

EAT Airfield Improvement Needs Assessment

Appendix E / PAC Meetings and Public Information Workshops

PAC Meeting Photos



Public Information Workshop Photos





**Pangborn Memorial Airport
Airfield Improvement Needs Assessment**

**Planning Advisory Committee Meeting
November 14, 2007
At Noon in the
Airport Terminal Conference Room**

Minutes

Patricia Moore, Airport Manager, called the Planning Advisory Committee Meeting to order at 12:23pm. The meeting began with introductions of committee members and planning staff.

ATTENDEES:

Advisory Committee Members:

Greg Brizendine	Manager, East Wenatchee Water District, and private pilot
Daren Fuller	Pangborn neighbor and aviation mechanic
Deb Hassler	Vice President, Ancillary and Support Services, Central Washington Hospital
Peter Ringsrud	Pangborn neighbor and retired Douglas County engineer
Jack Snyder	Pangborn neighbor and owner of C&O Nursery
Deanna Walter	Project Manager, Premium Developments

Planning Staff:

Patricia Moore	Pangborn Memorial Airport Manager
Tom Schnetzer	Mead & Hunt
Damon Smith	Mead & Hunt
Evan Barrett	Mead & Hunt
Lisa Corcoran	USKH

Also Present:

Lisa Parks	Alliance Consulting Group
Jim Huffman	Commissioner, Port of Douglas County
Mark Urdahl	Executive Director, Port of Chelan County
Ron Russ	Pangborn Memorial Airport Operations
Mary Vargas	Civil Engineer & State Planner, Federal Aviation Administration

The following Advisory Committee Members were absent:

Linda Haglund	Director, Greater Wenatchee Regional Events Center
Sandy Mathews	Owner, Journey Travel & Tours
Jerry Paine	President Elect, North Central Washington Realtors Association
Tim Thompson	Marketing Director, Executive Flight Inc.

Tom Schnetzer conducted a presentation for the balance of the meeting, responding to questions from committee members as necessary. The presentation reviewed the roles, responsibilities, and expectations for each of the following groups:

- Consultant team
- Airport management
- Planning Advisory Committee
- Federal Aviation Administration
- Airport sponsor (Ports of Douglas and Chelan Counties)

Mr. Schnetzer's presentation then reviewed the goals, objectives, elements, and schedule for the Airfield Improvement Needs Assessment study. These were presented as follows:

Study Goal: To establish a solid plan for the improvement of Pangborn Memorial Airport's primary runway, in order to improve safety and reliability to current and future users.

Study Objectives

- Determine the runway length and navigational aids needed by commercial, corporate, and general aviation users for the near and long term;
- Explore and document alternatives for runway extension and road relocation, if needed;
- Determine the best course of action to meet the identified needs; and
- Communicate with and keep the public informed on the study and its ramifications.

Study Elements

- Data collection and evaluation
 - Review key documents, studies, and reports
 - Interview airport users
 - Analyze demographic and trend data
 - Acquire aerial mapping and photography
- Aviation Demand Projection
 - Forecast operations for commercial, cargo, and corporate aircraft
 - Compare using different methodologies
- Facility Requirements Analysis
 - Determine required runway length
 - Evaluate navigational aids and instrumentation
- Airfield Improvement Alternatives
 - Develop options for runway and roadways
 - Technical analysis of each option
 - Evaluation and selection of the preferred alternative
- Documentation
 - Airfield Improvement Needs Assessment Report
 - Updated Airport Layout Plan

- Coordination & Participation
 - Planning Advisory Committee
 - Public Information Workshops
 - Federal Aviation Administration
 - Study website (www.meadhunt.com/pangbornairport)

The study schedule was presented to committee members. The schedule calls for three additional meetings of the Planning Advisory Committee, with public information workshops held concurrently. Commissioner Huffman suggested that the committee set a date for the next meeting. The committee agreed to a tentative date of Wednesday, January 9, dependent on the consultant team's progress.

The Planning Advisory Committee meeting concluded at 1:19pm. A public information workshop was held in the evening from 6:30pm to 8:30pm in the terminal baggage claim area. The workshop presented the same information as the Planning Advisory Committee meeting.



**Pangborn Memorial Airport
Airfield Improvement Needs Assessment**

**Planning Advisory Committee Meeting
August 20, 2008
At Noon in the
Airport Terminal Conference Room**

Minutes

Patricia Moore, Airport Manager, called the Planning Advisory Committee Meeting to order at 12:07pm. The meeting began with introductions of committee members and planning staff.

