

MEETING NOTES - DRAFT

Project: Ted Stevens Anchorage International Airport (ANC) Master Plan Update

Location: Coast International Inn, Anchorage

RS&H Project #: 226-2566-000

Date and Time: September 12, 2013; 5:30-8:30 PM

Subject: Public Open House 6

Staff/Agency Attendees:

John Parrott (ANC)
John Johansen (ANC)
Teri Lindseth (ANC)
Katie Gage (ANC)
Mike Lee (ANC)

Katherine Wood (HDR)
Mark Mayo (HDR)
Allison Biastock (HDR)
Jessica Abbott (HDR)
Jessica Conquest (HDR)
Stephanie Bennett (HDR)

Evan Pfahler (RS&H)
Delia Chi (RS&H)
Gareth Hanley (RS&H)

Pat Oien (FAA)

Tom Middendorf (DOWL HKM)

Public Open House Summary:

On Thursday, September 12, 2013, the Ted Stevens Anchorage International Airport (ANC) Master Plan Update hosted its sixth in a series of public open houses. The purpose of this meeting was to provide information on progress to date, share the results of the alternatives analysis, and present the Airport's draft plan for future development. Comments on the draft plan are being collected and used to assist the Master Plan Update team in finalizing the Master Plan. From 5:30-6:15 PM, a public open house featured posters with Master Plan Update information, as well as maps of all four phases of the plan. A presentation was given by Evan Pfahler at 6:15 PM, followed by a Q&A session facilitated by Katherine Wood. The Q&A session ended at approx. 8:36 PM. The meeting was closed at 8:45 PM.

Advertising

- Two Anchorage Daily Newspaper ads (September 1 and 8, 2013)
- Legal notice in the Anchorage Daily News (August 29, 2013)
- Postcard (sent to zip codes 99502, 99503, 99509, 99515, 99517, 99518 = approx. 40,000 addresses)
- E-newsletter to contact list of approximately 950 addresses, including addresses for community council distribution lists
- GovDelivery Notice
- State Online Public Notice
- DOT and Airport website
- Master Plan Update website
- ANC bulletin boards
- Online Advertising: 18,000 impressions on alaskadispatch.com and approximately 50,000 on adn.com. Online ads ran for the seven days preceding the meeting.
- *What's Up* List Serv

At the sign in table, most attendees said they had heard about the meeting via the postcard or email newsletter; some noted they saw the Anchorage Daily News advertisement or heard about the meeting from another organization/word of mouth.

Attendance

86 people signed in to the event. Approximately 2 additional people attended but did not sign in. The sign-in sheets resulted in 34 new email addresses being added to the distribution list.

Media Coverage

KTVA/Channel 11 attended the event, resulting in a media story: <http://www.ktva.com/home/top-stories/Airport-Master-Plan-has-some-residents-concerned-223624731.html>

KTUU/Channel 2 attended the event, resulting in a media story on the September 12 and 13 newscasts (no online copy available).

KYUR/Channel 13 covered the event in a September 16 newscast:
<http://www.youralaskalink.com/news/Anchorage-Airport-Planning-to-Handle-More-Traffic-223928541.html>

Anchorage Daily News covered the event in a September 13 publication:
<http://www.adn.com/2013/09/13/3074157/new-airport-plan-puts-off-new.html>

Alaska Dispatch Reporter Jerzy Shedlock also attended and published a story on September 13:
<http://www.alaskadispatch.com/article/20130913/sluggish-growth-stalls-anchorage-airport-plans-new-runway>.

Stakeholder Organizations Present

- FAA Planning
- AWWU
- Alaska Department of Fish and Game
- Alaska Center for the Environment
- Turnagain Community Council
- Spenard Community Council
- Transportation/cargo businesses
- Nordic Ski Association of Anchorage
- Lake Hood Pilot's Association

Meeting Materials

- Handouts (comment sheets, agenda, fact sheet, and FAQs, comment response report #1 and comment report #2, draft communications plan)
- Main PowerPoint Presentation
- Station posters

Summary of Question and Answer Session (Full Q&A Summary below)

The Q&A session lasted for 90 minutes, during which the Master Plan Update team answered approximately 25 questions.

