

Project Name

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

Date of Meeting

June 10, 2026



HNTB Project #

87606

Location

MS Teams

Purpose of Meeting

PAC/TAC Combined
Meeting #4

Time

10:30 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.) opened the fourth 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 welcomed attendees and expressed appreciation for their continued participation, emphasizing that the Master Plan serves as a comprehensive framework for guiding the airport's long-term development in alignment with projected aviation demand. He reiterated that the combined PAC and TAC meetings are a critical component of the planning process and are intended to keep stakeholders informed, provide opportunities for coordination, and gather feedback to implement into the ongoing analysis and decision-making. Curt O. noted that the project is currently in Phase 3, during which the project team has developed a series of preliminary alternatives based on the facility requirements and analysis presented in prior meetings.
- b. Ken Poon (Ken P.), the consultant project manager, introduced the agenda and noted that the meeting would begin with a refresher on the Master Plan objectives and a high-level overview of the project development process. He explained that the primary focus of the meeting would be a more detailed walkthrough of each alternative, followed by a discussion of how those alternatives will be consolidated into a smaller set of concepts for further evaluation. He added that the meeting would conclude with a discussion of next steps, including the logistics for the third Community Informational Meeting.

2. Master Plan Objectives and Development Process

- a. Ken P. provided a refresher on the Master Plan objectives, noting that these objectives were developed early in the process and serve as the framework for evaluating all alternatives presented at this stage. He summarized that these include providing additional airport access, modernizing the terminal, integrating a "right-sized" second runway, enhancing safety across both fixed-wing and rotary-wing operations, and supporting the development of airport lands and infrastructure. He explained that these objectives are directly tied to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA)-approved aviation activity forecast and facility requirements presented at the previous PAC and TAC meeting, and that each alternative has been designed to meet these requirements.

- b. Ken P. reviewed the project development process, explaining that the Master Plan represents the first phase in a longer sequence of implementation steps. He noted that once a preferred alternative is identified, it needs to proceed through concept refinement, followed by environmental review under both the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the Hawaii Environmental Policy Act (HEPA), which evaluate potential environmental impacts. Following environmental clearance, projects will proceed to design, permitting, and construction. He emphasized that the team is currently at an early planning stage and that additional analysis, stakeholder coordination, and regulatory review will occur before any project advances toward implementation.

3. Landside Alternatives

- a. Andrew Blaisdell (Andrew B.) from HNTB presented three landside alternatives focused on improving airport access, internal circulation, and accommodating projected growth in parking and rental car activity. He explained that a key driver for all alternatives is the existing condition of a single primary access point via Keahole Airport Road, which creates limitations in both operational efficiency and flow during peak activity or disruptions. He noted that the alternatives are intended to introduce redundant second access to the airport, improve circulation patterns within the site, and separate different types of traffic (personal vehicles, rental cars, commercial traffic, etc.). Andrew B. reported that landside planning assumptions are based on projected growth consistent with the FAA-approved Aviation Activity Forecast, including approximately a 10 to 15 percent increase in parking demand and an approximated 15 to 20 percent increase in rental car facility needs. He explained that each alternative accommodates this growth while exploring different strategies for roadway layout, parking placement, and rental car operations.
- b. For Landside Alternative 1, Andrew B. explained that the concept introduces a new northern access roadway connecting directly to Queen Kaahumanu Highway, providing a second entry and exit point to the airport, improving overall operational flow, and increasing resiliency. This alternative also includes a parallel roadway to support circulation between access points and adjacent land development. A key feature of this alternative is the introduction of a consolidated rental car facility (ConRAC), which centralizes rental car operations into a single Customer Service Building (CSB) with adjacent Quick Turn Areas (QTAs) serving the three rental car family brands. This configuration allows for a consolidated bus shuttle system rather than multiple independent shuttles, which will improve efficiency and passenger wayfinding at the curbside. The alternative also introduces expanded parking areas and a cell phone waiting lot to reduce curbside congestion and improve traffic flow near the terminal.
- c. For Landside Alternative 2, Andrew B. described a concept that builds on existing infrastructure, along the southern portion of the airport near Paoo Street, particularly utilizing the recent work completed near the gas station. He explained that this alternative creates a looped system that allows vehicles to enter and exit through a connected roadway system. The rental car facilities remain generally in their existing location but are expanded to meet the projected demand. He emphasized that this approach minimizes new infrastructure while improving access and circulation and allows for expanded parking areas within walking distance of the terminal. Andrew B. noted that this alternative also avoids cultural constraints that are present in the middle of the site.
- d. For Landside Alternative 3, Andrew B. described a more integrated approach that combines a northern access point with a relocated ConRAC positioned closer to the

