

# Memorandum

---

**To:** Sean Scanlon, Tweed Airport

**Date:** November 10, 2020

**From:** Shawn Callaghan, FHI

**Subject:** **Tweed Airport Master Plan Update Community Advisory Committee Meeting #2  
Summary of 10/15/2020 Meeting**

---

The second Community Advisory Committee (CAC) meeting for the Tweed-New Haven Airport (HVN) Airport Master Plan Update (AMPU) was conducted from 6:30pm to 7:30pm virtually using the Microsoft Teams platform. Jeff Wood of McFarland Johnson (MJ) welcomed CAC members and the consultant team conducted a presentation, which was followed-up by questions and discussion with CAC members. The presentation is attached below.

The CAC Meeting was attended by six CAC committee members along with several members of the project team and Tweed Airport staff.

Mr. Jeremy Nielson, the General Manager of HVN, provided an introduction and thanked the committee members for their participation. Mr. Wood, the project manager for the Master Plan Update, introduced the project team, outlined the master plan process, and explained the agenda. Sean Scanlon, the Executive Director of HVN, thanked the committee members for their participation and stated that public outreach is critical to the project. Mr. Wood updated the committee on the project schedule and gave a summary of COVID-19 updates and impacts. He then reviewed and summarized the forecasts provided by the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) and explained that initial assessments have been completed on various elements of the master plan, and more in-depth analysis will continue in the next phase.



Laura Canham of MJ presented on the airport facility requirements, including runway lengths, widths, orientation, geometry, and strengths; runway design surfaces; markings, lighting, and signage; taxiways; and apron/ramp areas. She also reviewed the critical/design aircraft, both current and proposed. There are no changes to the grouping of aircraft anticipated to use the airport in the future. The existing runway is 5,600 feet long and the recommendation is to increase the runway length to 6,000 - 7,600 feet. Smaller aircraft do not necessarily need smaller runways, so runway length does not directly correlate to aircraft size. The alternatives will review a balance of runway length and associated operational reliability with physical limitations.

A review of the design surface analysis was conducted. The FAA prefers that the runway protection zones are free of incompatible uses, but many airports in the country are like Tweed, where homes are located in these areas. Mr. Wood emphasized the airport will only purchase property from willing owners and will not use eminent domain to acquire runway protection zone areas.

The results of automobile parking, passenger terminal requirements, curb front, vehicle parking, airport access, and hangar requirements were presented and will be used in the alternatives analysis. Public

health accommodations that the airport has undertaken in response to the pandemic were listed. The results of the facility requirements to general aviation assessments for ramp requirements, parking, and fueling were presented. The support facility assessment included a look at utilities, airfield maintenance/snow removal, firefighting, deicing practices, back-up power, and fence/wildlife management. Some additional considerations recommended included electric vehicle charging stations, a drainage study, and resiliency planning.

Next steps in the Master Plan process include development of alternatives, followed by preparation of the Airport Layout Plan (ALP) for FAA review and approval. Additional CAC meetings will be held at each of these key milestones. After the AMPU is completed, the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process would be completed next, followed by final design, and permitting.

After the presentation was completed, the attendees were asked if there were questions or comments. The following is a summary of the questions by CAC members and key discussion points.

- The runway protection zones (RPZs) are there to protect people on the ground – The FAA prefers the airport control RPZs, but it is not an eminent domain situation.
- The Forecasts approved by the FAA took a conservative approach. Growth scenarios beyond these estimates and associated airport needs will be reviewed in the alternatives and next steps.
- The environmental inventory has been completed. The site limitations will be taken into consideration as part of the alternatives review.
- Consideration for moving the terminal to a new location (due to size and flooding) will be reviewed in the alternatives. The results of the alternatives analysis will be discussed at the next meeting.
- While the airport master plan will probably not be able to fulfill all of the facility requirements, it will strive to find the balance between improvements and limitations.

