

## MEETING SUMMARY

---

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

**Location:** CIRI Building First Floor Conference Room, 2525 C Street, Anchorage, AK 99503

**RS&H Project #:** 226-2566-000

**Date and Time:** May 8, 2013; 11:00AM-1:00PM

**Subject:** Working Group Meeting #5

---

### Staff Attendees:

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

Gareth Hanley (RS&H)

Katherine Wood (HDR)  
Allison Biastock (HDR)  
Jessica Abbott (HDR)  
Mark Mayo (HDR)

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

### Working Group Attendees:

Gordon Wetzel, Nordic Ski Association of Anchorage  
Dana Pruhs, Pruhs Corporation  
Cathy Gleason, Turnagain Community Council  
Thede Tobish, MOA Planning  
Lynette Moreno-Hinz, Anchorage Cab Drivers Association  
Will Kyzer, Anchorage Economic Development Association  
Nick Moe, Alaska Center for the Environment  
Julie Dodds, Visit Anchorage  
Bob Auth, Spenard Community Council  
Matt Claman, Anchorage Airport Communications Committee  
Mark Butler, Federation of Community Councils  
Andy Rogers, Alaska Chamber of Commerce  
Mort Plumb, Anchorage Chamber of Commerce

---

## Meeting Overview

On Wednesday, May 8, 2013, the Ted Stevens Anchorage International Airport (ANC) Master Plan Update hosted the fifth in a series of Working Group meetings. The purpose of this meeting was to provide information on progress to date, provide an overview of the draft airport development alternatives, and discuss Working Group initial feedback on draft airport development alternatives. A presentation was given by Evan Pfahler, and the meeting's discussion and activities were facilitated by Katherine Wood. At the end of the meeting, there was time allowed for comments from the public. The meeting ended at approximately 1:10PM.

## Advertising

- Email to Master Plan Update contact list of approximately 600 addresses, including addresses for community council distribution
- Email invite to participants and draft agenda sent in advance
- Anchorage Daily News Legal Ad, 4/24/13
- GovDelivery Notice
- State of Alaska Online Public Notice

- Posted on bulletin boards in ANC Airport Manager's Office and in Terminal
- Master Plan Update Website: [www.ancmasterplan.com](http://www.ancmasterplan.com)
- Airport Website: [www.dot.state.ak.us/anc/](http://www.dot.state.ak.us/anc/)
- "What's Up" community email list serv@
- Email notice sent to Federation of Community Councils, Turnagain Community Council, Spenard Community Council, and Sand Lake Community Council

### **Attendance**

25 people signed in to the event. Of those, 13 participated as representatives of organizations on the Working Group.

### **Meeting Materials**

- Handouts
  - Agenda
  - Alternatives maps and accompanying notes
  - Alternatives exercise handout
- PowerPoint presentation

### **Meeting Summary**

#### **Introductions**

John Johansen, Manager of Engineering, Environmental and Planning at the Ted Stevens Anchorage International Airport (ANC) welcomed participants, noting that Airport Manager John Parrott was currently in China on business, and turned the floor over to Evan Pfahler, RS&H, Master Plan Update Project Manager and Katherine Wood, HDR Alaska, Master Plan Update Public Involvement Lead.

#### **Meeting Presentation**

Evan Pfahler provided a PowerPoint presentation that:

- Provided a brief update on Master Plan activity
- Shared five draft alternatives for future Airport development

The presentation is available at [http://www.ancmasterplan.com/library/index\\_83\\_2206953150.pdf](http://www.ancmasterplan.com/library/index_83_2206953150.pdf)

#### **Presentation Q&A**

*Note: Questions and comments from Working Group Members and the planning team in this summary are a synopsis of the meeting's dialogue. When appropriate, Master Plan Update planning team responses have been supplemented to supply complete responses.*

*Working Group member question:* Why is Postmark Drive only partially relocated in some alternatives?

*Planning team response:* Alternative #3 would maximize the North Airpark, so the Airport would need additional North Airpark space. Fully relocating Postmark Drive allows for that. Alternatives 4 and 5 look at moving some development to the West Airpark, so less of the North Airpark would be needed, hence

not as much of Postmark Drive would need to be relocated. Postmark Drive would remain open to the public, as would the Airport Post Office in all of the alternatives

*Working Group member question:* In Alternative 5 for Airport Support, did you consider access to West Airpark?

*Planning team response:* Yes, a tunnel under the existing north-south runway is considered necessary to access the West Airpark, should that area be developed.

*Working Group member question:* Can we re-use the rental car facility (note: the question refers to the rental car support facilities in the East Airpark not the garage near the terminal) as Alaska Dept. of Transportation and Public Facilities parking?

*Planning team response:* That is a possibility to address staff parking needs, should they arise.