terminal. He explained that a key feature of this alternative is the introduction of a walkable connection between the terminal and the rental car facility, which will reduce reliance on shuttle buses. This concept requires modifications to existing circulation patterns, including restricting portions of Pao Street for rental car operations and introducing new internal roadway connections to maintain access for other users. Andrew B. noted that this alternative prioritizes passenger convenience and reduced shuttle traffic but would require more significant modifications to existing landside infrastructure.

- e. Andrew B. emphasized that all three alternatives meet the same underlying objectives but represent a range of approaches, from incremental improvements to more transformative changes, and will be evaluated further based on operational performance, cost considerations, and stakeholder input.

4. Terminal Alternatives

- a. Kyle Wang (Kyle W.) presented the terminal alternatives, prefacing that all alternatives are based on the facility requirements analysis, which established a need to accommodate 11 Airplane Design Group (ADG) III (narrow-body) gates and 4 ADG V (wide-body) gates within the planning horizon. He explained that these requirements were derived from the forecast passenger aircraft fleet mix and the FAA-approved Aviation Activity Forecast and form the baseline for evaluating the terminal alternatives. Kyle W. noted that while several terminal functions, such as check-in and security screening, are projected to be adequate in terms of capacity, the existing layout presents operational inefficiencies. In addition, he noted the holdroom areas as significantly undersized, creating passenger circulation constraints and limiting the ability to accommodate simultaneous boarding operations.
- b. Kyle W. presented the first alternative, which expands the existing terminal to both the north and south, while maintaining a single-level configuration. He described how this option rebalances aircraft parking positions and introduces improvements to circulation/operational flow. The design also introduces a new taxiway in front of the terminal building to mitigate aircraft pushback conflicts onto Taxiway A, which is a current operational issue. For terminal alternative 2A, he described an expansion entirely to the north side of the existing terminal. Kyle W. explained that this configuration consolidates new development in one direction and leaves room for potential future expansion beyond the 2044 planning horizon, which was represented conceptually in the layout with a dashed line. Kyle W. then presented terminal alternative 2B, which involves the same north expansion concept, developed into a two-story configuration, along with passenger circulation and holdrooms being located above back-of-house functions. He explained this arrangement may improve operational efficiency by separating functions vertically, though it introduces additional complexity in circulation and design.
- c. Kyle W. also discussed the introduction of Multiple Aircraft Ramp System (MARS) gates, which is an apron space that allows flexibility for either a single wide-body aircraft or two narrow-body aircraft at the same position. He explained a benefit of this approach is that it provides adaptability in aircraft fleet mix and gate utilization. A terminal alternative 3 was also described, which introduced the possibility of construction of a new replacement terminal facility, shifting away from the existing layout entirely. He noted that this option represents a more intense planning and design approach and would involve different phasing considerations.