Mr. Wood closed by saying the facility requirements chapter does not consider constraints to development which will be examined in detail in the alternatives chapter.

The Airport Master Plan team thanked CAC members and ended the meeting.

Attendees:

- Sean Scanlon, HVN
- Jeremy Nielson, HVN/Avports
- Felipe Suriel, HVN/Avports
- Scott Luzzi, Yale
- Chuck Licata, East Haven Assistant Fire Chief
- Arlene Depino, New Haven Resident
- Susan Godshall, New Haven Resident
- Edward Fitzgerald, New Haven Resident
- Pete Leonardi, East Haven Resident and Board of Directors
- Shawn Callaghan, FHI
- Jeff Wood, McFarland Johnson
- Rick Lucas, McFarland Johnson
- Laura Canham, McFarland Johnson
- Steve Bourque, McFarland Johnson



# MASTER PLAN UPDATE

Tweed-New Haven Airport Authority



**Advisory Committee  
Meetings** Oct. 15, 2020



# Logistics

---

- Meeting Recording
- Please Mute Your Microphone
- Sign-In Sheet - Please Send a Chat with:
  - Name
  - Affiliation
  - Email Address
- Questions Will be Addressed at the End
  - Send a Chat any Time During the Presentation
  - Open Mic Q&A at the Conclusion

# Introductions

---

- Sean Scanlon, Executive Director
- Jeremy Nielson, Airport Manager
- Consulting Team:
  - McFarland Johnson
  - Fitzgerald Halliday, Inc.
  - ASM Americas
  - Harris Miller Miller & Hanson, Inc.
  - Woolpert
- Attendees


# Agenda

---

- Introductions
- Master Plan Process
- Schedule
- Key Issues and Goals
- COVID-19 Update
- Forecasts/Design Aircraft
- Facility Requirements
- Next Steps
- Conclusion/Questions




# Master Plan Process



Public Outreach

# Schedule






# Key Issues and Goals



- Identify Runway 2-20 ultimate length (1)
- Determine terminal area improvements to meet demand (2)
- Future of Runway 14-32 (3)
- Identify opportunities for economic sustainability
- Determine phasing and implementation plan for recommended improvements
- Engage the public throughout the process
- Maintain planning flexibility for future aviation industry changes

# National Aviation Impacts



- Nationwide 95% Drop in Demand for April
- September Demand Down 83% at HVN
- Sustained Lack of Demand Resulting in Unprecedented Times for Airlines
- ~1,000 Aircraft Expected to Prematurely Retire
- Additional Consolidation or Bankruptcies
- Airline Crew Layoffs and Furloughs
- Recovery Uncertain

# COVID Changes at HVN

---

- Public Outreach – Online versus in Person
- HVN Terminal Changes
  - Floor Placards
  - Hand Sanitizing Stations
  - Digital Signage for Public Announcements
  - Pursuing ACI Airport Health Accreditation Program
- Fleet Changes due to Premature Retirement and Network Changes
- Network and Regional Airline Model
  - Weakened Appetite for New Opportunities
  - Increased Appeal of Smaller Airports like HVN
- Overall General Aviation Impact
- Long-Term Impact on Demand for Flight Training

# Forecasts

Inventory

Forecasts

Environmental  
Overview

Facility  
Requirements

Alternatives

Airport Layout  
Plan (ALP)

- Goal: Devise a Realistic Forecast
  - General Aviation (GA)
    - Service Area
    - Trends
    - Historic and Forecast Operations
    - Historic and Forecast Based Aircraft
  - Commercial Aviation
    - Catchment Area
    - Trends
    - Historic and Forecast Enplanements
    - Historic and Forecast Operations
  - Existing and Future Design Aircraft

# Summary of FAA Approved Forecasts

Enplanements			
Year	Constrained Low (Selected MP)	Covid-19 Impact	Revised Master Plan Forecast
2020	65,659	-80%	13,132
2021	74,377	-50%	37,188
2022	76,379	-25%	57,269
2023	78,436	-10%	70,592
2024	80,776	-5%	76,737

