

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: June 13, 2013; 11:00AM-1:00PM

Subject: Working Group Meeting #6

Staff Attendees:

John Parrott (ANC)
John Johansen (ANC)
Teri Lindseth (ANC)
Katie Gage (ANC)
Evan Pfahler (RS&H)

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

Working Group Attendees:

Dana Pruhs, Pruhs Corporation
Thede Tobish, MOA Planning
Lynette Moreno-Hinz, Anchorage Cab Drivers Association
Nick Moe, Alaska Center for the Environment
Bob Auth, Spenard Community Council
Matt Claman, Anchorage Airport Communications Committee
Mark Butler, Federation of Community Councils
Mort Plumb, Anchorage Chamber of Commerce
Gloria Manni, Turnagain Community Council
Jim Burkholder, Nordic Ski Association Anchorage
Aves Thompson, Alaska Trucking Association

Meeting Overview

On Thursday, June 13, 2013, the Ted Stevens Anchorage International Airport (ANC) Master Plan Update hosted the sixth in a series of Working Group meetings. This meeting was a continuation of a Working Group meeting held on May 8, 2013. The purpose of both of these meetings 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. During the course of the meeting on May 8th, only Alternatives 1 and 2 were discussed in detail. The primary purpose of this meeting was to give the opportunity for the same level of discussion of Alternatives 3, 4, and 5. 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, 5/30/13
- 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
- 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, 11 participated as representatives of organizations on the Working Group.

Meeting Materials

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

Meeting Summary

Introductions

Katherine Wood, HDR Alaska, Master Plan Update Public Involvement Lead, opened the meeting by thanking those in attendance. She also explained that this second meeting to consider Master Plan Update development alternatives was scheduled at the request of Working Group members in order to provide them with an extended opportunity for discussion and input. Evan Pfahler, RS&H, Master Plan Update Project Manager, then made a brief PowerPoint presentation.

Meeting Presentation

Evan Pfahler provided a PowerPoint presentation that:

- Addressed questions from the previous Working Group meeting
- Reviewed the five draft alternatives for future Airport development

The presentation is available at 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: Will a 1.4% increase in cargo equate to a 1.4% increase in airport operations?

Planning team response: While cargo activity is related to airport operations, the two are forecast to increase at different rates. Cargo tonnage is anticipated to grow at about 2.9% while total airport operations (landings and take-offs) are forecast to grow at about 1.4%. Each metric is considered and has differing impacts on facility needs over the planning period. The number of operations and cargo tonnage will be used as triggers to indicate when varied airport improvements may be needed to maintain the Airport’s safe and efficient operation.

Working Group member question: Why hasn't moving the Coastal Trail further west (along the coast) been considered (e.g. along the west side of the AWWU Asplund waste water treatment plant)?

Planning team response: Realignment of the Coastal Trail would require agency coordination before anything could happen even though such realignment may be technically feasible. At the current time, there is no proposal by the Municipality to realign the Coastal Trail in this area. It should be noted that the segment of the Coastal Trail nearest the AWWU Asplund waste water treatment plan is not on Airport property.

Working Group member comment: I think moving the Coastal Trail closer to the coast should be explored, especially since there is a better relationship between the Municipality and AWWU.

Working Group member comment: AWWU is currently developed for primary treatment only. It is likely that the federal government will require that AWWU provide a higher level of treatment (secondary or tertiary) in the future. When this higher level of treatment is required, AWWU will need to have an adequate amount of land available near its current facility in order to expand and provide additional treatment.

Planning team response: The Airport is working with AWWU throughout the planning process in order to ensure that AWWU will be able to expand at its present location.

Working Group member comment: It is unknown how AWWU will expand in the future. Technological advancements may result in a smaller footprint being necessary than is currently being considered. What AWWU is concerned about, in addition to having enough land to expand upon, is the location of their outfall into the mixing zone available in Cook Inlet. It is the vastness of the Cook Inlet and its ability to effectively breakdown waste via that mixing zone that has allowed Anchorage to only conduct primary treatment while most of the country has been required to provide secondary, and in some cases tertiary, treatment.

Working Group member question: When do you expect the decision will be made as to whether or not AWWU will have to increase its level of treatment?

AWWU response: Five to ten years. It is not likely that AWWU will be able to continue to only perform primary treatment long-term.

Working Group member question: When will there be a cost-benefit analysis to compare alternatives?

Planning team response: Our evaluation of alternatives will include a planning-level analysis of costs and benefits. However, consideration should be given to the fact that the cost-benefit analysis will merely be a projection. The costs associated with each of the alternatives would likely change over time. It is not anticipated that implementation of any of the alternatives would be necessary in the near future. As a result, it is probable that the costs projected as part of the study would not be the same as the final implementation cost, should development of the chosen alternative be deemed necessary. In addition, before the improvements could be constructed, they would also be subject to a separate FAA cost/benefit analysis and the NEPA evaluation process.

Working Group member comment: If we [AWWU] go to secondary [waste water] treatment, it would not be considered under the cost-benefit analysis done for the Airport.

Working Group member question: How do you define "peak departure time?"