5. Second Runway Alternatives

- a. Ken P. presented the second runway alternatives, noting that the analysis focused on defining a runway that accommodates projected demand, and improves operational flexibility, while meeting FAA design standards. He noted that all alternatives assume a runway length of approximately 7,500 feet and a width of 150 feet, based on analysis of aircraft performance, route structure, and operational requirements, including evaluation of both takeoff and landing length required under wet pavement conditions. Ken P. described the similarities of all the alternatives evaluating different configurations for locating a parallel runway on the ocean side of the existing Runway 17-35, with the key differences being related to runway separation distance, alignment, and accompanying taxiway system. He explained that one alternative applies an 800-foot lateral offset, representing a minimum configuration based on runway-to-taxiway separation requirements, while the other alternatives apply an 1,200-foot runway centerline separation, consistent with FAA Advisory Circular 150/5300-13B recommendations for ADG V runways. He noted that the 1,200-foot spacing allows for improved accommodation of required safety areas, including the Runway Object Free Area (ROFA) and Taxiway Object Free Area (TOFA), and provides greater flexibility for placement of navigational aids and supporting infrastructure.
- b. Ken P. also described how each concept includes variations in how the paired taxiway system is arranged in relation to the existing and proposed runways. He reported that taxiway crossings are intentionally located outside of the FAA-defined runway high-energy zone (middle third of the runway) to reduce the potential severity of an aircraft incident. He explained that the alternatives were evaluated using runway occupancy time (ROT) analysis to assess operational efficiency, using “fuselage out” conditions to measure when aircraft fully clear the runway. Ken P. reported that under existing conditions, the ROT is approximately 69 seconds for arrivals on Runway 17 and approximately 88.6 seconds for Runway 35. He explained that the proposed alternatives provide minimal improvements to the ROT of the existing runway, while the proposed second runway ROT values fall in the range of approximately 54 to 56 seconds, with optimized runway exit placement. He also noted that some alternatives include staggering the runway ends by 800 feet, due to Runway 17 accounting for approximately 74 percent of operations of Runway 17-35, while others align runway ends, stating that this is to provide improved visual cues and clarity for pilots. Ken P. emphasized that runway and taxiway geometry will be evaluated in coordination with the broader airfield and terminal alternatives and that design refinements will continue throughout planning phases.

6. Additional Airfield Improvements

a. Taxiway Edge Safety Margin (TESM)

- i. Ken P. summarized the Taxiway Edge Safety Margin (TESM) analysis conducted as part of the airfield evaluation, noting that the assessment was based on both the existing and future critical design aircraft, which is the Boeing 777-200 and Boeing 787-9 Dreamliner, respectively, leading to accounting for Taxiway Design Group (TDG) 5 aircraft. He explained that TESM deficiencies were identified using AviPlan simulating, finding multiple deficient locations, especially in areas where aircraft operating along the taxiway centerline do not maintain the required separation between the centerline and the taxiway edge.
- ii. Ken P. explained that the alternatives incorporate targeted mitigation strategies to address the most critical TESM deficiencies, particularly along

Taxiway A5, Taxiway A3, and Taxilane Bravo North. He described how these improvements generally involve modifications to taxiway geometry, such as adjusting fillet radii or pavement width, to better accommodate aircraft turning movements. He also noted that in some locations, particularly near the terminal expansion areas, potential changes to taxiway alignment may be influenced by the selected terminal alternative, where certain taxiway segments may be reconfigured, relocated, or removed entirely depending on future development.

7. Air Cargo Alternatives

- a. Andy Guan (Andy G.) presented the air cargo alternatives, explaining that they were developed to address both existing deficiencies and projected growth in cargo demand identified during the facility requirements phase. He reported that the current air cargo facilities do not provide sufficient space to meet existing and projected demand, particularly with the apron space, cargo processing areas, and ground service equipment (GSE) storage. He explained that due to this, the air cargo alternatives are intended to expand operational capacity while also accommodating future infrastructure needs, including potential electrification of GSE. He also noted that the study area generally matches that of the previous Master Plan, located north of the airport traffic control tower (ATCT), and that development concepts were designed to avoid impacts to critical existing infrastructure, including the wastewater treatment plant, ATCT, and the aircraft rescue and firefighting (ARFF) station.
- b. Andy G. explained that since the previous PAC and TAC meeting, the project team met with Chairperson Sharon Hurd and representatives from the Hawaii Department of Agriculture and Biosecurity (DAB) to understand cargo inspection and processing needs. He explained that based on this, the alternatives incorporate a transition facility with cold storage capabilities, which is intended to support the inspection process for perishable goods, which is the majority of cargo moving through KOA.
- c. Andy G. stated that three alternatives were developed, differing primarily in apron layout and taxilane configuration relative to Taxiway A, which in turn influences aircraft circulation and operational flexibility. He explained the first alternative consists of a linear air cargo layout, with a taxilane running parallel to Taxiway A and aircraft parking positions along the apron taxilane. The second alternative that he presented includes an L-shaped configuration, with two taxilanes connecting to the apron, one parallel to Taxiway A, and one perpendicular, which allows aircraft to access parking positions from multiple directions and provides increased flexibility in circulation within the cargo area. He showed the third alternative, which includes parallel taxilanes that are perpendicular to Taxiway A.
- d. Andy G. noted how all three alternatives contain the same number of aircraft parking positions, including positions to accommodate ADG II feeder aircraft, as well as ADGs III, IV, and V aircraft, along with a flexible ADG VI position to accommodate occasional larger aircraft operations. He explained that accommodation for ADG VI aircraft includes adjustments within the taxilane alignment to meet the increased wingtip clearance requirements without having to overbuild.