	Baseline	Forecasts			CAGR
	2019	2025	2030	2040	
<b>FAA TAF (2019)</b>					
Enplanements	46,953	49,836	52,380	57,861	1.05%
Total Operations	26,255	26,162	26,394	26,895	0.12%
Based Aircraft	59	65	70	80	1.53%
<b>Master Plan Forecast</b>					
Enplanements	50,355	82,723	94,531	123,999	3.40%
Total Operations	25,219	25,923	26,476	27,631	0.46%
Based Aircraft	50	51	53	56	0.57%
<b>Percent Difference From TAF</b>					
Enplanements	7.2%	66.0%	80.5%	114.3%	
Total Operations	-3.95%	-0.91%	0.31%	2.74%	
Based Aircraft	-15.25%	-21.54%	-24.29%	-30.00%	

# Existing/Future Design Aircraft

Existing - Embraer 175



Existing - Gulfstream V/550



Future - Airbus 319/320



Future - Gulfstream 650



No Change in Design Criteria (C/D-III)

# Facility Requirements

Inventory

Forecasts


Environmental  
Overview

Facility  
Requirements

Alternatives

Airport Layout  
Plan (ALP)

- Goal: Identify Needs for Alternatives
  - Compare Existing Conditions To:
    - FAA Safety Standards
    - FAA Design and Geometry Standards
    - Code of Federal Regulations Airspace Surfaces
    - Forecasts



# Airside Facility Requirements

---

- Determines What, if any, Additional Facilities Will be Required
- Based on Most Demanding Aircraft Characteristics (Multiple Aircraft)
- Is Based on Existing and Forecast Activity
- Considers Peak Hour and Annual Demand
- Reviews the Following:
  - Runway Length
  - Runway Widths
  - Runway Strengths
  - Runway Orientation
  - Runway Design Surfaces (RSA, ROFA, OFZ, RPZ, etc.)
  - Markings, Lighting, and Signage
  - Taxiways
  - Apron/Ramp Areas (GA and Terminal)
  - Runway Geometry Standards
  - Visual Approach Aids



# Runway Length

- HVN to Charlotte on ERJ-175 at maximum payload: 5,400 to 7,200 feet take-off length
- During strong crosswinds, runway contamination, and other factors, passenger/baggage/cargo load may be limited

Aircraft	Takeoff Length (MTOW)	Landing Length (MLW and Wet)
Existing		
E175 STD	6,061' – 7,261'	4,945' – 5,405'
E175 LR	7,361' – 7,861'	4,945' – 5,405'
E175 AR	8,061' – 9,061'	4,945' – 5,405'
CRJ7	5,861'	5,865'
GLF5	5,971'	3,186'
Future		
A319	7,561'	5,175' – 5,290'
A320	7,661'	5,520' – 5,750'
GLF6	6,360'	4,034'

**Find Balance between Airport  
Limitations and Operational Reliability**

# Runway Length – Route Comparison

	Takeoff (feet)	Landing – Wet Runway (feet)	
<b>Commercial</b>	CRJ-700 – ex. Philadelphia (136 NM)	4,661	<b>5,865</b>
	CRJ-700 – ex. Charlotte (525 NM)	<b>5,861</b>	<b>5,865</b>
	ERJ-175 AR – ex. Philadelphia (136 NM)	4,861	5,290
	ERJ-175 AR – ex. Charlotte (525 NM)	<b>7,100</b>	5,290
	ERJ-175 AR – ex. Chicago (674 NM)	<b>8,161</b>	5,290
	Airbus A319 – ex. Sanford, FL (1,479 NM)	<b>7,561</b>	5,290
	Airbus A320 – ex. Punta Gorda (971 NM)	<b>7,561</b>	<b>5,635</b>
<b>Gen. Aviation</b>	Gulfstream IV	5,341	3,865
	Gulfstream G550	<b>5,971</b>	3,186
	Global 5000	<b>5,601</b>	2,538
	Global Express	<b>5,881</b>	2,519
	Dassault Falcon 900EX	5,274	2,772
	Gulfstream G650	<b>6,360</b>	4,034