ATTENDEES

Advisory Committee Members

Greg Brizendine	Manager, East Wenatchee Water District, and private pilot
Daren Fuller	Pangborn neighbor and aviation mechanic
Linda Haglund	Director, Greater Wenatchee Regional Events Center
Deb Hassler	Vice President, Ancillary and Support Services, Central Washington Hospital
Sandy Mathews	Owner, Journey Travel & Tours
Jerry Paine	President, North Central Washington Realtors Association
Tim Thompson	Marketing Director, Executive Flight Inc.
Calvin White	Premium Developments

The following Advisory Committee Members were absent

Peter Ringsrud	Pangborn neighbor and retired Douglas County engineer
Jack Snyder	Pangborn neighbor and owner of C&O Nursery

Planning Staff

Patricia Moore	Pangborn Memorial Airport Manager
Tom Schnetzer	Mead & Hunt
Damon Smith	Mead & Hunt
Evan Barrett	Mead & Hunt
Ken Nichols	USKH

Also Present

Lisa Parks	Alliance Consulting Group
Jim Huffman	Commissioner, Port of Douglas County
Craig Larsen	Commissioner, Port of Chelan County
Jeff Wilkens	Executive Director, Wenatchee Valley Transportation Council
Kristina Stepper	J. Russell Creative Marketing
Bruce Baguley	Pangborn neighbor

The focus of the meeting was to provide an understanding to the committee and the public of the technical work done thus far. The first installment of what will be several phases has been completed – the facility requirements analysis – which determines the required near-term (5-year) runway length at Pangborn Memorial Airport.

Tom Schnetzer clarified that the study is more thorough than a traditional airport planning exercise, due to a higher level of standard that complies with National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) criteria which defines a solid purpose and need to the point where it can be defended through a NEPA process. This was done intentionally so it would not need to be revisited, and this phase has come to the conclusion of a justified runway length. However work remains to be done on development and analysis of airfield improvement alternatives.

As the committee had not met since November 2007, Mr. Schnetzer reviewed the study goals and objectives as follows:

Study Goal: Establish a solid plan for improvement of the Airport's primary runway to improve safety and reliability.

Study Objectives

- Determine the runway length and navigational aids needed by commercial, corporate, and general aviation users for the near and long term;
- Explore and document alternatives for runway extension and road relocation, if needed;
- Determine the best course of action to meet the identified needs; and
- Communicate with and keep the public informed on the study and its ramifications.

Damon Smith presented the collection of aircraft operational data, analysis of that data, and the resulting required runway length. This presentation was a summary of the findings in Draft Chapter 1 of the Airfield Improvement Needs Assessment, *Facility Requirements Analysis*. The following outline summarizes this presentation:

Data Collection and Forecasts

1. Key Airfield Users
 - a. Horizon Air
 - 4 daily passenger service Seattle trips – 46,000 enplanements at Pangborn in 2007
 - Replacing 37-seat Q200 with 76-seat Q400 in 2008, expected to maintain 4 daily trips
 - b. Executive Flight
 - Pangborn-based operator providing medical emergency and charter flights
 - Conducted 1,754 operations at Pangborn in 2007, expected to grow 5% annually
 - c. Itinerant Corporate Aircraft
 - At least 158 operations by demanding aircraft at Pangborn in 2007
 - FAA foresees 10% growth in business jet hours for 2008-2018
 - d. Pangborn's 5,700 foot primary Runway 12/30 requires compromised operations by these users
 - Aircraft cannot operate at Pangborn with full load during wet/icy/hot weather
 - Restricts performance, convenience, service, profitability

- Deters potential air carriers like Delta & Allegiant
 - Affects Safety
2. Critical Design Aircraft
- Analyzed technical performance capabilities for user-specific aircraft based on documented usage at Pangborn
 - Horizon Air operates Bombardier Q200 & Q400 aircraft
 - Executive Flight operates Canadair Challenger 600, Learjet 60, and Learjet 30 Series turbojet aircraft
 - Among the many itinerant corporate turbojet aircraft using Pangborn are the Embraer Legacy 600, the Gulfstream G-IV, the Hawker 800, and the Cessna Citation X
 - Potential additional commercial air carriers operate aircraft such as the Bombardier CRJ-200 and the McDonnell Douglas MD-83