Planning team response: 10am – 5pm or 6pm. This timeframe is considered peak departure time for both the summer and winter seasons. Under Alternative 3 there would be more daytime departures on runway

7L. Although this would produce more noise, such noise increases would occur primarily during a time when most people are at work and are not trying to sleep. To better understand the benefits of adding more departures during the peak departure time, the Part 150 Noise Study team will conduct noise modeling for this alternative to better define potential noise impacts.

Working Group member question: Have you considered lengthening 7L to the west so that departing aircraft would be higher up when they went over the residential areas to the east? This might reduce noise impacts for Alternative 3.

Planning team response: Lengthening 7L to the west could affect the noise levels in the area. While it is possible that the extension could lessen noise impacts, any decrease in noise would not be as much as one might hope.

Working Group member comment: The Spenard Community Council unanimously passed a resolution supporting continuation of the preferential runway program.

Planning team response: Additional noise associated with use of 7L during peak departure time may produce less of an impact on the surrounding community due to the fact that increases in traffic would occur between the hours of 10am and 6pm.

Working Group member comment: We want to keep airport-induced noise as far away from population centers as possible. If Runway 7L is extended, so will the extent of noise impacts.

Working Group member comment: An assessment of which community councils will be affected by additional noise impacts should be conducted. Following said assessment, impacted community councils should be contacted and be made aware of the fact that they will likely have more noise.

Planning team response: The Part 150 Noise Study should reveal which areas will actually be impacted, and we will take that into consideration for future outreach.

Working Group member question: Will the Working Group have the capability to remove an alternative from consideration?

Planning team response: No. Working Group comments will be noted, but the Airport will have the final decision when it comes to the removal of alternatives.

Working Group member question: Who makes the final decision on alternatives? Is it John Parrott?

Planning team response: The final decision about which alternative is preferred is made by Airport Management, including John Parrott and others, but it also must be acceptable to the Department of Transportation and Public Facilities (DOT&PF) management staff including the Deputy Commissioner of Aviation and the Commissioner, and higher levels of government, all the way up to the Governor's office. In addition, the revised Airport Layout Plan must be conditionally approved by the FAA; and any changes that would impact the Airlines would need to have their tacit approval as well. Furthermore, Master Plan alternatives will not be constructed until the following steps were met, including additional public process components:

1. Existence of need
2. FAA approval
3. DOT&PF/ANC approval
4. Legislative approval/funding
5. NEPA process

The FAA will be looking for two things: (1) Did the Airport undergo the planning process; (2) Does the Plan meet the set standards and guidelines?

Working Group member question: Is the Working Group responsible for producing a deliverable?

Planning team response: We are asking for a formal comment from each of your respective organizations; however, this is not a requirement. The Working Group is not tasked with producing any formal, joint deliverables.

Working Group member comment: Development to the east, under Alternative 3, needs to also be considered. Existing facilities should be optimized, thereby decreasing the cost that is associated with the construction of new facilities. We should come up with recommendations that reflect the visions of the community.

Working Group member comment: Some of the pros behind Alternative 3 are that it maximizes what is already available and is relatively inexpensive. However, it is hard to comment on it if we don't know the capacity it will provide.

Working Group member comment: I'm not opposed to moving Postmark Drive to accommodate more lease lot capacity.

Working Group member comment: Are the terminal and runway alternatives separate, or do they need be considered as one alternative?

Planning team response: The terminal and runway alternatives are being proposed separately. Please be explicit about what you like and dislike about the proposed alternatives so that the best combination of terminal, airfield and other improvements can be determined.

Working Group member comment: There is a lot more risk associated with aircraft approaching/departing from the east over densely populated parts of Anchorage. I think Alternative 3 has the largest safety implications. No one has approached the safety aspect of the proposed alternatives.

Working Group member comment: Under Alternative 4 there would be a cluster of runways nearly meeting in a small space. Is that ideal? It appears like it would cause a real traffic problem.

Planning team response: Just west of the terminal area is where many cargo planes park. The goal is to have safe and efficient taxiways, but this is a heavily-used, small space. The proposed design under both alternatives was drawn based on the constraints of the site and FAA standards and guidelines. In order to put in another runway, there needs to be a minimum of 400 feet between a runway and a taxiway. Due to the fact that Taxiway Y is located to the west of the current North/South runway and it is 508 feet away from the existing runway, a 908-foot separation between the current and proposed North/South runways would be necessary to meet the minimum FAA requirements (508 feet + 400 feet = 908 feet).

Working Group member comment: Why was Alternative 4B (new east/west runway south of Runway 7R) from the previous Master Plan not evaluated?

Planning team response: A new runway in this location would require the relocation of extensive existing airport development (portions of South Air Park and the former Kulis ANG) and would induce more noise to residential areas east and south of the airport. The gain in airfield capacity can be accomplished by a new north/south runway on the west side of the airfield with fewer adverse impacts.

Working Group member question: Alternatives 3, 4, and 5 all have different terminal designs. Are we being provided with a menu of terminal options, or is each terminal option tied to a specific alternative?

Planning team response: A menu of options is being provided. Each terminal design can be mixed and matched with each airfield alternative.