Comments Received

Ten written comment forms were received. Six comments were received via email following the public open house. These comments will be responded to in the Comment Response Report #3.

Presentations:

Main Presentation

Evan Pfahler gave a PowerPoint presentation that addressed the following:

- an update on project progress to date
- five draft alternatives for future development of the Airport
- the results of the alternatives analysis
- the Airport's draft plan for future development

The presentation lasted approximately 45 minutes. The presentation can be viewed in its entirety here: http://www.ancmasterplan.com/onlinemeeting/files/ANC_MPU_Public_Open_House_Presentation_2013_09_12.pdf

Notes from Question and Answer Session following the PowerPoint presentation:

***Questions and answers below are a synopsis of the meeting's Q&A session following the presentation. When appropriate, Master Plan Update team responses have been supplemented to supply complete responses.*

Comment from public: Thank you for the good presentation. I live in Midtown and when the planes take off on the east/west runways, I have a hard time hearing in my house. Getting rid of the preferential runway [use program] will cause real heartache in our community. You should swap Phases 2 and 3, even if it is only to keep the level of noise down.

Question from public: When is the National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA) process triggered? You need to address off-site impacts, such as increases in traffic at the intersection of International Airport Rd and Arctic Blvd. I am moving to Midtown away from airport noise, and if Phase 2 is implemented, I will be impacted again by airport noise. Your impacts transcend airport boundaries. Those impacts must be addressed.

Answer from the Master Plan Team: The NEPA process for Phases 1 and 2 would likely be conducted following adoption of the Master Plan. However, an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Phase 4 would not occur until the Airport determined implementation of Phase 4 was necessary.

Questions from public: The results of the alternatives analysis for Alternative 4 were bad. Is not Alternative 4 the current preferred alternative for the Airport Master Plan? How did such a bad alternative get by the screening done last time?

Answer from the Master Plan Team: This is the seventh Master Plan that the Airport has undertaken. The last Master Plan was completed in 2002 and it considered alternatives and a multitude of runway locations based on the traffic forecast at that time. At that time, a second closely-space north/south runway (which is the same as the one shown in Alternative 4) was determined to have the least negative impact and the greatest benefit. However, it is important to consider that at that time the last Master Plan was drafted, the type of aircraft used was different and that the peak hour delay was not analyzed in 2002 to the extent it was for this master plan process. We have a better understanding of air carrier needs now, and this process reflects current trends in aircraft use. The closely-spaced runway does not meet the needs of the airlines today. In addition, the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) recently updated their

design standards. The preferred alternative under the previous Master Plan may have been the right decision in 2002. However this was determined to no longer be an ideal alternative due to changing aircraft use, FAA design standards updates, and better analysis of peak congestion conditions at the Airport.

Questions from public: The Airport is a big economic generator. What have you done to coordinate with other boroughs, such as the Mat-Su and Kenai boroughs? Have you reached out to the University of Alaska Anchorage (UAA) to do studies? Have you looked into the resources that may be impacted?

Answer from the Master Plan Team: The Airport and its planning staff have sought input from the Fairbanks Borough at the airport system level, but have not reached out to Mat-Su and Kenai borough representatives. However, the public outreach for the project has been statewide via online media and notification, and planning staff has plans to present at the Chugiak-Eagle River and Palmer Chambers of Commerce. The Airport and its planning staff are actively developing a relationship with the University, and the University had a representative on the Working Group. At this point the University has not been approached to conduct any studies for this project, although University (ISER) studies were used as inputs for the aviation forecast. The Master Plan team has conducted an environmental overview as part of the Master Plan in order to gain a planning level analysis of resources likely to be impacted. It would take a significant amount of resources to implement all four phases of the Master Plan. Such potential impacts would be further explored and assessed during the required NEPA review.

