



## Meeting Notes

Reynolds, Smith and Hills, Inc.

---

**Date of Meeting:** November 17, 2004

**Location:** City Hall, Council Chamber St. Marys, Georgia

**Subject:** Community Advisory Committee Meeting

**In Attendance**

- Bill Shanahan, City Manager, St. Marys
- Mark McAnaw – Woodbine City Council
- W. Burford Clark – Woodbine, Mayor
- Walt Yourstone – Camden Partnership
- Mike McKinnon – CO, Kings Bay Naval Base
- Cecily Hill – State Representative (District 180)
- David Rainer – Camden County Administrator
- Bob Noble – Executive Director (Joint Development Authority)
- Richard Russell – St. Marys Airport Authority
- Brian Reed – RS&H
- Bill Sandifer – RS&H
- Russ Owen – RS&H

---

The following is a summary of the meeting that took place with the members of the Community Advisory Committee for the Airport Feasibility & Site Selection Study for the City of St. Marys. The primary purpose of the meeting was to discuss some potential sites that were analyzed by Reynolds, Smith & Hills. Furthermore, this meeting was to discuss the First Working Paper and any changes needed. This meeting was intended to explain to the committee how Reynolds, Smith & Hills arrived at the proposed sites.

The meeting began with a brief introduction of consultant team members. The role of this committee is to provide guidance to the consultant team as it pertains to the political issues, public support and implementation of the final product of the Study. This committee will also help the RS&H team develop screening criteria to be used in the site selection process. The overall completion of the project, from site selection to opening of the new facility, is approximately 3 to 5 years. It was discussed that the website for the City now has a link on the homepage, to take you to a project site which will contain various information available to the public concerning the project such as meeting minutes, presentations, graphics boards, pictures, agenda's, and other various project documents.

Mr. Sandifer gave a brief history and its origins. The original ownership of the airport was discussed. Mr. Sandifer proceeded to discuss the current constraints of the current airport, eg, Instrument approach capability, Runway Length and Airspace constraints. During this discussion, it was noted that the current airport could alleviate many of the constraints, but will never alleviate the Airspace constraint. The current airport will always be constrained by airspace and most likely on the landside. This is the reason why a relocated airport is in the best interest of the community.

A discussion of Economic Activity and what the St. Marys Airport Economic Assessment Chapter of the Working Paper concluded. Mr. Yourstone asked if the economic analysis was independent of location, which Mr. Sandifer stated it was. Moreover, this shows that the airport will be an economic generator regardless of location in the county. It was stated that the airport with the constraints will continue to add economic activity, but will not be utilized to its highest degree since the airport will not be able to grow. Mr. Sandifer then discussed the Replacement Airport Development Costs. Most of the items associated with the new airport will be available for federal and state funding. Mr. Ratigan stated that GDOT could help in funding for Land Acquisition if federal bonds come through. Also, it was stated that the federal government funds hangars, but this is a very low priority. Hangar/Storage funding will most likely come from private investors and the local share. Mr. Sandifer explained that much of the work currently being done is through In-Kind services, which can be counted towards the local share.

The next discussion was focused on the Future Airport's Governance structure. There are many ways to operate and own an airport. Since the last meeting, RS&H and the committee focused on the Camden County Joint Development Authority as the sponsor (owner) of the airport. Mr. Sandifer believes that the city attorneys and the JDA attorney need to get together to see if the ownership is possible for the JDA. There was some discussion that the FAA Southern Region is enforcing a regulation that an airport sponsor (owner) must have taxation capabilities. Mr. Reed believes that there is no regulation for this to happen, RS&H will contact the FAA and find out what the regulations are in conjunction with taxation and ownership of airports. Mr. Shanahan will check on the legal authority of the JDA having governance capabilities over an airport. Mr. Sandifer said he would talk to Mr. Serrit (FAA in Atlanta) about the taxation question.

Mr. Sandifer discussed the future airport dimensions and stated that the current area that RS&H believes is prudent is 410 Acres. These dimensions will be able to support a 5,000-foot runway as well as include both of the Runway Protection Zones (RPZ) and future development. Most likely, the airport will be a one runway configuration.

Mr. Sandifer then discussed the Screening Criteria, showed the entire county and explained how RS&H narrowed the county down to the Revised Study Area by using the criteria set forth by the committee in the first meeting, eg. Transportation Corridors, Population Centers, Airspace Constraints, etc. Each site was then discussed and everyone agreed that Site 1, should be selected for further analysis. It was agreed that Site 2 was landlocked and should not be included for further analysis. Site 3 was a good site and will be included for further analysis. Mr. Shanahan believes that Sea Island might own the property. All agreed that Site 4 was boxed in and would be difficult to use. Site 5 has no rail access and was not included in further analysis. Site 6,7,8 and 9 have good access to US 40, but 6 and 7 are too close to an obstruction while 9 will be

included for further analysis. It was stated that US 40 is the highway of the future in Camden County, so the closer we can get to the Highway the better for future use of the airport. Ms. Hill stated that there might be a possibility of a new interchange at I-95 and Billyville Rd.

Mr. Noble, stated that he would like to be present when RS&H meets property owners. He explained that he has knowledge of a 10/31 exchange for property and that some owners might like to consider that alternative. Mr. Noble also wanted clarification on the Wetland Issues, and Mr. Sandifer said that when we get to one property and wetland issues, Mr. Noble can help resolve any discrepancies.

It was concluded that RS&H will conduct further analysis of Sites 1, 3 and 9. Two alternatives might be selected. The updated project schedule was discussed, and the following date of January 5 for the third and final meeting might get pushed back a couple of weeks, due to the possibility of not getting on the Sites for further analysis, quickly. RS&H will supply the committee members with working papers a week before the meeting and Mr. Sandifer will contact the committee members in case of date change for the Third Meeting.

Mr. Sandifer thanked everyone for meeting, and the meeting was adjourned at 6:55 PM.

Meeting Notes by Owen