HNTB Corporation
Infrastructure Solutions

2101 Webster Street, Suite 1400
Oakland, CA 94612

Telephone (510) 208-4599
www.hntb.com

Project Name
AH2011-07 Ellison Onizuka Kona International Airport at Keahole Master Plan Update

Date of Meeting
February 27, 2026

HNTB Project #
87606

Location
MS Teams

Purpose of Meeting
PAC/TAC Combined Meeting #3

Time
10:00 A.M. HST

Attendance via MS Teams	
Name	Organization
Refer to the attached attendee list PDF for the full details	

MEETING NOTES

1. **Introduction and Agenda**
   - **a.** Deputy Director Curt Otaguro (Curt O.) kicked off the third combined Public Advisory Committee (PAC) and Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) meeting for the Ellison Onizuka Kona International Airport at Keahole (KOA) Master Plan Update. He opened with appreciation for attendees and a reminder that the Master Plan establishes a framework to guide the airport's future development based on projected aviation demand. He reiterated that the purpose of the PAC and TAC meetings is to keep stakeholders informed, gather input, coordinate related projects, and request additional information as needed. The project is currently in Phase 2, during which the team has evaluated facility requirements using the FAA-approved aviation activity forecast and will soon begin developing alternatives, followed by a presentation of key findings from the facility requirements stage.
   - **b.** Ken Poon (Ken P.), the consultant project manager, introduced the agenda items and noted that, due to the volume of material to be presented, the team would take questions at the end of the meeting.
2. **Aviation Activity Forecast Summary**
   - **a.** Ken P. stated that the Aviation Activity Forecast was approved by the FAA in early December of last year (2025). He explained that the forecast serves as a planning tool for the Master Plan, supporting long range planning by projecting future aviation demand. These projections help determine when additional facilities such as parking, apron space, and gates may be needed within the planning horizon. He noted that the identified design years are not exact predictions of activity levels in a specific year but instead provide reasonable planning benchmarks to guide development decisions.
   - **b.** Ken P. also discussed the critical design aircraft, which the FAA defines as the most demanding aircraft conducting at least 500 annual operations at the airport, with each takeoff or landing counted as a single operation. The team evaluated both existing conditions based on federal fiscal year 2024 activity and future conditions within the planning horizon. The Boeing 777-200 was identified as the existing critical design aircraft, and the Boeing 787-9 Dreamliner was identified as the future critical design aircraft. Both aircraft fall under Airplane Design Group (ADG) V and Taxiway

Design Group (TDG) 5, classifications that establish the dimensional and design standards for runways and taxiways and guide overall airfield facility requirements.

3. **Facility Requirements: Airfield**
    a. **Runway and Taxiway Clearance Standards Gap Analysis**
        i. Ken P. began the airfield facility requirements discussion by summarizing the comprehensive gap analysis conducted on runway and taxiway safety and clearing standards based on the critical design aircraft, in accordance with FAA Advisory Circular (AC) 150/5300-13B. The analysis reviewed applicable runway and taxiway safety areas and object free areas, which are intended to reduce risk during abnormal events such as runway excursions by maintaining obstruction-free space consistent with ADG V and TDG 5 standards. He reported that two objects are located within the Runway 17-35 Runway Object Free Area, which is 800 feet wide: the Runway 17 glide slope antenna and equipment shelter near the Runway 17 threshold, and an anemometer and wind vane near the Runway 35 threshold. Their presence within the safety surface constitutes a nonstandard condition, and potential mitigation strategies will be evaluated during the alternatives development stage.
    b. **Taxiway Edge Safety Margin (TESM) Gap Analysis**
        i. Ken P. also summarized the TESM gap analysis, noting that TESM represents the required safety buffer to ensure an aircraft's landing gear remains within the taxiway pavement edge. Based on FAA AC 150/5300-13B standards, the required margin for TDG 5 is 14 feet. The team conducted a comprehensive aircraft turning movement analysis using both the existing and future critical design aircraft to identify locations where TESM deficiencies occur, defined as instances where the taxiway edge encroaches into the required safety buffer while the aircraft remains on the taxiway centerline. These deficiencies were documented, and potential modifications to taxiway fillets and the future airfield operating configuration will be evaluated during the alternatives development phase to bring conditions into compliance with TESM standards.
    c. **Airfield Hot Spots**
        i. Ken P. reported that the team reviewed existing airfield hotspots and FAA runway incursion mitigation criteria to better understand current safety conditions and identify potential improvements during the alternatives phase. He explained that airfield hotspots are locations within the movement area with an elevated risk of safety incidents, formally designated by the FAA to increase awareness among pilots and vehicle operators. At KOA, two hot spots have been identified, both associated with extensive helicopter operations in and around Taxiway A. Hot Spot #1 is located near Ramp K, and Hot Spot #2 is located near Taxiway A5.
    d. **Runway Incursion Mitigation (RIM) Criteria Evaluation**
        i. Ken P. summarized the RIM evaluation, noting that FAA guidance identifies nonstandard airfield geometry as a primary contributing factor to runway incursions. The team reviewed applicable RIM criteria and determined that direct access was the only item warranting further evaluation at KOA. Direct access occurs when a taxiway connects an apron directly to a runway, potentially creating a false expectation for pilots that they will encounter a parallel taxiway before reaching the runway, which can lead to a loss of situational awareness. Based on a review of existing geometry, Taxiways A4