Runway Length Determination

1. Runway Length Determination Factors
- Airport Elevation
 - Weather
 - Temperature
 - Runway Surface Gradient
 - Runway Surface Conditions
 - Aircraft Weight
 - Stage Length of Trip
 - Aircraft Performance
2. User-Specific Runway Length Requirement Results
- Horizon Air: 6,300 ft increasing to 6,500 ft for weather
 - Executive Flight: 7,000 ft increasing to 7,600 ft for weather
 - Itinerant Corporate Aircraft: 6,232 ft increasing to 8,126 ft per aircraft type
 - Delta Airlines: 6,000 ft increasing to 8,025 ft for weather
 - Allegiant Air: 7,750 ft increasing to 8,150 ft for weather
3. Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Runway Length Requirement Determination Methodology
- An FAA software package – utilized by the FAA and made available to the general public – provides general ranges of lengths for family groupings of similar aircraft.
 - Not all aircraft within a grouping will need the maximum runway length determined for that grouping, and some aircraft will need a little more than recommended under certain circumstances.
 - Runway length factors were plugged into the software and a recommended runway length of 7,000 feet was produced by the software for the family grouping with the most aircraft operations at Pangborn (75% of fleet at 90% useful load).
 - As a commercial air carrier, required runway length for Horizon Air is determined a little differently under FAA rules. However, Executive Flight and itinerant aircraft fall into the family groupings analyzed with this method.

4. Recommended Runway Length

- Based on user-specific information, FAA software, and correspondence with the FAA, a required near-term 7,000-foot length was determined and agreed upon.

The new study schedule, dated July 28, 2008, was distributed to the committee. The current study schedule and documentation represent works in progress. The study team is expecting comments from the committee, the public, and the FAA that may require changes to either the study schedule or documentation. The next phase of the study will develop and analyze alternatives for turning the current 5,700-foot runway into a 7,000-foot runway. This phase has not begun yet and will require a considerable effort similar to that required for the facility requirements analysis. Each alternative developed will be accompanied by a different combination of implementation requirements. The study team will review previous county-level and airport-level planning studies, and revalidate or alter their conclusions to make a decision as to how to best implement the 7,000-foot runway length recommendation, if indeed it is possible on the current airport site. It has not yet been determined whether this length is possible.

A Q&A session was held with the committee following the presentation. Items discussed during this session included federal NEPA processes required for implementation of airfield improvement projects; weather scenarios that affect specific users at Pangborn; potential long-term (20-year) runway length requirements; potential additional commercial airlines and their runway length needs; previous road relocation studies; FAA-required airspace design surfaces and their role in the improvement alternative development phase; hypothetical timelines for Airport Layout Plan (ALP) approval and airfield improvement implementation; aircraft operation disruption impacts resulting from potential airfield construction; FAA Airport Improvement Program (AIP) funding rules and grant assurances; potential new instrument approach procedures and navigational aid technologies; and future opportunities for public input on improvement alternatives.

Mr. Smith concluded the meeting by stating that the study team will be moving forward with the alternatives development phase by reviewing previous planning work that has been done and talking with Douglas County, the Port of Chelan County, and Port of Douglas County. The same documents distributed to the committee are available on the study website (www.meadhunt.com/pangbornairport/) for members of the public who are interested. The study schedule calls for two more meetings of the Planning Advisory Committee, with public information workshops, tentatively scheduled for December 2008 and March 2009.

The Planning Advisory Committee meeting concluded at 1:13pm. A public information workshop was held in the evening from 6:30pm to 8:30pm in the terminal baggage claim area. The workshop presented the information presented at the Planning Advisory Committee meeting, in an open house format.



**Pangborn Memorial Airport
Airfield Improvement Needs Assessment**

**Planning Advisory Committee Meeting
February 18, 2009
At Noon in the
Airport Terminal Conference Room**

Minutes

Patricia Moore, Airport Manager, called the Planning Advisory Committee Meeting to order at 12:04pm. The meeting began with introductions of committee members and planning staff.

