

MEETING SUMMARY

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

Location: Anchorage International Airport
North Terminal, Room NA165

RS&H Project #: 226-2566-000

Date and Time: May 9, 2013; 1:30-3:30PM

Subject: Technical Advisory Committee Meeting
#4

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:

Gretchen Rickard, Alaska Cargo Port
Joe Zerck, Pegasus Aviation Services
Bob Rieth, NAC
David Chilson, FAA ATC
PJ Cranmner, Commodity Forwarders, Inc.
Terry French, ERA Aviation
Matthew Shaw, Alaska Airlines
Keri Stephens, AvAir Pros ATR
Ed Faith, UPS
John Steiner, Pfeffer Development

Meeting Overview

On Thursday, May 9, 2013, the Ted Stevens Anchorage International Airport (ANC) Master Plan Update hosted the fourth in a series of Technical Advisory Committee 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 Technical Advisory Committee members' 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 3:30PM.

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
- Airport Website: www.dot.state.ak.us/anc/
- "What's Up" community email list serve

- Email notice sent to Federation of Community Councils, Turnagain Community Council, Spenard Community Council, and Sand Lake Community Council

Attendance

21 people signed in to the event. Of those, 10 participated as representatives of organizations on the Technical Advisory Committee.

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_82_1742686625.pdf

Presentation Q&A

Note: Questions and comments from Technical Advisory Committee 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.

Technical Advisory Committee member question: The shortening of Runway 15/33 - would that reduce the type of aircraft that could take off and land on that runway?

Planning team response: The vast majority of the ANC fleet mix could be accommodated if that runway were shortened.

Technical Advisory Committee member question: Is there evidence that indicates Airlines would choose to go to FAI over non-Alaskan airports if ANC could not accommodate them?

Planning team response: The AIAS planning study (currently underway) is evaluating the probability of gas and go traffic using FAI instead of ANC at a future time. The AIAS can only encourage airlines to make use of both airports if one becomes congested. However, the AIAS cannot require that airlines use an airport and an Airline may choose to use a non-Alaska airport if it desires too.

Technical Advisory Committee member question: In the scenarios where Postmark Dr. is relocated, would the existing Postmark still be a public road?

Planning team response: No, in those scenarios, the existing Postmark Drive would be used for tugs (airfield vehicles) and tenants only. The relocated Postmark Drive would be open to the public.

Technical Advisory Committee member question: Is there an indication that there will be a high demand for additional ramp areas at the North Terminal?

Planning team response: Additional apron parking will be required in the future to accommodate growth. The location of additional ramp areas is considered in the alternatives. Potential locations considered include the existing ramp areas near the terminal complex, the Postmark Bog area south of Taxiway P, and the West Airpark. The South Airpark is also considered but is considered best suited to General Aviation uses.

Technical Advisory Committee member question: What type of development is considered for the West Airpark?

Planning team response: Land is available for any tenant who may choose to develop in the West Airpark. Tenant development would be considered on a case-by-case basis. The Master Plan Update envisions that the West Airpark is best suited for apron parking to accommodate tech stops, cargo handling and transfer, etc.

Technical Advisory Committee member question: Is there a reason there are so many exits to runway 7R?

Planning team response: The number of and type of exits on Runway 7R reduce the amount of time aircraft occupy the runway after landing. Reduced runway occupancy time allows the airport to efficiently accommodate high numbers of landings. However, the Master Plan Update Alternatives envision modifications to the taxiways that provide access from Runway 7R-25L such that they meet new FAA taxiway design standards. These standards no longer permit angled taxiways directly connecting two runways.

Technical Advisory Committee member question: Do you really need that many taxiways in South Airpark?

Planning team response: The South Airpark future development plan would only be implemented to meet tenant demands. Thus, if demand does not materialize for this amount of development, all of the planned taxiways may not be needed.

Technical Advisory Committee member question: Do all of the alternatives meet the highest anticipated demand levels?

Planning team response: The Master Plan Update Team is establishing which alternatives meet forecast demand levels. At this time, it is not known which alternatives would meet forecast demand levels but we estimate that Alternative 1 (no action) would not meet more than about 84% of forecast demand.

Alternatives Exercise

Katherine Wood presented the alternatives exercise to the group. The exercise was designed to stimulate discussion on the alternatives. Technical Advisory Committee 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.