and A5 were identified as locations that could present potential direct access conditions.

ii. He explained that the team then evaluated actual airfield operations to determine whether the geometry introduces a true RIM concern. At Taxiway A4, aircraft typically push back from the terminal apron under tug to Taxiway A, which mitigates the likelihood of direct entry onto the runway. At Taxiway A5, aircraft proceeding straight from Taxiway C would not directly enter Runway 17-35 pavement due to the required turn and intervening nonpaved area. Based on further operational analysis, the team concluded that although the geometry initially appears to present a RIM concern, current operating procedures effectively mitigate the potential risk.

e. Incursion and Incident

i. Andy Guan (Andy G.) from HNTB reported that the team reviewed all recorded runway incursions and surface incidents at the airport over the past ten years, from 2016 through 2025, to identify historical safety trends. Data were obtained from the FAA Runway Safety Office Runway Incursion Database, the FAA Accident and Incident Data System, and NASA's Aviation Safety Reporting System. He explained key terminology used in the analysis, including runway incursion, defined as the incorrect presence of an aircraft, vehicle, or person on the protected area of a runway; runway excursion, when an aircraft veers off or overruns the runway surface; and surface incidents, which involve unauthorized movement within the movement area outside the protected runway area. Surface events are further categorized as Operational Incidents, Pilot Deviations, Vehicle/Pedestrian Deviations, and Other. He also noted that runway incursions are classified by severity from Category D, the least severe, to Category A, the most severe, and that these classifications help prioritize safety improvements during alternatives development.

ii. Andy G. stated that, after filtering out events outside the airport's control, only a limited number of relevant incidents were identified at KOA. Over the ten-year period, there were three recorded runway incursions, two of which were duplicate records of the same pilot deviation event, all classified as Category D with little or no risk of collision. In addition, there was one runway excursion and three surface incidents. He concluded that the relatively low number of incursions and incidents compared to other airports is a positive indicator of overall airfield safety.

4. Facility Requirements: Second Runway Focus Study

a. Second Runway Focus Study Background

i. Ken P. introduced the Second Runway Focus Study, which supports a core objective of the Master Plan Update to integrate a properly sized second runway into the airport's airside infrastructure. In addition to evaluating capacity benefits, the study considers how a second runway could enhance safety and potentially reduce noise impacts. He explained that recent events highlighted the need for this analysis, including operational disruptions in 2024 due to cracks discovered on Runway 17-35 that resulted in closures, as well as the 2025 to 2026 runway rehabilitation project. With only one runway in operation, the rehabilitation required runway shortening and closures, increasing operational complexity and reinforcing the need to evaluate long term resiliency.

ii. Ken P. also emphasized the regional importance of KOA, noting that it serves as the state's second port of entry for international arrivals after HNL and plays a critical role in supporting international passenger traffic. He added that the airport provides essential services, including fixed wing medevac operations and air cargo access for the Big Island, particularly the Kona and Kohala Coast regions. These factors underscore the importance of maintaining continuity of aircraft operations and support the justification for the Second Runway Focus Study.

