

# NextGen Benefits to Small Airports

Stephen Williams, DRBA Airports

Sharon Glasgow, FAA Airports

February 18, 2009

## All small airports are not created equal...

NPIAS, public use small or secondary airports as defined in NextGen may range from:

- Rural, hard surfaced design group 1 with limited non-precision instrument approach(es), to;
- Small and Medium Hub airports with multiple precision approaches both within high density airspace and serving medium-sized communities.

All provide a mix of general aviation, air carrier, joint-use, and all-cargo operations

Each airport's role will drive its airside facilities and support needs (i.e., cargo driven, Louisville or transient focused, Teterboro)

Airport growth and opportunity should follow economic trends and national priorities, (emerging communities, i.e., Fort Lauderdale)

The focus of many secondary airport owners is survival given a range of local and national pressures

How do we assess the value of these airports? Who advocates for them?

# Format of the small airport exercise

- Defining the “small airport” requires a macro view toward its future mission within NextGen
  - Operational (high density accessibility within the Metro area based on the 4D concept)
  - Use category – an FAA definition derived from pax, cargo, and based aircraft levels;
  - Capacity - are there opportunities to identify early contributors to capacity improvements?
  - Financial – Ownership and local economics will serve to drive an airport’s perceived value;
  - Environmental – small airports are more vulnerable in that its primary constituents are more narrowly defined – thus strong advocacy is needed for preservation and equal access to resources;
- Activities and discussion should address public-use airports only;
- The resource allocation formula for airport preservation and improvement must work in concert with other regional goals and focus on facilities having the most potential to contribute to NextGen goals (reliever in Metro area, i.e. Chicago Exec.)
- Identify and define the on-going roles for States, MPO’s and others within the systems planning arena

# How is the analysis best conducted?

- Segregate those GA airports having little or no potential for providing capacity help from;
- Those currently making and having additional potential (i.e., airside, terminal, access) for meaningful contribution(s) to system capacity;
- Thus, are two papers required? (Preservation vs. capacity enhancement)
- What should be the order of analysis priority (metro area all-GA relievers, Teterboro, Van Nuys, Peachtree Dekalb (PDK)?; or,
- Medium Hub airports outside the initial reach of NextGen's focus (Milwaukee, Dayton, Birmingham, Little Rock?, or'
- Should the small airports paper look to identify and advocate for improvements in "constrained", i.e., single-airport communities such as Atlanta, Philadelphia, Phoenix and Charlotte and Minneapolis?
- Finally, to what degree will the role and need for small airport improvement and value be driven by airline hubbing and consolidation decisions? (Raleigh, Dayton, Pittsburgh, Memphis?

# Committee composition and collaboration

- Critical Stakeholders:
  - Operator advocates (NBAA, AOPA, NATA, etc.)
  - State organizations and associations (NASAO, NYAMA, FAMA)
  - Airport organizations (ACI-NA, AAAE)
  - Regional air carrier reps?
  - Other FAA staff resources (air traffic, safety and standards, etc)
  - TSA and the ever-changing security and oversight regulatory environment

# Other Issues

- Input from other working groups that bear on secondary airport enhancements:
  - Weather information technology
    - Drives snow removal decisions
- Economic incentives to use small airports as a means/attempt to “shift” traffic?
- Who will advocate for these small airports aside from the narrow constituency? Is this goal in concert with the JPDO airport advocacy mission?

# Secondary and small airports within NextGen

Questions?