8. General Aviation and Fixed-Based Operations Alternatives

- a. Ken P. presented the general aviation (GA) and fixed base operator (FBO) alternatives, noting that three concepts were developed to address identified deficiencies in apron and ramp space, particularly for corporate aviation operations, and to accommodate projected demand. He explained that objectives include providing sufficient facilities to meet future GA and FBO aviation activity, incorporating additional GA support facilities, and protecting the Hawaii Fueling

Facilities Corporation (HFFC) fuel farm expansion area, which is located between the existing Signature and Atlantic FBO sites. He also emphasized utilizing recent improvements such as the relocated GA apron adjacent to Pao Street, and accounting for the near-term FBO expansion project. He noted that these considerations are reflected across all alternatives.

- b. Ken P. described that the first alternative introduces additional T-hangars, shaded parking structures, and tie-down positions to accommodate projected demand. He noted that a designated GA support area is provided adjacent to Pao Street, and that an apron expansion is also introduced on the western side near Ramp K, supported by the relocation of air cargo facilities to the north. He explained that the taxilane system in this configuration maintains Taxilane Bravo South as ADG III capable, while the adjacent taxilane near the commuter terminal transitions from ADG III to ADG II toward the north. He noted that ADG III aircraft exiting the FBO apron would need to route via Ramp K to access Taxiway A, and that this approach allows additional space to be allocated toward the commuter terminal and airline support areas by having reduced ADG taxilane object free area (TLOFA) requirements.
- c. Ken P. described that the second alternative introduces changes to the GA expansion area and taxilane system to improve flexibility. He noted that the arrangement of T-hangars and shaded structures is flipped, with tie-down positions relocated to the north, allowing those areas to be converted to additional hangar development if future demand warrants. He explained that the taxilane system on the western portion is modified to remain ADG III capable throughout, eliminating the transition to ADG II and allowing ADG III aircraft to circulate more freely between Taxilane Delta to the north and Ramp K to the south. He noted that this improves operational flexibility and circulation within the GA/FBO area, but results in a larger ADG TLOFA footprint, which reduces the amount of space available for commuter terminal expansion and airline support functions.
- d. Ken P. described that the third configuration modifies the taxilane system to enhance operational flexibility by removing the taxilane closest to the commuter terminal and FBO apron, allowing for additional apron expansion. He noted that aircraft circulation is instead accommodated through perpendicular taxilane connections to Taxilane Bravo South, which in this scenario is upgraded to be ADG V capable, consistent with Taxiway A. He explained that providing ADG V capability in this area improves aircraft movement and air traffic management, while also creating additional apron space for the commuter terminal and airline support areas. He noted that this configuration provides greater flexibility for accommodating a wider range of aircraft within the GA/FBO area.

9. Helicopter Facilities Alternatives

- a. Andy G. presented the helicopter facilities alternatives, noting that existing helicopter operations contribute to two FAA-designated hot spots on the airfield. He explained that a hot spot is a location within the airfield movement area where there is an increased risk of safety incidents and where pilots and air traffic control must maintain heightened awareness. He noted that the two identified hot spots are located at the intersections of Taxiway A and Ramp K, and Taxiway A and Taxiway A5, and that both are associated with the interaction between helicopter and fixed-wing operations. He stated that feedback from stakeholders throughout the planning process has consistently identified the operational complexity created by this mix of aircraft types as an issue to be addressed.
- b. Andy G. described that the primary mitigation strategy evaluated in the alternatives is the relocation of helicopter operations outside of the main airfield movement area.

He noted that, as in the previous Master Plan, a site northeast of Runway 17 was identified as a suitable location, adjacent to the existing northern boundary of the helicopter's north practice area. He explained that accommodating visual flight rule (VFR) helicopter approach and departure surfaces requires a total lateral dimension of approximately 4,000 feet, and that in order to meet this requirement, the northern boundary of the practice area is shifted approximately 3,550 feet to the south, as reflected in the alternatives.