Working Group member question: Why are there only five new gates on the proposed new concourse in the South Terminal?

Planning team response: If we were to build an additional concourse, there would be a net gain of 5 gates (8 gates total, 3 of which already exist).

Working Group member comment: Expansion of the North Terminal could be inconvenient. Consolidation of terminals would allow for fewer services to be required to accommodate more people.

Working Group member comment: (Airfield) Alternatives 4 and 5 should not be considered because the forecast does not warrant it. Additional runways should be considered in a future Master Plan – not this one.

Planning team response: The FAA accepted forecast and demand/capacity analysis shows that additional airfield capacity may be needed within this Master Plan Update's planning period. This Master Plan Update is reviewing a range of alternatives that would provide additional capacity at the Airport to meet forecasted demand.

Each draft alternative will be further analyzed over the next few months to determine how much of the projected 20-year demand it will 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.

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 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 for major capital improvements. Constructing a new runway can take 10 to 20 years – this long lead time needs to be taken into consideration during the planning process. Even if the Airport selects Alternative 4 or 5 as the preferred alternative runway improvements would not be implemented until necessary to meet demand.

Working Group member comment: Alternatives 4 and 5 should be considered along with the others. The Airport needs to plan for the future.

Working Group member comment: Planning for the short term while not taking into consideration the long term needs is disingenuous to the planning process, and is not responsible planning. If at some point a new runway may be needed, it is prudent on our part to consider that in these discussions.

Working Group member comment: Use of the Elmendorf base for gas-n-go traffic should be evaluated, particularly for air cargo. Gas-n-go traffic has no stake in the local economy, and there is no certainty that it will continue to come through Anchorage in the future. Before \$1 billion is spent on a new runway, it must be verified that the need would exist long-term to warrant such an expenditure.

Planning team response: A letter has been send to the JBER Commander asking whether joint use of Elmendorf would be feasible. Informal communications with JBER indicate that joint use is not feasible because the fuel used at Elmendorf is incompatible with commercial jet fleet, that Elmendorf's infrastructure is already at capacity, and JBER cannot accommodate foreign nationals that conduct much of the gas-n-go operations due to security concerns. The AIAS planning study found Fairbanks to be the preferred airport to supplement ANC gas-n-go traffic, which is reflected in Alternative 2.

Working Group member comment: Smaller gas-n-go operations like to land where the big cargo planes are so that if they encounter any mechanical difficulties they will be able to fix the issue. A critical mass of

air traffic is necessary to provide this amenity, and even if they were able to attract some additional gas-n-g traffic, neither Fairbanks nor Elmendorf would have said critical mass.

Working Group member comment: It would be a mistake to get rid of Pt. Woronzof Park. Including Alternative 5 as an alternative essentially puts Point Woronzof Park on the table for a land swap.

Planning team response: There are no plans at this time to dispose of any airport property in a land swap. The FAA encourages Airports in the US to retain their developable land. The purpose of the Master Plan is to make sure that land ANC currently has available for future development be available should the need arise.

Working Group member comment: I think there are a lot of feasibility issues with Alternative 5 that have not been fully investigated yet. There is homework that needs to be done before it is included in the Master Plan.

Planning team response: All the alternatives are drafts, so yes, there are many details associated with each of them that need to be addressed. The Master Plan Update team is currently working on a more detailed assessment of both impacts and benefits of each draft alternative, including draft Alternative 5. However, it is important to include draft Alternative 5 to evaluate one alternative that provides two widely-spaced parallel runways.

Working Group member question: What happened to the road going to the western part of the runway from the past Master Plan?

Planning team response: Both draft Alternative 4 and draft Alternative 5 consider providing a public access road to the West Airpark from Postmark Drive which would tunnel under Taxiway R, Runway 15/33, and Taxiway Y.

Working Group member question: Is there a need for a new hotel at the airport?

Planning team response: Airport hotels provide higher levels of air traveler service - an objective of this Master Plan Update. The Master Plan Update has identified a potential hotel site should a developer choose to invest in such a facility. The identified site would serve the likely needs of a hotel development without interfering with the Airport's aviation mission.

Working Group member comment: The East Airpark would be a better location for a hotel because the rail could be utilized for visitors to travel between the hotel and the Airport.

Working Group member comment: Widely-spaced runways, whether they are running east/west or north/south, would cause the most community issues.

Planning team response: Widely spaced parallel runways are the only means of conducting concurrent operations in all weather conditions.

Planning team response: We should not close off our options. Alternatives 4 and 5 should continue to be evaluated as we try to determine what would make the best preferred alternative.

At this point in the discussion, Katherine Wood noted the time.

Next Steps

The next Working Group meeting will be scheduled for some time in September. See the website for additional meeting dates/information (<http://www.ancmasterplan.com/schedule/>).

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.

A general meeting summary will be distributed to the group.

“Parking Apron” Items *(Valid ideas and questions for potential further action that need follow up before additional discussion, issues that will be addressed at a later time with the group or with the comment originator.)*

- Provide an update on the Technical Advisory Committee’s perspective re: alternatives
- Additional alternatives data on capacity and cost-benefit analyses

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