**Smaller Aircraft Does Not Mean Shorter Runway**

# Runway Length

---

- Airlines are Retiring Fleets Earlier
- Operators Generally Require a Minimum of 6,000 Feet of Runway Length
- Aircraft Serving HVN are a Function of the Larger Network
- Some Smaller Aircraft May Need Longer Runways
- The More Minimal a Schedule, the More Reliable Service Needs to be
- Current Runway Only Accommodates 24% of Class C Aircraft in Wet Conditions
- **Recommendation:** 6,000' - 7,600' (48-93% wet, 92-100% dry)

Find Balance between Physical Limitations and Operational Reliability

# Wind Coverage

- Runway 2-20 Meets 95% => No Eligible Crosswind
- Planning Estimate of Reconstructing Runway 14-32 (Excluding Obstruction Removal): \$7.1 million

All-Weather				
	10.5	13	16	20
Runway 2-20	96.28%	98.10%	99.53%	99.88%

IFR				
	10.5	13	16	20
Runway 2-20	95.37%	97.08%	98.83%	99.66%

VFR				
	10.5	13	16	20
Runway 2-20	96.52%	98.36%	99.71%	99.93%

# Capacity

- Maximum Annual Service Volume (ASV) Expected is 21%
- No Capacity Constraints

Year	Demand		Capacity			Percent Peak Hour		Percent ASV
	Annual	Peak Hour	ASV	Hourly VFR	Hourly IFR	VFR	IFR	
2019	25,219	10	134,658	77	53	13%	19%	19%
2025	25,923	10	134,658	77	53	13%	19%	19%
2030	26,476	11	134,658	77	53	14%	21%	20%
2040	27,631	11	134,658	77	53	14%	21%	21%




# Runway Width and Strength

- Runway 2-20: 150 Feet Wide
- Meets C-III Standards
- Pavement Strength Meets Demand



	ACN	Runway 2-20 PCN	Deficiency
Embraer 175	10-19	57 /F/C/X/T	None
Airbus 319	17-50	57 /F/C/X/T	None
Airbus 320	19-42	57 /F/C/X/T	None
Gulfstream 650	13-32	57 /F/C/X/T	None



# Runway Design Surfaces



**Review RSA for Incremental Improvements  
Acquire Land in RPZs in Fee or Easement**

# Runway Design Surfaces

- Runway/Taxiway Standard Separation for C-III Airports is 400'
- Existing Taxiways A and B – 275'
- Projects Ongoing for Taxiway A Separation




LEGEND	
	RUNWAY SAFETY AREA
	RUNWAY OBJECT FREE AREA
	RUNWAY PROTECTION ZONE
	TAXIWAY SAFETY AREA
	TAXIWAY/TAXILANE OBJECT FREE AREA

Meet FAA Standard Separation Between Runways and Taxiways



# Airfield Lighting




- Runway 2-20 HIRL (Standard)
- Runway 2:
  - Existing: MALSF
  - Review Lower Minimums Feasibility Potential MALSR
- Runway 20:
  - Existing: No Approach Lights (GPS)
  - PAPI Being Installed (2020)
  - Recommend:
    - Runway End Identifier Lights (REILs)
    - Evaluate Feasibility of Vertically Guided Approach
- Taxiway Lighting MITL (Standard)
  - Two Areas of Reflectors:
    - Taxiway B/C Closure
    - Run-up Pad on Former Runway 14-32