ATTENDEES

Advisory Committee Members

Greg Brizendine	Manager, East Wenatchee Water District, and private pilot
Daren Fuller	Pangborn neighbor and aviation mechanic
Deb Hassler	Vice President, Ancillary and Support Services, Central Washington Hospital
Sandy Mathews	Owner, Journey Travel & Tours
Jerry Paine	President, North Central Washington Realtors Association
Peter Ringsrud	Pangborn neighbor and retired Douglas County engineer
Jack Snyder	Pangborn neighbor and owner of C&O Nursery
Calvin White	Premium Developments

The following Advisory Committee Members were absent

Linda Haglund	Director, Greater Wenatchee Regional Events Center
Tim Thompson	Marketing Director, Executive Flight Inc.

Planning Staff

Patricia Moore	Pangborn Memorial Airport Manager
Damon Smith	Mead & Hunt
Evan Barrett	Mead & Hunt
Lisa Corcoran	USKH

Also Present

Jim Huffman	Commissioner, Port of Douglas County
Craig Larsen	Commissioner, Port of Chelan County
Jeff Wilkens	Executive Director, Wenatchee Valley Transportation Council
Kristina Stepper	J. Russell Creative Marketing
Bruce Baguley	Pangborn neighbor
Don Harter	President, Executive Flight Inc.

The focus of the meeting was to present alternatives for achieving the required near-term (5-year) runway length at Pangborn Memorial Airport, which was documented in the *Facility Requirements* portion of the study as 7,000 feet. The alternatives were documented in Draft Chapter 2, *Airfield Improvement Alternatives*.

As the committee had not met since August 2008, Damon Smith reviewed the purpose of the study. The overall goal of the study is to establish a solid plan for improvement of the Airport's primary runway, to improve safety and reliability for users. The Airport Master Plan completed in 2004 recommended a longer runway, and the Facility Requirements portion of the Airfield Improvement Needs Assessment study – completed in August 2008 – documented the required length. In a larger sense, however, the study is about positioning the Airport to continue to accommodate the needs of the Airport users, Airport owners, and the community as a whole. Mr. Smith stressed the importance of committee's insight and direction by helping voice a broad spectrum of individual, community, and business concerns regarding the future of the Airport. The study objectives were reviewed.

Study Objectives

- Determine the runway length and navigational aids needed by commercial, corporate, and general aviation users for the near and long term;
- Explore and document alternatives for runway extension and road relocation, if needed;
- Determine the best course of action to meet the identified needs; and
- Communicate with and keep the public informed on the study and its ramifications.

To maintain and improve airfield safety and reliability, other means than increasing runway length were considered and recommended as part of the *Airfield Improvement Alternatives* documentation. The study team included three specific safety and reliability recommendations.

Safety and Reliability Recommendations

- Maintain and Improve Instrument Approach Procedures
- Provide Improved Visual Guidance
- Protect FAA Design Surfaces

The eight alternatives were then presented.

- Alternative 1** No-Action Alternative
- Alternative 2** Runway End 30 Extension (1,300 feet)
- Alternative 3** Runway End 12 Extension (1,300 feet)
- Alternative 4** Runway End 30 Extension (700 feet) and reclaiming 600 feet of unusable pavement beyond Runway End 12
- Alternative 5** New 7,000-foot Primary Runway
- Alternative 6** Improvement and Extension of Crosswind Runway 7/25
- Alternative 7** New Airport Site
- Alternative 8** Use of Other Airports

Following the presentation of alternatives, a Q&A session was held with the committee. Items discussed during this session included selection of a preferred alternative; hypothetical timelines for federal NEPA processes and project implementation; potential road relocations or closures not included as part of the alternatives presented; runway length required for future additional commercial airlines; recommendations and requirements of FAA design surfaces located in the air and on the ground; residential relocations and property acquisitions recommended for project implementation; uncertainty of federal funding availability; potential new instrument approach procedures and navigational aid technologies; and future opportunities for public input on improvement alternatives.

The study team is expecting comments from the committee, the public, and the FAA for consideration by the Airport owners and the study team. A public comment period is open through April 1, 2009. Comments should be addressed to the Airport owners, the Port of Douglas County and the Port of Chelan County, and delivered to the Airport management office located in the terminal building. The next phases of the study will be to incorporate comments from the committee, the Airport owner, the FAA, and the public into the alternatives analysis and select a preferred alternative.

The same documents distributed to the committee are available on the study website (www.meadhunt.com/pangbornairport/) for members of the public who are interested. The study schedule calls for one more meeting of the Planning Advisory Committee, with a concurrent public information workshop, tentatively scheduled for June 2009.