b. Annual Service Volume (ASV)

i. Ken P. explained that the Annual Service Volume represents an estimate of the airport's annual aircraft operational capacity and was calculated using the methodology outlined in FAA Advisory Circular 150/5060-5, Airport Capacity and Delay. The ASV analysis considered multiple factors that influence capacity, including runway use configuration, weather conditions and the proportion of visual versus instrument operating conditions, the number of exit taxiways and associated runway occupancy time, and aircraft fleet mix, including wake turbulence and approach speed differences. He noted that peaking characteristics were also evaluated, as the distribution of operations throughout the day affects overall capacity calculations.

ii. Using existing and forecast fleet mix for identified design years, the team calculated the ASV and evaluated activity levels against the FAA Order 5090.5 thresholds, which identify 60 percent of ASV as the planning activity level trigger and 80 percent as the development activity level trigger for a new runway. The analysis compared the approved forecast of annual operations to these thresholds, including a focused review of fixed wing operations by excluding helicopter activity. Ken P. reported that both the base year and future forecast years through 2044 exceed the 60 percent planning activity level trigger, supporting further evaluation of a second runway.

c. Safety-Enhancing Benefits from a Second Runway

i. Ken P. discussed the potential safety benefits of a second runway, beginning with the diverse mix of aircraft operations at KOA. He noted that the airport currently accommodates air carriers, heavy air cargo jets, small piston aircraft, corporate jets, and military aircraft, resulting in a wide range of approach speeds and performance characteristics. He also highlighted the prevalence of touch-and-go operations among general aviation traffic, with approximately 90 percent of small aircraft operations involving touch-and-go activity. This diversity in aircraft type, speed, and pilot experience introduces operational complexity on a single runway.

ii. He explained that managing this mix on one runway requires careful spacing between faster and slower aircraft, adherence to wake turbulence separation standards, and coordination of touch and go operations. As activity levels increase in future years, these factors are expected to create additional airfield management challenges and a higher likelihood of go-arounds during peak periods. Ken P. stated that a second runway would provide greater operational flexibility for air traffic control and could enhance safety by reducing these constraints and mitigating future operational risks.

5. Facility Requirements: Landside

a. Parking Requirements

i. Andrew Blaisdell (Andrew B.) explained that the landside facility requirements analysis covers four areas: parking, rental car facilities,

roadway requirements, and curbside. He noted that the discussion focused on future requirements rather than development alternatives and is based on existing activity levels collected during the inventory process and escalated using the FAA approved aviation activity forecast. For parking, the analysis distinguishes between public and employee parking. The airport currently operates Lot A and Lot B for public use, with Lot B also accommodating some employees, and Lot C primarily serving employees across from the rental car facilities. The evaluation used peak month data from July 2024, including public parking transactions and employee RFID badge swipes across tenants such as airlines, TSA, and rental car companies.

ii. Andrew B. stated that existing parking supply generally meets current demand, although Lot A occasionally reaches capacity, requiring public overflow into Lot B. Projected growth rates aligned with employment and enplanement forecasts were applied to estimate future demand. Based on these projections, total parking demand is expected to reach approximately 2,098 spaces by 2044, representing a need for roughly 435 additional public and employee parking spaces compared to existing supply.

b. Rental Car Requirements

i. Andrew B. summarized the rental car facility requirements, noting that a recent baseline study evaluated existing leasehold areas operated by Enterprise Holdings, Avis Budget Group, and the Hertz Corporation, which collectively manage eight brands on approximately 25.5 acres. The analysis considered all functional components of the rental car campus, including customer service facilities, vehicle pickup and return areas, ready and returned vehicle storage, and maintenance functions such as fueling and washing. Using the enplanement growth forecast, the team projects that by 2044 the total rental car area will need to expand to approximately 30.5 acres, representing an additional six acres of required space, with specific development alternatives to be evaluated in a later phase.

c. Roadway Requirements

i. Andrew B. summarized the roadway capacity and level of service (LOS) analysis, which evaluated traffic volumes entering and exiting the airport. A traffic count conducted in November 2025 identified a mid-day peak hour associated with clustered arrivals and departures, and these volumes were scaled to represent an average day during the July 2024 peak month. Using projected enplanement growth, the team applied a volume to capacity ratio methodology to assess roadway and intersection performance, including both signalized and unsignalized intersections. Existing conditions generally reflect LOS C or better, consistent with planning guidance, with the primary exception occurring on the main airport entry road in the outbound direction approaching the highway intersection during peak periods.