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*

- There is minimal cost associated with this alternative.
- Is the reason this alternative only meets 84 percent of demand due to the capacity of a three runway system?
 - Planning team response: Yes, the existing three runway system and operational restrictions (e.g. the Preferential Runway Use program which discourages full use of Runway 7L for departures) is unable to operate efficiently at forecast demand levels. Once annual demand exceeds about 258,000 landings and takeoffs, the airport would experience delays in excess of what most airlines can operate with on a regular basis.
- Do alternatives 2-5 address capacity equally?
 - Planning team response: We will study each alternative to determine its capacity and whether it meets forecast demand. The AIAS Planning Study has determined that if half or more of the freight flights can be shifted to Fairbanks, ANC would operate with an efficiency rate acceptable to the airlines.
- From an Airline's perspective, the North Terminal is at a competitive disadvantage to the South Terminal. It costs the same to operate at either terminal yet the South Terminal provides a much higher level of customer service and amenities. This should be resolved.
- Is it more expensive to tear down the North Terminal, or leave it there?
 - Planning team response: We will be examining this question in our alternatives evaluation.
- If the A380 aircraft operated at ANC, would it be accommodated with the reduced runway length shown in this alternative?
 - Planning team response: The A380 would be able to operate on ANC's existing runways. Newer aircraft typically have better runway performance due to better aerodynamics and more powerful engines.
- Is there a timeline from the FAA wherein these taxiway improvements need to be implemented?
 - Planning team response: There is no specific timeline. It would be prudent to replace the taxiways at a time they are in need of rehabilitation. That way the cost of replacing them is not undertaken earlier than necessary.
- This "no action" alternative may be low cost up front, but it could impose more costs on users if airlines choose to go elsewhere or delays worsen.
 - Planning team response: Good point, there could be costs associated with delays and reduced services to Alaskan customers.
- This alternative has no community impacts to land use, neighborhoods, etc. That's a good thing.

- Planning team response: Notable that increased aircraft delays can lead to some environmental impacts related to longer idle times (reduced air quality may result from taxiway congestion etc.) and noise.
- Is there any consideration to improve access to [former] Kulis land?
 - Planning team response: Airside access, yes. In alternatives 4 and 5, taxiway Zulu is extended east to provide improved access to the facilities that were part of the former Kulis property.
- There are gains associated with shortening the runway in this alternative, but the new taxiways will not allow planes to “wait” on them.
- Consider reconfiguration of runways to allow for an entrance at the end of the runway.

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

- This alternative is the greatest use of the AIAS system resources.
- If cargo users have been at Fairbanks International Airport (FAI) in the past, and they chose to use ANC, how can we assume they will go back to FAI?
 - Planning team response: The AIAS Planning Study is currently being completed and will address that question.
- Would moving tech stops (gas n’ go traffic) to FAI undermine ANC’s work to attract additional cargo carriers?
 - Planning team response: That’s a possibility; the planning team will need to consider what it would take to perhaps incentivize carriers to use FAI, and the cost of building FAI’s infrastructure to accommodate the additional traffic. It may be that a new runway option at ANC is less expensive than FAI improvements. If a gas line is built in or near FAI, it may create more demand for that Airport and justify improvements.
- If we plan to use the North Terminal for another 20 years, is that maintenance a justified cost?
- For cargo airlines to use FAI (due to lower landing fees for example), they would need to be headed towards/departing locations east of Chicago, otherwise travel costs get too high.
- It’s too expensive for cargo carriers to have operations in both ANC and FAI. FAI may do better trying to attract new cargo carriers, not those with infrastructure already in place at ANC.
- FAI’s very cold winter weather would make it difficult for any carrier to function without some sort warm storage/handling facility – and that’s a cost.
- In this alternative, would the Postmark Bog be developed for cargo infrastructure?
 - Planning team response: Development in that area has been envisioned for “airport support” functions – so is not limited to cargo. Cargo, however, may be a good use of that location given its proximity to existing facilities/infrastructure.

Considerations and comments for *Alternative #3 – Optimize ANC*

- In this alternative, what defines “daylight hours”?
 - Planning team response: Officially, 7am – 10pm – so the preferential runway use plan would be suspended during these hours. However, peak traffic times are closer to 10am to 4-6pm.
- You may want to consider the 10pm threshold, as there is another operations peak from 10pm - 1am.
- Asian carriers have really tightened up their operations. Most of them arrive and depart ANC within a small window between 10pm and 1am.
- There is also a passenger flight rush from 10pm-1am as carriers are trying to reach lower 48 destinations in time for morning flights.