- c. Andy G. presented alternative 1, that includes a single helipad for takeoff and landing, along with 11 helicopter parking positions and 10 shade ports or hangar structures to house helicopters. He noted that this concept also includes one multi-purpose building, which could accommodate terminal-related functions or administrative office space. He explained that this configuration provides the core components needed to support relocated helicopter operations while addressing the identified hot spot conditions.
- d. Andy G. then described alternative 2, that expands on this configuration by introducing two helipads, allowing for simultaneous takeoff and landing operations and improving overall operational flexibility. He noted that this concept includes 12 helicopter parking positions and nine shade ports or hangar structures, along with two multi-purpose buildings that provide additional space for terminal or administrative functions. He explained that the additional helipad and support facilities allow for increased capacity and more efficient helicopter circulation within the site.
- e. Andy G. noted that both alternatives include a dedicated public access road connecting the facility to Queen Kaahumanu Highway, providing landside access to the relocated helicopter area. He also noted that, although not shown in the primary graphics, both alternatives include the opportunity for a dedicated service road connection to the main airport campus, which would allow for airside support functions such as fuel truck access. He stated that both alternatives are intended to remove helicopter operations from Taxiway A, reducing operational complexity and addressing the existing airfield hot spots while maintaining flexibility for future operations.

10. Land Use Alternatives

- a. Daniel Nahoopii (Daniel N.) presented the land use alternatives, explaining that they were developed to support airport operations, generate non-aeronautical revenue, and reflect input received from stakeholder engagement. He noted that evaluation criteria included economic benefit, compatibility with airport functions, consistency with the Kona Community Development Plan, and environmental and cultural considerations. He emphasized that infrastructure availability and access—particularly from Queen Kaahumanu Highway, Paoo Street, and Road M—are key factors influencing how development could occur over time, and that implementation would likely be phased as supporting infrastructure is expanded.
- b. Daniel N. first described a scenario focused on uses that could be accommodated within existing conditions. This approach includes airport-supportive office space and a fire training facility, generally located in areas that can be served by existing access and utilities. He noted that these uses are relatively low intensity and are intended to support airport operations directly, allowing development to occur incrementally without the need for significant changes to roadway networks or land use re-designations.
- c. He then described a second scenario that introduces additional development intensity while remaining generally consistent with established access corridors.

This concept includes a limited-service hotel, as well as light industrial, logistics, and warehouse uses, particularly in areas accessible from Paoo Street and Road M. These uses are intended to complement airport-related activity, including proximity to air cargo operations, while also providing new revenue-generating opportunities. Daniel N. noted that this approach reflects a moderate increase in development and may require targeted infrastructure improvements to support expanded activity.

- d. Lastly, Daniel N. described a more intensive, longer-term development scenario that builds on improved access and visibility along Queen Kaahumanu Highway. This concept includes a larger full-service hotel site positioned closer to the highway, along with expanded commercial and retail uses intended to serve both airport users and the surrounding community. He noted that this level of development could require more substantial infrastructure investment and potential changes to land use designations, including areas currently zoned for conservation, and would likely occur over a longer timeframe.
- e. Daniel N. emphasized that all land use alternatives are conceptual and intended to illustrate a range of development approaches. He noted that the specific mix and location of uses will continue to be refined in coordination with landside access, infrastructure planning, and ongoing stakeholder input as the Master Plan progresses.

11. Consolidated Alternatives

- a. Ken P. described the approach to consolidating the individual alternatives into three overall concepts that bring together landside, terminal, airfield, and support facility elements. He explained that these are not direct one-to-one combinations of earlier alternatives, but rather coordinated concepts that reflect different levels of change across the airport system. The intent is to show how the various pieces work together and to help compare tradeoffs between more incremental improvements and more comprehensive reconfiguration.
- b. Ken P. introduced the first concept, which generally maintains the existing operating framework, with targeted improvements made across each system. Landside access would continue to rely primarily on Keahole Airport Road, with only minor changes to circulation and rental car facilities remaining largely where they are today. He described that terminal improvements would focus on incremental expansion to meet the 11 ADG III and 4 ADG V gate requirement, without major shifts in overall layout. On the airfield side, the second runway and taxiway system would be introduced in a more limited configuration.
- c. Ken P. presented the second consolidated alternative, which introduces a more balanced set of improvements across the system, with a focus on flexibility and long-term expansion. Landside circulation would be improved through dual access from Queen Kaahumanu Highway and connections from both north and south of Keahole Airport Road. A ConRAC with a consolidated shuttle service would be introduced to improve efficiency. He described that these changes are coordinated with terminal expansion to the north that allows for continued growth over time, along with airfield improvements including a second runway at a 1,200-foot separation and enhanced taxiway connectivity. Ken P. explained that with this option, GA and FBO facilities are reconfigured to improve circulation and reduce operational constraints, particularly in how aircraft move through each area. Overall, Ken P. described this concept as building on existing infrastructure while introducing more system-wide improvements.
- d. Moving onto the third concept, Ken P. explained that this concept reflects a more intense shift in how the airport is organized, with changes across landside, terminal,