Question from public: Why did the Master Plan team go from an alternatives approach to a phased approach for the Master Plan? Did you look at Kenai Airport as an option for transferring gas-n-go operations? Kenai has a more temperate climate and might be a more palatable location to airlines than Fairbanks International Airport (FAI). I live in Turnagain and I see all alternatives as having the Turnagain neighborhood taking the brunt of environmental impacts. What are you going to do to mitigate these impacts?

Answer from the Master Plan Team: There is no perfect solution under which there are no environmental impacts and forecast demand is met. No single alternative recognizes today's realities and prepares the Airport to meet future potential demand. However, this phased approach allows us to do the right thing at the right time, giving the Airport more flexibility to respond to changes in the economy and air traffic, which is why a phased approach is proposed rather than a single alternative. At the trigger point for each phase, the Airport and its planning staff will try to balance impacts associated with additional development with the needs of the Airport to meet demand. The AIAS planning study looked at several potential supplemental airports and found that FAI is best suited to accommodate additional gas-n-go traffic. The Kenai Airport runway isn't long enough, and there are not enough hotels nearby, or enough commercial airline flights going through to take pilots home. With regards to your comment about additional noise impacts in the Turnagain neighborhood, the Master Plan team has not studied specific impacts of noise. However, it is reasonable to anticipate that noise impacts will decrease because a new runway, which would be located $\frac{3}{4}$ of a mile west of the current north/south runway, would split the traffic between the two runways and thereby would essentially be moving air traffic farther away from the Turnagain neighborhood. In addition, having two north/south runways could allow for the preferential runway system to be in place during all times, thereby reducing noise impacts to residents across Anchorage.

Comment from public: I recently retired from the cargo airline industry. My house is located between Elmendorf and the Anchorage International Airport. From my house, I do not hear aircraft noise from Anchorage, but do from Elmendorf. This proposed plan is unique. None of the phases are actually fixed and it makes it so that we won't get to the point of constructing a widely-spaced runway until more than 10 years down the road. We will have another chance to consider the plan before then. This is an intelligent way to view the problem.

Comment from public: I appreciate the work the Airport does as it is much needed. However, this plan was developed from the point of view of the Airport. This phased plan is so visionary and basically gives

the Airport a blank check to do whatever they want. I am very uncomfortable with it. I do not want to reroute the Coastal Trail. The Airport needs to decide if it wants to be a big airport or a lesser one and whether or not to support the maintenance of our current lifestyle. The proposals need to be more realistic.

Question from public: I like your phased approach. At what point does the Airport decide to enter into a new phase?

Answer from the Master Plan Team: The primary factor is whether or not the Airport observes a significant amount of growth and congestion to the point that airlines cannot efficiently do business. It is not a perfect world, and it is hard to project when each phase will be triggered. The goal of this Master Plan is to provide the Airport with guidelines regarding what decisions would need to be made. These guidelines will consider the level of traffic at which the airport will experience congestion and long delays and how long the environmental process will likely take before each phase can be implemented. The Airport is not the only decision maker. The State legislature, FAA, Governor's office, airlines, and the public to an extent, will all be consulted. In particular the airlines will have a very strong voice when it comes to determining when a new phase should be entered into. More detail as to what will likely be components of each trigger point will be discussed during the next public meeting.

Questions from public: Does FAI have enough hotels to handle increases in traffic when airplanes are delayed due to bad weather? Also, Wasilla, Eagle River, and Talkeetna are where the growth is for those using the Anchorage International Airport. How are we going to get residents from those areas to the Airport? We've got to get used to airport traffic. I live on Hillcrest, so I hear it. For impacts to air quality, can we tax the airlines?

Answer from the Master Plan Team: The number of hotels in Fairbanks is a challenge. Crew support facilities are better in Anchorage. As for being able to tax airlines for air quality impacts, that is a FAA question. Currently, the airlines are not taxed for flying over the region.