The Planning Advisory Committee meeting concluded at 1:34pm. A public information workshop was held in the evening from 6:30pm to 8:30pm in the terminal baggage claim area. The workshop presented the information presented at the Planning Advisory Committee meeting, in an open house format.



**Pangborn Memorial Airport
Airfield Improvement Needs Assessment**

**Planning Advisory Committee Meeting
August 18, 2009
At Noon in the
Port of Douglas County Conference Room**

Minutes

ATTENDEES

Advisory Committee Members

Dan Feil	Premium Developments
Daren Fuller	Pangborn neighbor and aviation mechanic
Don Harter	President, Executive Flight
Sandy Mathews	Owner, Journey Travel & Tours
Jerry Paine	President, North Central Washington Realtors Association
Peter Ringsrud	Pangborn neighbor and retired Douglas County engineer

The following Advisory Committee Members were absent

Greg Brizendine	Manager, East Wenatchee Water District, and private pilot
Linda Haglund	Director, Greater Wenatchee Regional Events Center
Deb Hassler	Vice President, Ancillary and Support Services, Central Washington Hospital
Jack Snyder	Pangborn neighbor and owner of C&O Nursery

Airport and Consultant Staff

Patricia Moore	Pangborn Memorial Airport Manager
Damon Smith	Mead & Hunt
Evan Barrett	Mead & Hunt
Lisa Corcoran	USKH

Also Present

Jim Huffman	Commissioner, Port of Douglas County
Craig Larsen	Commissioner, Port of Chelan County
Jeff Wilkens	Executive Director, Wenatchee Valley Transportation Council
Kristina Stepper	J Russell Creative Marketing
Bruce Baguley	Pangborn neighbor

Patricia Moore, Airport Manager, began the Planning Advisory Committee (PAC) Meeting at 12:07pm, with introductions.

Damon Smith said that the focus of the meeting was to present a recommended Preferred Alternative for achieving the required near-term (5-year) runway length at Pangborn Memorial Airport. A required runway length of 7,000 feet is documented in Chapter 1, *Facility Requirements*, and alternatives are documented in Chapter 2, *Airfield Improvement Alternatives*. Mr. Smith mentioned the importance of the PAC and public input to the planning process, as the Airport generally benefits from interest and attention from the community.

Mr. Smith said FAA acknowledgment of the required near-term runway length of 7,000 feet was received in July 2009.

Mr. Smith stated that the Airport did not know what length was needed when the Study began, and the *Facility Requirements* chapter determined 7,000 feet. Eight alternatives were developed, and a Preferred Alternative was determined based on input and discussion with the Airport. Alternative 2, a 1,300-foot extension to Runway End 12, is being recommended as the Preferred Alternative. This alternative is supported by the 2004 Airport Master Plan and the Airport Overlay Zones. The Study was not intended as a validation of these existing documents, but the Study did arrive at a similar conclusion.

The meeting moved to general discussion and questions. Jim Huffman said he was pleased with the work done by the consultant and was impressed by feedback from the PAC. Commissioner Huffman said the PAC provides a solid base for discussion and explanation of the proposed project to community, and he expressed appreciation for their time and expertise. Mr. Smith said that, although the new document recommends a Preferred Alternative, it is not the last step in the process. An environmental study with continued public outreach will be required for federal approval and participation. Pat Moore said the Alternative 2 layout is not a final design, and that the design phase will include the County, the Ports, and the public.

Daren Fuller asked when road alternatives will be brought to the table. Mr. Smith said that opportunities for public input will be provided as part of the environmental process, and the design process will develop engineering details. Ms. Moore said that the Grant Road relocation concept has been public information for some time, but options to connect intersecting roads and driveways will be addressed as part of the environmental and design processes. Mr. Fuller asked if the process will involve back and forth between the Airport and the community, and if it will be a structured process. Commissioner Huffman said the environmental process will determine how to minimize potential impacts to the community and the environment, and determine how to mitigate impacts that cannot be minimized. Ms. Moore said that federal, state, and local government agencies will be involved in the project. Lisa Corcoran added that local plans, such as the regional transportation plan, will need to be considered during the process.

Jeff Wilkens asked if, in the event additional impacts are discovered during the environmental study, the FAA will take on associated costs. Mr. Smith said that the FAA will consider costs as they arise, and is unlikely commit to unknown costs at this early stage.