*Working Group member question:* Alternatives 4 and 5 are controversial. Is this the same thing we want to battle? These alternatives could stop the process, they are so unrealistic and a farce to include. How big of a battle do we want?

*Planning team response:* A Master Plan Update is most effective when we thoughtfully consider all reasonable alternatives that would meet future aviation demand that has been forecast. The Master Plan Update is only a plan. Actual implementation of any infrastructure recommended in the Master Plan Update would generally necessitate many additional steps, approvals, and reviews and would only be undertaken as necessary to meet actual future demand. The Master Plan is a long-term plan examining which alternatives would meet demand if it does materialize. The aviation forecasts do project that Anchorage may become constrained during the planning period, and therefore it is reasonable to evaluate alternatives to address that capacity need.

*Working Group member question:* How do you pick an alternative when there is no demand to justify it?

*Planning team response:* This is a planning process, and the Master Plan Update forecast suggests that in 20 years, the 3 runway system at ANC may not operate efficiently. All of the alternatives will be further analyzed over the next few months to determine how much of the projected 20-year demand they may meet. We need to compare the costs and the benefits of each alternative, and need to best maximize the Airport's existing facilities, but we also need to be prepared to meet potential long-term demand, even if there is no immediate need.

There are benefits to such long term planning, especially when it comes to strategic land use at the Airport. Having a long-term development plan in place allows ANC to protect land uses and manage leasing. Having a long-term development plan means ANC will best know where to allow long term leases or where to hold land in reserve where it may be needed one day should demand rise.

The actions recommended in any alternative are not likely to be implemented until it is necessary to meet demand.

*Working Group member question:* How does the process work? Will the Airport ultimately choose one alternative?

*Planning team response:* Yes. We will conduct further technical analysis for all the alternatives and consider public feedback prior to selecting a draft preferred alternative in September 2013.

*Working Group member question:* There is currently no connectivity between the North and South Terminals. Have you considered a light rail of some sort to better connect the facilities? Such a light rail may make the North Terminal more attractive to prospective tenants, including the proposed hotel between the two terminals.

*Planning team response:* The North and South Terminals are currently connected via an enclosed walkway. The Master Plan Update is not considering a light rail connection at this time because we have not determined the future use of the North Terminal.

*Working Group member question:* What is the current cargo forecast?

*Planning team response:* At ANC, annual cargo tonnage has been anticipated to grow at an annual rate of about 2.9%. The forecast estimates that ANC could potentially handle about eight million tons of cargo throughput annually at the end of the Master Plan Update planning horizon (2030).

*Working Group member comment:* I think the presentation makes perfect sense, it is important for ANC to have a plan in place for the future. In addition, the idea of a hotel integrated with the Airport is a good one.

*Working Group member comment:* Cargo activity is important, but operations (takeoffs and landings) are going to drive development.

*Working Group member comment:* You make a convincing case that the alternatives are all quite different. I understand that when we hit a certain demand threshold, there will be need for something like a new runway. However, there is a significant lead time associated with something like a runway – so you may be required to depend on the forecast somewhat. Cargo growth is much different than passenger growth. I appreciate the difficulty in planning.

*Working Group member comment/question:* Since the 2008 market drop, ANC cargo activity has been down and passenger activity has remained about the same. My concern is that the forecast shows a 30% growth over the next 20 years – the community and the airlines will see these high forecast numbers may be skeptical. How do you tailor the forecast information for planning efforts?

*Planning team response:* The forecast, which has been accepted by the FAA and the Airlines for use in this Master Plan Update, is what the Master Plan anticipates as the most likely scenario. However, planners understand that a forecast represents a projection based upon the existing point in time; forecasts can be updated (though it is a substantial undertaking). These draft alternatives represent plans that would be implemented based on actual demand and activity trigger points instead of based on the timeline projected by the forecast. Part of our job as planners is to think about what alternatives and land the Airport might need if and when future demand levels warrant potential additional infrastructure.

*At this point in the discussion, Katherine Wood noted the time and that the group had not yet begun its exercise, and asked the group if they would like to extend the meeting until 1:30 pm. A working group member requested that the group have the opportunity to meet again to further discuss the alternatives. A poll was taken, and a majority of members favored holding another meeting at a later date, and the Airport agreed.*

## Alternatives Exercise

Katherine Wood presented the alternatives exercise to the group. The exercise was designed to stimulate discussion on the alternatives. Working Group members were given a handout and asked to list considerations (benefits, impacts, community impacts, etc.) relating to the alternatives. Prior to discussion of an alternative, members were given a few minutes to generate a list of considerations.

Given the time constraint at this meeting, only alternatives 1 and 2 were discussed. The list of considerations and comments that the group generated in the exercise is summarized below. In the case where comments/responses were provided by the planning team, they are listed.