Questions from the public: What is the Airport's position on the proposed land swap for Point Woronzof Park? Is the Airport pursuing this now or will they pursue it in Phase 4? How will public involvement be handled in this discussion?

Answer from the Master Plan Team: The Municipality of Anchorage is leading a continuing discussion on a land trade to address several parcels, including the dog park and the municipal snow dump on Airport land. A task force has been created by the Municipal Planning Department to discuss potential land trades as proposed in the West Anchorage District Plan. The Airport has been asked to participate. The first meeting will likely be next month. With regards to public involvement, this is an MOA led effort and so the question should be directed to them.

Question from public: The phased approach makes sense. The main question is what are the driving forces? How did the forecast project 30 percent growth?

Answer from the Master Plan Team: The best answer would be to direct you to the full forecast report, which is available online (<http://dot.alaska.gov/aias/news.shtml>). The forecast study took both a top-down view (from a national and global perspective) and a bottom-up view (from a local perspective) of the potential for growth. This 30 percent growth was determined based on factors such as the number of landings and take-offs, Boeing/Airbus aircraft sales reports, University of Alaska's Institute for Social Economic Research (ISER) reports, and global trade prospects between North America and Asia. The FAA requests that forecasts look forward 20 years. At the 20 year point the forecast anticipates approximately 280,000 annual aircraft operations at Anchorage International Airport.

Question from public: Due to the fact that there is no known timeframe for Phase 4 to be implemented, no perceived need, high price tag, and the potential for it to be held up and/or stopped during the NEPA process, why even consider it?

Answer from the Master Plan Team: The FAA requires that the Master Plan look at a 20-year forecast to determine its plan for development. With a projection of 280,000 operations in 20 years the charge was to develop a plan that would meet the highest levels of forecast demand. There were two alternatives considered that would meet this demand: (1) an additional north/south runway, or (2) moving operations to FAI. As a result, the Master Plan team created a phased plan that prioritizes moving traffic to FAI. Not planning for how the Airport would accommodate forecasted growth in the foreseeable future would essentially mean ignoring the problem and not being prepared which fundamentally fails to meet the foundational goal of an Airport Master Plan.

Question from public: What keeps the Airport from not going to Phase 4 prematurely?

Answer from the Master Plan Team: The cost and the airlines. The airlines are not likely to support a major capital project that does not have a clearly demonstrated need.

Question from public: What is going to be stored near the new north/south runway (there is a lot of empty space on either side)? Are we storing fuel?

Answer from the Master Plan Team: The FAA requires a Runway Safety Area and other protection zones around airport runways. There are no plans to locate fuel storage or other storage facilities or buildings in close proximity to any existing or proposed runway.

Question from public: I understand you want to include Phase 4 in the Master Plan, but given that there is a lot of information needed yet to determine its suitability, why can it not just be stated in the plan that a widely-spaced runway is needed under Phase 4 that is conceptual, rather than having a drawn-out plan for how that widely-spaced runway will be configured?

Answer from the Master Plan Team: One of the goals of the Master Plan is to share as much information about the future as possible. The runway would need to be at least 3,000 feet from the current runway and a certain length to meet FAA standards. Even though plans are drawn that show a suggested location for the runway, the question of location and configuration would be reopened and clarified during the NEPA process if and when a near-term need for another runway can be demonstrated. The point of including a potential location at this point is to help the Airport manage its land effectively and plan proactively.

Comment from public: For an issue of this large a magnitude, a failure to plan would be a plan to fail.

Question from public: I am encouraged by this phased approach. If the Master Plan is adopted, would other interests be involved in working through the phases? I feel that sending flights to FAI would mean a loss to ANC in the long-term. I also think Phase 2 and 3 should be flipped as the Airport is too noisy now. How obligated is the Airport to follow this proposed plan?

Answer from the Master Plan Team: The Master Plan is a guiding document. Projects funded by the FAA need thorough supporting analysis and justification including relevant technical analysis. In this way, the Master Plan serves as initial justification of a project's need and potential benefit.

Question from public: Are there plans to accommodate vertical landings and take-offs?