ii. Andrew B. noted that future year 2044 projections indicate deteriorating conditions, particularly along Keahole Airport Road and at key intersections, where LOS D and E are anticipated as traffic volumes increase. While most internal roadways continue to perform at acceptable levels, the analysis indicates a need for additional roadway capacity entering and exiting the airport. These findings will guide the development of roadway alternatives in subsequent phases of the Master Plan Update.

d. Curbside Requirements

i. Andrew B. presented the curbside requirements analysis, which evaluates whether sufficient space exists along the terminal curb for passenger pick up and drop off activity. The study included private vehicles, rental car shuttles, commercial vehicles, buses, transportation network companies, taxis, and shared ride services. Peak hour traffic counts collected in September 2025 were scaled to the July 2024 peak month baseline and projected forward using enplanement growth factors. The analysis applied ACRP Report 266 LOS standards, which consider peak hour vehicle volumes and dwell times, to assess capacity along both the outer and inner curbs. The outer curb primarily serves buses, rental car shuttles, and transportation network companies, while the inner curb generally accommodates private vehicles and taxis, with informal separation between arrival and departure activity.

ii. Andrew B. reported that the outer curb shows sufficient capacity under existing conditions and through the 2044 forecast horizon. On the inner curb, arrival areas are expected to maintain adequate capacity due to activity being distributed across two locations. However, the shorter departure curb may experience delays by 2044 if peak hour volumes increase as projected. In the long term, this could result in operational inefficiencies such as vehicles using a second lane for passengers drop off during busy periods, although near and midterm conditions are expected to remain acceptable.

6. Facility Requirements: Terminal

a. Check-In Lobby

i. Kyle Wang (Kyle W.) reported that the check in lobby analysis, based on peak hour departing passengers by airline and assumptions regarding the distribution of check in activity across full service counters, self-service kiosks, bag drop, and curbside check in, indicates that existing space is adequate to meet demand for the three design years evaluated. He noted, however, that there are operational inefficiencies in the current layout, and these assumptions and space needs will be reassessed during the alternatives development phase.

b. Security Screening Checkpoint

i. Kyle W. reported that the security screening checkpoint analysis evaluated peak hour departing passengers from the design day flight schedule, incorporating assumptions for TSA PreCheck participation, future screening equipment with higher throughput, and a maximum passenger wait time of 10 minutes. Based on these factors, the checkpoint is projected to be adequate for the future planning years. He noted that space requirements will be further validated during the alternatives development phase.

c. Holdrooms

i. Kyle W. reported that holdroom requirements were developed based on the design day flight schedule and a gate utilization analysis. By 2044, the airport is projected to require 11 ADG III narrow body gates and four ADG V wide body gates to accommodate demand. Using the recommended hold room area guidelines for ADG III and ADG V aircraft and applying assumptions including a 90 percent load factor and a 70 percent seated to standing ratio, the analysis incorporated space for boarding, service podiums, and circulation. He noted that the existing holdroom space is significantly undersized and will not adequately accommodate future demand.

d. Concession

i. Kyle W. explained that concession space requirements were calculated based on annual enplaned passengers and a planning metric of concession area per 1,000 enplaned passengers. The airport currently provides approximately 14,000 square feet of concession space, while projections indicate that about 37,000 square feet, including storage areas, will be required by 2044 to meet future demand.

