north end of the building. Consolidated parking for cruise ship buses and truck parking was shown on the east side of the building. Alternatives for interim or permanent surface parking expansion were also shown. Tom noted some skepticism of the cost-effectiveness of constructing a roof over the entire garage. Public comments on the site development included:

- a) When does the airport parking demand exceed current capacity? Based on verbal reports, short term, long term and employee parking demand each sometimes exceed capacity during peak times. Employee parking demand may go down with the imposition of parking fees. One option could be to handle some peak demand on an interim basis at one of the remote lots, allowing free employee parking there or moving employee parking to the sand storage building site, when that building is demolished.
 - b) How much garage parking is shown? The concepts show up to 600 spaces in the garage, which would handle existing short term, long term and rental car parking. Whether this much could be built depends on funding. The Project Committee should consider creative financing with federal transit funds for the garage and federal highway funds for the roads. The Project Committee has previously been given information about how these funds have been used elsewhere in Alaska for garages and airport roads.
- Program conceptual Costs (Tony Yorba, JYL):
 - Project costs at this early stage are only intended to reflect an order of magnitude basis for comparison. They are based on construction costs of \$175 for renovation work, \$380 for new construction, and \$15,000 per parking stall for structured parking.
 - The building budgets at this time are as follows:
 - a) Concept A: \$45,976,000
 - b) Concept B: \$45,976,000
 - c) Concept C: \$32,835,600

4. Summary: Next Step

The next meeting is scheduled for Feb 18, 2005, and will be dedicated to funding issues.

4:00 P.M.: Meeting Ends

**JUNEAU INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT
CONCEPTUAL DESIGN PROJECT BUDGETS**
JENSEN YORBA LOTT, INC.

Concept Number	Item	Unit	Cost Per Unit	SubTotal
Parking Garage	600	stalls	\$12,000	\$7,200,000
				Project cost (40% of construction) \$2,880,000
Parking Garage Total				\$10,080,000
Misc Airside and Landside Costs		L.S.	4,000,000	4,000,000
Subtotal, Site Costs:				\$14,080,000
Building Costs, Concept A				
Demolition		30,000	\$43	\$1,290,000
Addition		60,000	\$380	\$22,800,000
Renovation		50,000	\$175	\$8,750,000
Subtotal				\$32,840,000
Project cost (40% of construction)				\$13,136,000
Concept A Building Budget				\$45,976,000
Building Costs, Concept B				
Demolition		30,000	\$43	\$1,290,000
Addition		60,000	\$380	\$22,800,000
Renovation		50,000	\$175	\$8,750,000
Subtotal				\$32,840,000
Project cost (40% of construction)				\$13,136,000
Concept B Building Budget				\$45,976,000
Building Costs, Concept C				
Demolition		30,000	\$43	\$1,290,000
Addition		35,300	\$380	\$13,414,000
Renovation		50,000	\$175	\$8,750,000
Subtotal				\$23,454,000
Project costs (40% of construction)				\$9,381,600
Concept C Building Budget				\$32,835,600
Total Building, Parking, Airside and Landside Costs				
Concept A				\$60,056,000
Concept B				\$60,056,000
Concept C				\$46,915,600

TERMINAL COMMITTEE ATTENDANCE LIST

4-Feb-05

GROUP	NAME	REPRESENTING	ATTENDED	REPRESENTED
Tenant User				
Part 135	Bob Jacobson	Wings of AK	Yes	
Part 135	Lynn Bennett	LAB	no	
Part 121	Kathy Smith	Alaska Airlines	yes	
Concessions 1	Ella Rogers	ESS	yes	
Rental Car	Bob Trivett	Budget	no	
Customs	Ken Koelsch	US Customs	yes	
FBO 1	Jim Wilson	Coastal Helicopters	yes	
FBO 2	Dick Rountree	R & L leasing	yes	
Cruise Lines	Larry Johansen	Cruise West	yes	
Community				
Community	George Davidson		yes	
Juneau Chamber of Commerce	Chris Wyatt	JNU C of C	yes	Sandy Williams
JCVB	Lorene Palmer	JCVB	yes	
Alaska Committee	Win Gruening, Rosemary Hagevig	Alaska Committee	yes	
Alaska State Chamber	Wayne Stevens	AK State C of C	no	
Board Assembly				
Assembly	Merrill Sanford	Assembly	yes	
Airport Board	Ron Swanson	Airport Board	yes	
Airport Board	Fred Gaffney	Airport Board	yes	
Airport Board	Joe Heueisen	Airport Board	yes	
Staff				
Airport Manager	Allan Heese	Staff	yes	
Airport Planner	Ben Mello	Staff	yes	
City Architect	Catherine Wilkins	Staff	yes	
Airport Staff	Patty deLaBruere	Staff		
Consultant				
JYL	Tony Yorba		yes	
HNTB	Andy Herman		yes	
HNTB	Jeff Fucigna		no	
HNTB	Joe Barden		yes	
HTNB	Alan Berentes		no	
HNTB	Jesus Lopez		yes	
AXIS	Ken Sura		no	
DOWL	Tom Middendorf		yes	
DOWL	Steve Noble		yes	
JYL	Wayne Jensen		no	

Members of the public in attendance:

Teresa Bleakley, CBP

Michael Gunnoud, CBP

James Pak, Pak's Custom Parking

Rolando Rodriguez, Pak's Custom Parking

Craig Loken, Loken Aviation

Richard Enriquez

Tom Williams