### Considerations and comments for Alternative #1 – Minimize Development

- This is burying your head in the sand. Alternative 1 creates no new growth, and is not realistic for passenger travel.
- Could some of these alternatives be phased?
- I agree, I see alternative #1 as Phase I.
- There are development issues. What is your plan for the North Terminal? Being reactive instead of proactive is never making a step forward to increase North Terminal use.
- This alternative does not meet future demand; it removes the ability to grow in the future.
- The hotel site is something present in all the alternatives. Wouldn't that be non-aviation use of Airport land?
  - Planning Team Response: So long as it is shown that the proposed parcel is not better suited for aviation use and so long as a tenant pays fair-market value for the parcel, a hotel would be considered an acceptable land use. Ultimately, development of a hotel on the Airport would need to be vetted by the FAA prior to implementation.
- Hotels integrated with airports serve passengers, airlines and more.
- Taxi cab drivers may be concerned about having a hotel on the Airport.
- This alternative shows more development in the North Airpark, which has noise implications for the Turnagain community – this treed area provides a noise buffer. Will the Part 150 Study be looking at this?
  - Planning Team Response: The Master Plan update team is working closely with the Part 150 team and will discuss the alternatives with them.

### Considerations and comments for Alternative #2 – Optimize Use of Alaska International (AIAS) System Infrastructure (FAI)

- This alternative is more realistic. It provides the potential for expansion.
- I like the way you presented the information for these alternatives.
- I like the re-route of Postmark Drive in this alternative; you make it clear that the re-route would not restrict public access.
- Can you incentivize cargo to go to Fairbanks?
- Airlines would have to have a huge economic incentive to go to Fairbanks International Airport (FAI) – it is cold and more expensive to operate there, and FAI would need a fueling system upgrade. Airlines would leave Alaska before going to FAI.
- Cargo handlers may not be happy about having to split operations between ANC and FAI.
- This alternative equals a missed economic opportunity for Anchorage.
- There seems to be faulty logic with this alternative – can we merge alternative #1 and alternative #2?
- There was a lot of talk about better using existing infrastructure here at ANC and in FAI – why not join forces with FAI since they are a part of the same AIAS system? If this alternative won't work, you need to explain to the public why it won't work and stop referring to ANC and FAI as a joint system – it's flawed.

- Looking at ANC history, we have already had experience with FAI, and Airlines chose to move to ANC. This alternative is not a viable solution; private companies are already decided.
- Pushing traffic to FAI ignores market realities.
- Per the North Terminal, sometimes it is more expensive to remodel than to tear down and rebuild.
- Are there wetlands issues with developing in Postmark Bog? That could be limiting.
- Using FAI could meet potential demand requirements?
  - Planning Team Response: This alternative assumes half of all cargo tech stops (also called gas n' go traffic) go to FAI. This is not a "no action" alternative, as it requires additional infrastructure at FAI – fueling, aircraft parking, etc. The infrastructure needs at FAI would likely have a cost to both the AIAS and the airlines.
- How much would the Anchorage economy lose with this alternative? There would be a negative economic impact to Anchorage.
- FAI can't be completely ignored; it needs to be a viable alternative.
- Demand is not collateral that ANC can distribute. In private sector economics, redistribution is driven entirely by the tenants, not the AIAS. I am unclear how this alternative works – we can ask Airlines to go to FAI, but we cannot make them.
- What does the AIAS forecast show, how does it compare with the ANC forecast? How about the FAI Master Plan – does that dovetail with the ANC Master Plan?
  - Planning Team Response: The forecast for the ANC Master Plan Update was completed as part of the AIAS Planning Study. The same forecast is being used to support the FAI Master Plan Update and the Part 150 Noise Study. As a part of the ANC and the FAI Master Plan studies, the technical feasibility of moving half of ANC's gas n' go traffic to Fairbanks is being examined. The AIAS Planning Study forecast today does not assume cargo traffic would relocate to FAI from ANC.
- If Alternative #5 is implemented, there could be costly implications (water quality, etc). It may be less expensive to move gas n' go traffic to FAI. The Legislature can create economic incentives to push traffic to FAI, maybe tax incentives?

Due to time constraints, the Alternatives Exercise ended at this point in the discussion.

### **Next Steps**

One additional Working Group was scheduled for follow-up on June 13, 2013.

Katherine asked that Working Group members work with their organizations to provide formal comments on the alternatives, should they wish to do so. She noted that while the planning team will accept public comments at any time in the Master Plan process, planners will best be able to consider comments on alternatives that are received by June 30, 2013.

Katherine and Evan also noted that the Airport will be holding a Public Open House to present the alternatives on May 23, 2013 from 5:30-8PM at the Coast International Inn. Following that, an online Open House presenting the same information will be live from May 24-June 7.

A general meeting summary will be distributed to the group.

### **Public Comment**

One member of the public provided a comment at the end of the meeting. Comments will be recorded and responded to in the Master Plan Update comment response report.

Notes by: HDR Alaska