# Taxiway Design Surfaces

- Taxilane ADG I OFA: 79'
  - T-Hangars – 55' (1)
  - Taxilane between Tiedowns – 65' (2)
- Taxilane ADG II OFA: 115'
  - East Ramp Taxilane – 49' to Wingtip (2)
- Taxiway G North of Taxilane – Existing Wingspan Restriction for Aircraft Greater Than 36' (4)

Key Map



# Airfield Geometry Standards

- High Energy Intersection
- Direct Access
- Taxiway Intersecting Runway at Other Than a Right Angle
- Unexpected Hold Lines



# Airside Facility Requirements Summary

Item/Facility	Demand
Runway Length	Existing: 6,000'; Future: 7,600'
Runway Safety Area	Review Fence and Road in Runway 20 RSA Address RSA Transverse Grading
Runway Object Free Area	Review Fence, Road, and NAVAIDs in Runway 20 ROFA
Runway Protection Zone	Control of All RPZs Through Ownership or Avigation Easements
Runway Lighting	Update to Cable in Conduit Remove Runway 14-32 Lights
Runway Visual Aids	Upgrade to MALSR Runway 2 Install REIL on Runway 20
Instrument Approaches	Lower Runway 2 Minimums, if Possible Provide Vertical Guidance to Runway 20, if Possible
Taxiways	Runway 2-20 and Taxiway A Separation Runway 2-20 and Taxiway B Separation Address Taxilane/Taxiway Object Free Area Address Airfield Geometry Concerns and Meet FAA Standards

# Passenger Terminal Apron Parking

- Existing Provision
  - 1 Jet bridge Parking Position
    - Sized Approximately for Boeing 737
  - 1 Ground Level Boarding Position
    - Intended for Commuter Operations
- Recommended Provision
  - 2 Jet bridge Parking Positions
    - Both Sized for Group III (737/A220/A320)
  - Flexibility for a 3rd Position, Ground Boarding-OK
- Utilities
  - Terminal Electrical Capacity
  - Improve Internet Connection



Apron Parking Positions Should be Commensurate with Terminal Holdroom Sizes and Locations

# Passenger Terminal Requirements

Terminal Functional Area	Existing Provision	100 Peak-Hour Passengers	150 Peak-Hour Passengers	200 Peak-Hour Passengers	250 Peak-Hour Passengers
Check-In /Ticketing	1,648	949	1,446	1,897	2,394
Baggage Screening & Makeup	751	3,115	3,240	3,240	3,240
Security Screening Checkpoint	1,356	4,883	4,981	6,366	8,854
Secure Holdrooms	1,865/1,511	5,780	6,878	9,072	12,364
Baggage Claim and Inbound Baggage	769	5,566	4,292	8,820	12,265
Concessions	1,090	2,078	3,117	4,156	5,194
Other Functions/Tenants	5,810	12,286	15,644	17,871	23,689
<b>Total</b>	<b>14,800</b>	<b>34,657</b>	<b>39,598</b>	<b>51,422</b>	<b>68,000</b>
Passenger Terminal Requirement Range		30,000-35,000	35,000-40,000	50,000-55,000	65,000-70,000

## Recommendation Priorities:

- 1) Expand Baggage Claim Area
- 2) Expand Secure Holdroom
- 3) Expand Security Checkpoint
- 4) Expand Circulation and Support Facilities
- 5) Expand Outbound Baggage Screening Area (In-line System)

**Total Additional Space - 20,000-55,000 SF**

# Accommodations for Public Health

- Terminal Social Distancing
- Ventilation and Filtration
- UV Light Sanitation


# Curbfront and Parking



- Existing Curb – Approx. 100 Linear feet (useful)
- Required Curb
  - 200 LF Required @ 150 Peak Hr. Pax; 340 LF Required @ 250 PHP
- Auto Parking Demand will Increase with LCC Service
- Dedicated/Off Curb TNC Area Recommended
- No Changes Anticipated for Rental Cars
  - Improved Servicing Facility May be Required