7. **Facility Requirements: Air Cargo**
   - **a.** Andy G. explained that air cargo facility requirements were developed using ACRP Report 143, which provides planning ratios linking annual cargo tonnage to required building and apron space. The analysis focused on both all-cargo carriers that provide airport to airport service and integrated express carriers that offer door to door service, such as UPS, FedEx, and Amazon. Annual tonnage projections were based on the FAA approved aviation activity forecast. Existing facilities at KOA include approximately 35,000 square yards of apron space and about 55,250 square feet of building space dedicated to cargo operations.
   - **b.** Andy G. reported that current baseline requirements for 2024 already exceed available apron capacity, with a need for approximately 48,900 square yards for apron and ground support equipment storage and about 8,200 square feet of building space. He noted that these deficiencies are expected to grow significantly by 2044 if no expansion occurs. The team will incorporate these findings into the alternatives development phase to ensure sufficient space is planned to accommodate future cargo demand at KOA.
8. **Facility Requirements: General Aviation**
   - **a.** Ken P. concluded the facility requirements overview with a summary of general aviation needs, beginning with existing conditions that include T hangars, shade ports, and tie downs. Hangar requirements were evaluated based on the number of based aircraft in the FAA approved forecast, which projects growth from 50 aircraft in 2025 to 57 in the planning horizon. Given current inventory and an existing wait list for T hangars, the analysis identified deficiencies in both hangar and shade port capacity. These findings will inform alternatives that consider where and how additional hangar facilities can be developed to meet future demand.
   - **b.** Ken P. also reviewed fixed base operator requirements, noting that KOA is served by three FBOs: Atlantic Aviation, Signature Aviation, and Big Island Jet Center. FBO space needs are primarily driven by transient itinerant operations, such as corporate jets requiring apron parking and fueling services. The team evaluated peak month and peak day demand to assess apron, terminal, and landside parking requirements and identified existing deficiencies, particularly in apron parking during peak periods. These constraints, which were also highlighted during stakeholder outreach, will be addressed in the alternatives analysis to ensure adequate FBO facilities throughout the planning horizon.
9. **Market Assessment Initial Findings**
   - **a.** Daniel Nahoopii (Daniel N.) of JLL introduced his team's role in evaluating non aeronautical development opportunities on airport lands, including areas west of the highway and extending north toward Kekaha Kai. He explained that the work focuses on a strategic assessment of market demand for tourism related and commercial uses, benchmarking peer airports, identifying feasible development scenarios, and aligning opportunities with regulatory, environmental, and community considerations. Phase one efforts have included reviewing planning documents, economic development strategies, nearby projects such as those in NELHA and

Palamanui, and analyzing demographic, economic, workforce, retail spending, and tourism trends, including the hotel development pipeline.

b. He stated that the team is currently assessing demand for key sectors including retail, hotel, commercial, and industrial uses, while continuing stakeholder engagement to understand unmet needs, infrastructure constraints such as water resources, and measures of success. Preliminary findings emphasize that future development must demonstrate clear economic benefits such as revenue generation and job creation, while also providing tangible community benefits. He noted that zoning and land use constraints, particularly conservation designations on portions of the site, limit certain development options and require strong justification and alignment with state initiatives to advance funding and land use approvals.

c. Daniel N. outlined a phased development approach for inclusion in the Master Plan. Short term opportunities would focus on uses consistent with current zoning and existing infrastructure, such as airport supporting commercial and industrial space. Midterm opportunities may require minor regulatory adjustments and could include a hotel in allowable areas, energy related uses such as battery storage or hydrogen production, an education and innovation center, supporting retail, and potentially workforce or student housing where permitted. Long term concepts could involve more complex infrastructure or land use changes, including expanded hospitality closer to the highway, regional park amenities, or convention and event space, depending on community support and infrastructure feasibility.

d. He also described the benchmarking analysis of 11 comparable airports selected based on criteria such as tourism driven economies, origin and destination traffic, year-round demand, affluent visitor profiles, geographic isolation, and similar governance structures. Initial observations indicate a mix of visitor services, hospitality, commercial and industrial uses, and logistics related development at peer airports. These insights will inform recommended development scenarios and implementation strategies. Daniel N. concluded by inviting stakeholder input on desired outcomes and additional considerations to guide the non-aeronautical development strategy.

10. Other Questions and Comments:

a. **Commenter:** Kimberly Evans, Community Planner, FAA Honolulu Airports District Office
Comment: "Please include this RIM mitigation discussion in the Master Plan document."
Response: Ken P. responded that the project team will include the RIM criteria evaluation in the final Master Plan document.

b. **Commenter:** Steven Benson, Turo
Question: "With plans to expand parking - are there any plans to add parking stall indicators (numbered parking stalls) to help airport customers find their vehicle?"
Response: Andrew B. responded that the project team will explore the technology during the alternative development phase.

c. **Commenter:** Sharon Hurd, Chairperson, Hawaii Department of Agriculture
Comment:

i. "Greatly appreciate the consideration for additional cargo space - it is expected that agriculture operations will increase, and international exports will result."

ii. She also noted that airlines and airline representatives are aware of the plan and have been discussing it through airline committee coordination. She

stated that several freight forwarders have already expressed interest in a proposed north cargo facility and emphasized the importance of including cargo carriers and freight forwarders in future planning discussions. She also highlighted the proximity of NELHA operations to KOA and noted that shipments from the area are expected to support both international and domestic cargo activity.