- The noise impacts of this alternative could have a negative effect on the Airport's relationship with the community.
- When was the preferential runway use plan put into place?
 - Planning team response: It was enacted following the Part 150 Noise Study in 2001.
- If planes are taking off on 7L (to the east), there may be more noise as planes will need to turn immediately/use a higher power setting due to the mountains.
 - Planning team response: We don't yet know the airspace and noise impacts of this alternative; they will be looked at more closely during our technical analysis of the alternatives occurring this summer.
- The North Terminal plan associated with this alternative is a good example of "right sizing" – downsize and upgrade.
- Generally, this alternative and others feature a lot of development in wetlands, which can require fill and get expensive.
- One could take fill from the hilly West Airpark lands and move it to the North Airpark.
- If Postmark Bog and the North Airpark are developed before the West Airpark, then you will need to find a place to dispose of fill from the West Airpark if you want to develop that area.

Considerations and comments for *Alternative #4– Closely Spaced Runway*

- Moving Postmark Drive would be expensive –it would be cheaper to move the Post Office.
- Moving Postmark Drive would devalue cargo spots because there would be no public access to them.
- There doesn't seem to be much "bang for your buck" with this alternative. It won't do as much to meet demand.
 - Planning team response: We speculate that this alternative may provide between 10-15% more capacity. We will be assessing this alternative in more detail.
- In alternatives 1, 2, and 3 – there is still the opportunity to develop a widely spaced runway should the need ever arise. With this alternative, we would not have that option. We need to think strategically about future land use.
- This alternative feels like a "band aid" fix - we are only half way there.
- The level of North Terminal improvements associated with this alternative seems more cost effective – but without knowing the capacity limitation, it is hard to tell. The Airport needs to consider capacity as well as the cost of raising the level of service in the North Terminal before it makes a decision about the facility.
- We need to consider traffic "rushes" at the South Terminal, not just the number of gates. There are blocks of time during the summer months when every gate is full.
 - Planning team response: We will need to consider rushes in our analysis, there are both daily and seasonal peaks at ANC.
- There is minimal gain with this runway. There are jet blast issues with the proximity of the runways, as well as access challenges given the lack of a full length taxiway running along side the proposed runway.
- There is no new access to the proposed West Airpark developments in this alternative. Maybe a tunnel with a roadway to West Airpark should be considered in this alternative, too. With this alternative, the space left between the new runway and AWWU land would be a tight fit with the Airport road, the public road and the Coastal Trail all having to fit in.
- Would this runway configuration have the same take off/landing models as today?
 - Planning team response: There are still wind considerations for this alternative. In windy conditions, ANC may still need to limit takeoffs/landing to the north/south runways. The proposed separation of the north-south runways requires air traffic controllers to protect for wake turbulence impacts.

Considerations and comments for Alternative #5– Widely Spaced Runway

- How much does this alternative cost?
- This alternative is a tough sell to the community; there are impacts to the Coastal Trail, the shoreline, etc.
- This alternative provides the longest term solution. Other alternatives may work, but for how long?
- Alternative #4 (closely spaced runway) may not meet 20 year demand requirements, nor does it allow simultaneous operations – so we might find ourselves back in this position again soon if we don't choose a widely spaced runway.
 - Planning team response: We don't know yet whether alternative #4 will meet forecasted demand – we are going to determine that during our technical analysis this summer.
- Given air traffic, there is a lot to like with this alternative. It removes the wake turbulence issues, and may allow for simultaneous arrivals/departures in all weather conditions.
- With the proposed tunnel to the West Airpark in this alternative – will non-badged workers be able to access that?
 - Planning team response: The idea is that the tunnel will be 4 lanes – 2 lanes for public use and two lanes for airport vehicles. We understand both public and airport access are necessary to support airport business.
- There are many possibilities for takeoff/landing patterns with this alternative.
 - Planning team response: Yes, with alternative #5 the preferential runway use program could be maintained, which reduces noise impacts as well as conflicts with GA.
- Would building the West Airpark roadway access tunnel preclude development in Postmark Bog?
 - No, the tunnel depicted on the alternative map is not an exact location. A tunnel may not need the entirety of the bog to be constructed.
- Per the North Terminal – if you convert it to just handle international arrivals, can you have similar concessions and services as in the North Terminal? I'm not sure there is enough traffic to necessitate the South and North Terminal.
- If we eliminate the North Terminal, it would put more pressure on the South Terminal parking – but ANC employee parking may be able to move to the North Terminal lot.

Next Steps

Katherine asked that Technical Advisory Committee 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 completed and distributed to the group.

Public Comment

Two members 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