<b>Auto Parking Demand</b>	<b>Existing Demand</b>	<b>100,000 Enpl.</b>	<b>125,000 Enpl.</b>	<b>150,000 Enpl.</b>	<b>175,000 Enpl.</b>
<b>Average Demand</b>	<b>130-150</b>	<b>260-300</b>	<b>300-450</b>	<b>450-600</b>	<b>600-750</b>
<b>Peak Demand</b>	<b>150-220</b>	<b>300-400</b>	<b>450-550</b>	<b>600-700</b>	<b>750-850</b>
<b>Existing Provision</b>	<b>585</b>				



# Airport Access



Access Route	
Route 95 North via Exit 50 to Airport	
Route 95 South via Exit 52 to Airport	

# Airport Access

## Deficiencies:

- Access to the Airport is Through Residential Areas
- No place for TNCs (wait in residential areas)

## Overall Recommendations:

- Improve Airport Signage
- Create Cellphone/TNCs Lot



# Hangar Requirements

- Currently 50 Based Aircraft
- Forecast to Grow to 56 Based Aircraft

Based Aircraft	Existing	2040 Demand	Shortage
Individual Hangars	20 units	22 units	2 units
Conventional Hangars <sup>1</sup>	28,500 SF	70,700 SF	42,200 SF

<sup>1</sup> Based Aircraft Storage Only

- FBO Reports Conventional Hangars are Full
  - They Could Fill a 15,000 SF Hangar Today
  - 33,000 SF Minimum for Next Hangar

## Recommendations:

- 2 Additional Individual Hangars
- 42,200 SF Conventional Hangars
- Business Hangar(s) (private investment)


# General Aviation Ramp Requirements

- Current Provision: 45 Tie-Downs
- Total Need: 35 Tie-Downs  
(Based Aircraft Plus Transient Demand in 2040)



# General Aviation and Admin Parking

- ACRP 103, *Guidebook on General Aviation Facility Planning*
- Based Aircraft Owners Could Park in Hangar/Tie-down
- Admin Building Could Park in Excess Rental Car Spots



	Existing Auto Parking Spaces	Existing Deficiency	Future Deficiency
Conventional Hangars	87	17	46
T-Hangars and Apron	0	58	51
Administration Building	8	24	24
<b>Total</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>121</b>

# General Aviation Fueling Requirements

- Jet A Fuel Storage
  - Two Tanks, 12,000 Gallons Each
  - Fuel Dispensed via Mobile Fuelers
- Avgas 100LL Fuel Storage
  - One Tank, 12,000 Gallons
  - Fuel Dispensed via Mobile Fuelers
- 2019 Dispensed:
  - 1.1 million gallons Jet A (22,000 gallons/week)
  - 98,000 gallons AvGas (1,890 gallons/week)



**Plan Location/Parking for Electric Aircraft/Charging  
Additional Fuel Tanks are Business Decision**

# Support Facilities

---

- Utilities
  - Some lighting is cable in conduit, some direct burial
  - Terminal power load
- Airfield Maintenance/Snow Removal Equipment
  - Maintenance Facility is Aging
  - Less Than Half of Maintenance/Snow Removal Equipment can be Stored Indoors
  - Replace Vehicles as Eligible
- ARFF – Expand to House Equipment
- Deicing
  - Meets Standards
  - Review Permits with Increased Service
  - Monitor Regulatory Permit Changes



# Support Facilities


- ATCT
  - Full Power Restoration Back-up Generator
  - Will Exceed the Useful Life of the Building (1983)
- Fence/Wildlife Management – Follow 2019 Wildlife Hazard Management Plan





# Other Considerations

- Electric Vehicle Charging Stations
- Drainage Study
- Resiliency Planning
  - Existing Tide Gate MOU
  - Additional Resiliency Measures



# Next Steps

---

- Alternatives
- Airport Layout Plan – FAA Approval

## After the Master Plan

---

- National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process
- Final Design and Permitting
- Begin Implementation

# Conclusion / Questions