Peter Ringsrud asked that the consultant expand in Chapter 3 on current Object Free Area violations. Mr. Ringsrud asked that the new roadway pavement be identified in terms of two or four lanes. Mr. Smith said the recommendation of lanes is better left to the road owners. Mr. Ringsrud said the PAC meeting minutes are too abbreviated, and is concerned that lack of meeting documentation might cause problems. Mr. Ringsrud said he wants the project to succeed, but that it must be bulletproof to avoid back-tracking and additional costs at later stages.

Ms. Moore said that the FAA Flight Procedures Office is currently developing Required Navigation Performance (RNP) procedures for Runway Ends 12 and 30, which will not necessarily reduce minimums, but will give more approach options to Horizon Air and other users. Mr. Ringsrud asked if changing the approaches to Runway 7/25 would affect commercial operations. Ms. Moore said that Runway 7/25 is not used by commercial operations. Don Harter said the RNP approach to Runway End 30 will benefit Executive Flight operations, which is currently implementing new cockpit technology for the procedures, and that their new aircraft will have equipment for this technology. Ms. Moore said she appreciated Executive Flight's input on the RNP procedures development, which helped identify issues and considerations. Ms. Moore said the procedures should be completed by then end of the year.

Mr. Smith said an airspace analysis for the Preferred Alternative will be submitted to the FAA once the Airport owners have selected the Preferred Alternative. Mr. Smith said, from the FAA's point of view, the upcoming Airport Layout Plan update will be the final step in the Study. Evan Barrett said FAA analysis is expected to take about two months, and that the results of the analysis will indicate only what is possible with existing technology and procedure design criteria. Once the runway is improved, potential airspace procedures could be different.

Mr. Wilkens asked if the project will require an Environmental Assessment (EA) or an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). Mr. Smith said an EA is expected to be sufficient, but significant issues may lead to an EIS, which will substantially increase costs and lengthen the schedule for project implementation. Ms. Corcoran said that an EA was sufficient for the recent extension to Runway End 30, a project which had issues similar to those expected for the extension to Runway End 12.

Ms. Moore said that recovering the existing 600 feet of pavement beyond the Runway 12 threshold may provide an improvement phasing opportunity. Mr. Smith said Study cost estimates do not consider all potential scenarios. Mr. Harter asked if the use of the existing 600 feet in phased plan was considered by the Study, and Mr. Smith said that it was not. Mr. Harter said that Executive Flight's operations are challenged whenever there is rain or snow due to runway length.

Mr. Fuller asked if completion of the environmental study will be the last step in the planning process. Mr. Smith that completion of an environmental study is not necessarily a commitment of federal funding and that additional steps may be required. Ms. Corcoran said the nearby landfill will need to be considered as part of the environmental study, and Mr. Huffman said there is potential for archaeological impacts with Clovis sites. Mr. Harter mentioned a recent EIS at Ketchikan International Airport in Alaska, which had endangered species, wetlands issues, and other issues. Mr. Smith said that for the Airport to achieve its goals, it must make choices to continually face issues that arise.

Mr. Fuller asked about the process of land acquisition on Runway End 12 prior to land acquisition on Runway End 30. Mr. Smith said that Grant Road relocation will proceed before airfield improvements, and is dependent on land acquisition on Runway End 12. Mr. Fuller asked about the County's involvement. Mr. Smith and Ms. Corcoran said the County will likely be part of the environmental and design processes, and that the County will likely be involved in roadway details.

Ms. Moore discussed an upcoming construction of a roundabout north of the passenger terminal on Grant Road, which will include a new connector road to a new industrial park north of Grant Road. This project will close an existing Airport access road with safety and line-of-sight issues, and open a new perpendicular access road. This project is expected to be completed in 2010.

Mr. Huffman said that passenger enplanements at the Airport continue to grow, and that boardings are back to levels prior to September 11, 2001. He stressed the support from the Ports of Douglas and Chelan Counties to ensure a successful airport. Craig Larsen said that he sees the increase in boardings as a reflection of pent-up demand for commercial air service that is now being served by the larger Q-400 aircraft updated by Horizon. He said public support of the Airport is important.

Mr. Smith concluded the meeting with an invitation to the public information workshop held that evening at the Airport terminal. The meeting ended at 1:07 pm.