Answer from the Master Plan Team: Maintaining the ability for helicopters to land has been considered. However, the forecast did not consider drone operations or military aircraft capable of vertical takeoff and landings.

Comment from public: Have the impacts to FAI under Phase 3 been considered?

Answer from the Master Plan Team: FAI is currently undergoing a Master Plan process which is based on the same aviation forecast as the Anchorage Airport. It includes the potential to accommodate gas-n-go traffic that currently stops in Anchorage. That plan will include analysis of impacts from Phase 3, i.e., moving 50% of the Anchorage Airport's gas-n-go traffic.

Question from public: I'm confused by the trigger points for moving forward in the phased plan. What will happen if you see a decline in cargo airlines?

Answer from the Master Plan Team: The factors that will be considered when determining whether or not to move forward in the phased plan will be: Is the Airport becoming congested? Are operations being impacted? If cargo traffic declines it is safe to assume that there would be little if any congestion reducing or eliminating the need to develop more capacity.

Questions from public: One of my big worries is that the Coastal Trail will have to be shut down for 3-4 years during construction. The Airport Director says a committee is already being put together to facilitate the Airport's ownership of the Trail (i.e., the land trade which may include Point Woronzof Park). When is the public going to get involved? The Airport could end up being an owner of the Coast Trail. Will they maintain it? It seems to me that you have very little concern about the footprint into the Cook Inlet. Having a hotel on Airport land shows a lack of concern for the land the Airport is responsible for.

Answer from the Master Plan Team: The Municipality is leading the public process for the land trade task force. The Master Plan team is developing an implementation plan that will be included in the final Master Plan. The implementation plan will discuss more specific steps for what will be done in the next 10 years to facilitate development of the proposed phases. While there is no formal plan on how to mitigate impacts to the Trail at this time, the Master Plan Update will document that construction would be an impact to the Trail and that plans for maintaining Trail access at all times, even during construction, should be considered.

Comment from public: The plan should include a list of projects to accomplish in the next few years.

Answer from the Master Plan Team: The Master Plan will include a list of projects to be accomplished in Phases 1 and 2. The list will be in the final Master Plan.

Comment from public: I am concerned the Airport has different priorities. It seems the Airport has little concern regarding their footprint in the City, particularly with regards to the proposal to build a new runway into the Cook Inlet. If the Airport is going to allow a private hotel on airport land, then the Airport really does not take into consideration how valuable its existing land is. The Airport needs to understand that this is a land issue. I don't want a hotel on the airport.

Comment from public: Just as you have identified the need for monitoring noise impacts to the east, you have to do the same thing now for simultaneous take-offs to the north. This is just as much of a concern. There needs to be a noise analysis completed before any decision is made. This includes an analysis of the cargo expansion areas that are closer to Turnagain. An archeological site will be completely wiped out by an additional north/south runway, and this should be evaluated now. Phase 1 should include working with DOT&PF to come up with low cost and safe options that does not involve trucks crossing Postmark Drive into the neighborhoods or realigning Postmark Drive. Why has this land trade risen to the top of the suggestions made in the West Anchorage District Plan (WADP)? We have yet to prioritize the suggestions made in the Plan, and one of the goals is to retain and add to the Coastal Trail. The WADP and Master Plan Update are contradictory.

Question from public: Does the cost in Phases 2 and 4 that has to do with the realignment of Postmark Drive include how the US Post Office itself will have to be reconfigured?

Answer from the Master Plan Team: The only anticipated change to the US Post Office would be to change the location of the entrance. There would likely be a new driveway to access the USPS along the new road, and the USPS front door would likely remain where it is today. These changes are included in the overall cost estimates.

Question from public: Is there one change you made to the Plan that was a result of public input?

Answer from the Master Plan Team: Public input to the Master Plan Update is reflected in many aspects of the draft plan for future airport development. The phased approach is a direct response to community input. We heard from the community that an additional runway should be deferred and/or eliminated. Therefore, we prioritized every possible alternative to delay and potentially eliminate the need for an additional runway to be constructed. Another example is the recommendation of a potential location for a ground run-up enclosure due to public comments about ground noise generated by aircraft.