and airfield working together. He explained that landside circulation would be restructured, including adjustments to Paoo Street and internal roads, along with a walkable ConRAC located closer to the terminal. The terminal itself would move to a two-level configuration, improving passenger flow and connections between curbside, processing areas, and gates. On the airfield, the second runway and taxiway system would be configured to maximize flexibility, including design that supports more efficient circulation. He described this concept as representing the greatest level of change and investment.

- e. Ken P. noted that all three concepts will continue to be refined as part of the evaluation process, and that elements may be adjusted or combined based on technical findings and stakeholder input as the project moves forward.

12. Next Steps

- a. Ken P. provided an overview of next steps, noting that the project team will continue refining the alternatives and developing consolidated concepts. He also noted that coordination with the Hawaii Department of Transportation (HDOT), along with stakeholder groups will continue as part of this process, while we continue to develop the preferred alternative and the recommended implementation plan. Ken P. highlighted the upcoming Community Informational Meeting (CIM) that is scheduled for June 22, 2026, from 6:00 to 7:30 P.M. HST, at the West Hawaii Civic Center. He explained this meeting will provide an opportunity to share project updates with the public and gather additional input from the community. He noted that the format for this meeting will include presentation materials, poster boards, along with a Q&A session with the team for the public to support discussion and give feedback. Looking ahead, Ken P. mentioned the last remaining PAC and TAC meeting will take place in early fall, at which the preferred alternative will be reviewed as well as the recommended implementation plan. With that, Ken P. opened up the floor for questions.

13. Other Questions and Comments:

- a. **Commenter:** Chauncey Wong Yuen (Chauncey W.)
Comment: Chauncey W. provided several comments regarding the landside alternatives that were presented, inquiring about a possible alternative about connecting the terminal and ConRAC via a rail system, as well as access roads and if the project team can explore other options. He also asked about a cultural analysis to be done on the the airport property related to the landside and land use alternatives and the concerns that will come from the community. Chauncey W. then inquired about potential downsides to a Cell Phone Lot such as revenue diversion.
Response: Ford Fuchigami (Ford F.) from HDOT responded that the project team will explore additional connection options as part of the planning process, noting that at minimum there will be an electric shuttle provided. He also explained that the purpose of the Cell Phone Lot is to serve as a temporary holding area for vehicles to wait until their passengers are ready for pick up, improving curbside circulation and must be provided. Ford F. also noted that Lihue Airport (LIH) will be receiving a ConRAC upgrade prior to KOA. Ken P. noted that the project team will make a note of the landside suggestions and will include this in reviewing and refining alternatives, noting continued analysis as the master plan progresses.
- b. **Commenter:** Chauncey W.
Comment: Chauncey W. inquired about several airside components, starting with the runway length for the proposed second runway. He cited that Japan Airlines does not currently fly to KOA due to previously wanting an 8,600 ft runway. He compared that to the proposed 7,500 ft second runway, suggesting the potential compromise

to be made regarding runway length. Chauncey W. then inquired about whether or not the Master Plan will evaluate noise impacts, noting possible community concerns as well as asking about who is responsible for flight route development. He also provided positive feedback regarding the inclusion of flexible parking positions within the air cargo alternatives, noting the ability to accommodate ADG VI aircraft depending on demand as a benefit.

Response: Ford F. responded that flight routes are not responsibility of the airport or the Master Plan team, but rather the FAA that has authority over the airspace and is currently undergoing an airspace modernization program. He noted that if the public would like to provide feedback on airspace, to reach out through FAA avenues to comment. Ken P. seconded Ford F.'s response regarding the FAA airspace modernization program and directing the public to the correct forums to provide feedback regarding airspace impacts. He also made note that the team will continue to evaluate the suggested length for the second runway.

c. Commenter: Chauncey W.