Response: Ford Fuchigami (Ford F.), the Airport Administrator at the Hawaii Department of Transportation (HDOT), commented that cargo inspections at KOA are currently conducted outside the building, which creates operational challenges due to exposure to outdoor conditions. He suggested that a dedicated indoor facility for inspections by the United States Department of Agriculture and the Hawaii Department of Agriculture and Biosecurity could improve the process. He added that coordination with freight forwarders and industry stakeholders will be important to determine facility needs and requirements and encouraged continued input from the project team and stakeholders to help support future planning efforts.

d. Commenter: Kimberly Evans, FAA Honolulu Airports District Office

Comment: "I want to let you know that we at the ADO want to have a discussion with you about the second runway. I did look at your base forecast and the 60% ASV numbers, so we would just want to go over that a little bit more with you to help you with the justification and the future planning of that."

Response: Ken P. responded that the project team will schedule a separate meeting between HDOT, the project team, and the FAA to discuss the second runway focus study and the ASV calculations.

e. Commenter: David Blancett-Madddock (David B.-M.)

Comment: David B.-M. noted the importance of considering KOA's geographic isolation and limited diversion options when evaluating the need for a second runway. He also referenced considerations related to passenger accommodation and infrastructure during inclement weather or operational disruptions. Additional observations included general aviation operational needs such as aircraft wash facilities, fueling options, and maintenance space. He also shared perspectives related to parking conditions and alternative vehicle rental activity and emphasized the importance of carefully evaluating future land uses to ensure airport lands continue to support aviation related needs and potential future technologies.

Response: Ken P. noted that additional feedback could be submitted directly to the project team or through the project website. He stated that general aviation topics and other operational considerations raised during the discussion will be examined in greater detail during the alternatives development phase, explaining that the current presentation was intended to focus on higher level facility requirements rather than detailed evaluations.

Name	Organization
Anna Kelly	AEC Consulting
Llewellyn Fukui	Allied Universal
Jonathan Messerer	American Airlines
Nathan Kam	Anthology Group
Ed Ilagan	AvAirPros
Jeff Tarpey	AvAirPros
Aaron Schwarzkopf	Avis Budget Group
Bryce Yoshikawa	Bowers + Kubota Consulting
Emma Brown	Bowers + Kubota Consulting
Alan Thompson	County of Hawaii (COH), Department of Public Works
Ryan Quitoriano	County of Hawaii (COH), Department of Water Supply
Shari Uyeno	County of Hawaii (COH), Department of Water Supply
Blaine Peters	Delta Air Lines
Kimberly Evans	Federal Aviation Administration (FAA)
Renee Ellorda	Federal Aviation Administration (FAA)
William Pettit	Federal Express (FedEx) Corporation
Sharon Hurd	Hawaii Department of Agriculture (DOA)
Chauncey Wong Yuen	Hawaii Department of Transportation (HDOT), Airports
Craig Bisgard	Hawaii Department of Transportation (HDOT), Airports
Curt Otaguro	Hawaii Department of Transportation (HDOT), Airports
Cy Duvauchelle	Hawaii Department of Transportation (HDOT), Airports
Ford Fuchigami	Hawaii Department of Transportation (HDOT), Airports
Francis Ryan G Aguinaldo	Hawaii Department of Transportation (HDOT), Airports
Nathan Kaneshige	Hawaii Department of Transportation (HDOT), Airports
Paul Knoll	Hawaii Department of Transportation (HDOT), Airports
Traci Lum	Hawaii Department of Transportation (HDOT), Airports
Daniel Collins	Hawaiian Airlines
Keoho Kitashima	Hawaiian Airlines
Marie Guzman	Hertz Corporation
Morgan Williams	Hertz Corporation
Seward Akahi	Hertz Corporation
Andrew Blaisdell	HNTB
Andy Guan	HNTB
Justin Bychek	HNTB
Ken Poon	HNTB
Annie Satin	JLL
Daniel Nahoopii	JLL
David Blancett-Maddock	Kona General Aviation Committee (KGAC)
Kyle Wang	KYA Inc.
Brice Allen	Signature Aviation
Ramon Calderon	SIXT
David Sellers	Southwest Airlines
Eric Mitsuyoshi	Transportation Security Administration (TSA)
Steven Benson	Turo
Daniel Yang	United States Postal Service (USPS)
Fredlene Nahale	United States Postal Service (USPS)