Question from public: How will you accommodate my request for a noise analysis for the additional north/south runway? Would any significant public input change the draft Master Plan at this stage?

Answer from the Master Plan Team: The Master Plan team is not planning on conducting a noise analysis for the Phase 4 north/south runway at this time because the Airport will not pursue development of a new runway in the immediate future. The planning staff will discuss your request for more noise analysis on a new runway with the Airport, but since the new runway would be so far into the future, if it is even needed, a noise analysis is not likely to be undertaken now. The Phase 2 noise analysis is needed because Phase 2 might happen in the next 10 years.

The public involvement team is requesting that comments on the draft Master Plan be submitted by October 10th. This is a suggested deadline to ensure your comment is adequately considered before the draft plan is finalized. Comments will be accepted throughout the Master Plan process. Comments received by October 10th have the highest potential to be considered prior to the finalization of the draft Master Plan.

Comment from public: I am disappointed. Three to one of the public comments came out against the new runway, and yet it was included. Phase 4 is outside the 20-year window and furthermore, Phase 2 and 3 have the ability to put Phase 4 out of the window. Including Phase 4 in the Master Plan only gives people alarm.

Comment from public: Technology will change. As technology changes, the design will change. It is possible Phase 4 will altogether be eliminated.

Comment from public: I am disappointed to see that you will not protect the Coastal Trail. The Coastal Trail can be an economic driver for the region and you are destroying it with Phase 4, the crown jewel and centerpiece of your plan.

Comment from public: How many of you attended the meeting for the aviation system study? I have concerns about the AIAS Plan, which had no public input process. AIAS is made up of 3 airports – ANC, FAI, and Cold Bay. Kenai is owned by the City of Kenai. Mat-Su Borough is where the planes go and you haven't talked to them. There will be houses in the Mat-Su Borough that are affected by a new runway. The study doesn't look at how the runway will work with congested airspace. Why aren't we looking at the system? They didn't mention the flight paths. Whose money is this? Is it State money? Does Anchorage need to have everything? Flight tracks drive where there should be an airport. Alaska should decide, not the airlines.

Comment from public: Good work, good phased approach. Anchorage is a young city with special infrastructure to preserve for the future generations. The Coastal Trail is a jewel to preserve and protect. Proper planning is critical and important.

Comment from public: The battle is done here, and we have lost. Our prize is now at the land swap. We need to get involved with the land swap. Go to the city. The land trade will determine if Phase 4 will ever happen because it would secure land for a new runway. We should focus on the land trade, not on the Master Plan.

Question from public: I don't think the battle is done here. I want to swap Phases 2 and 3. What is the tipping point between Phase 2 and 3, and how will the noise study affect the decision? What is the schedule for the noise study? What are the daytime hours you refer to?

Answer from the Master Plan Team: Daytime hours are 7 AM to 10 PM, but to address the need we only need to implement Phase 2 in the early afternoon, from about noon to 5PM. The capital cost to implement Phase 2 is effectively zero. However, Phase 3 is potentially an expensive proposition. This is why Phase 2 was chosen to occur before Phase 3. However, if the demand should no longer be able to be supported by Phase 2, the Airport would transition into Phase 3. How the noise study affects decisions will depend on its results. It could change the parameters of runway use or other things. The noise study will be completed in the next few weeks and will be posted on the web site.

Question from public: What will be the length of the Coastal Trail that will be lost?

Answer from the Master Plan Team: About $\frac{3}{4}$ of a mile of the Coastal Trail would be impacted if a new runway were constructed as shown in Phase 4. This portion of the Trail would need to be replaced and would not be lost. At this time, no specific mitigation has been defined. The Trail would be addressed during a future NEPA process when and if a new runway is needed and pursued.

Notes by: HDR Alaska, Reviewed by RS&H