Comment: Chauncey W. commented that he had heard feedback from the community regarding the format of the previous two CIMs. He stated that the preference of the public is more dialogue between the public and the planning team and questioned if there is a plan to change that in the upcoming meeting.

Response: Ken P. responded that the planning team is changing the format of the upcoming CIM to poster boards, followed by a formal presentation, followed by a Q&A session with the planning team. He noted that this is in an effort to open up the floor to the public and encourage open conversations between the community and the planning team.

d. Commenter: Jeff Weaver

Comment: Jeff Weaver (Jeff W.) provided multiple comments in the meeting chat related to potential amenities within the terminal area, as well as public transit options such as an electric shuttle bus service between the airport and Waikoloa and downtown Kailua Kona. The amenities mentioned included to "add an open-air view deck above TSA with a restaurant, open to the public. Also add a multi-use building to accommodate airline emergency response plans, family reunification, etc."

Response: Ken P. responded, acknowledging the terminal suggestions and stating that the project team will look at the terminal alternatives. Regarding the transit suggestion, he noted that the team will work with HDOT to explore where the bus station will be based on the preferred landside alternative.

Name	Organization
Richie Ly	Air Canada
Antony Tam	Alaska Airlines
Windy Simmons	Alaska Airlines
Charles Nahale	Allied Universal
Llewellyn Fukui	Allied Universal
Carlos Charpenel	Amazon
Brice Fukumoto	American Airlines
Nicholas Read	Atlantic Aviation
Timothy Elliot	Atlantic Aviation
Ed Ilagan	AvAirPros
Perfecto Delmendo	AvAirPros
Tom Owens	Big Island Jet Center
Bryce Yoshikawa	Bowers + Kubota Consulting
Lt Col Robinson	Civil Air Patrol
John J Bagnas	Delta
Carlos Salas	Federal Aviation Administration (FAA)
Gordon Wong	Federal Aviation Administration (FAA)
Kevin H Nishimura	Federal Aviation Administration (FAA)
Rachel K Look	Federal Aviation Administration (FAA)
Andy D Le	Hawaii Department of Transportation (HDOT), Airports
Chauncey Wong Yuen	Hawaii Department of Transportation (HDOT), Airports
Christina F McWhorter	Hawaii Department of Transportation (HDOT), Airports
Curt T Otaguro	Hawaii Department of Transportation (HDOT), Airports
Cy C Duvauchelle	Hawaii Department of Transportation (HDOT), Airports
Emma L Brown	Hawaii Department of Transportation (HDOT), Airports
Ford Fuchigami	Hawaii Department of Transportation (HDOT), Airports
Joshua B Sonson	Hawaii Department of Transportation (HDOT), Airports
Nathan C Kaneshige	Hawaii Department of Transportation (HDOT), Airports
Roger R Ross	Hawaii Department of Transportation (HDOT), Airports
Thomas J Waldman	Hawaii Department of Transportation (HDOT), Airports
Traci H Lum	Hawaii Department of Transportation (HDOT), Airports
Daniel Collins	Hawaiian Airlines
Morgan Williams	Hertz Corporation
Seward E. Akahi	Hertz Corporation
Andrew Blaisdell	HNTB
Andy Guan	HNTB
Bennett Lewis	HNTB
Kasey Boyd	HNTB
Ken Poon	HNTB
Quinn Russell	HNTB
Daniel Nahoopii	JLL
Carol Torigoe	KYA Inc.
David Halloway	KYA Inc.
Kyle Wang	KYA Inc.
Logan Aruga	KYA Inc.
Andy Collaro	Signature Aviation
Brice Allen	Signature Aviation
Drew Clark	Signature Aviation
Eric Hill	Signature Aviation
David Sellers	Southwest Airlines
Steven Perez	Southwest Airlines
Jeff Weaver	United Airlines
Amber R Woody	United States Postal Service (USPS)
Bart Y Kihara	United States Postal Service (USPS)
Chuck Lum	United States Postal Service (USPS)
Eileen F Veach	United States Postal Service (USPS)
Fredlene Nahale	United States Postal Service (USPS)