

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: May 23, 2013; 5:30-8:00pm

Subject: Public Open House 5

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)

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

Pat Oien (FAA)
Leah Henderson (DOWL HKM)
Tom Middendorf (DOWL HKM)

Public Open House Summary:

On Thursday, May 23, 2013, the Ted Stevens Anchorage International Airport (ANC) Master Plan Update hosted its fifth in a series of public open houses. The purpose of this event was to update the public on draft Airport development alternatives prepared for the Master Plan Update to meet future aviation demand. Comments on the draft alternatives are being collected and used to assist the planning team in evaluating the draft alternatives. From 5:30-6:15PM, a public open house featured posters with Master Plan Update information, as well as maps of all five draft alternatives. A presentation was given by Evan Pfahler at 6:15pm, followed by a Q&A session facilitated by Katherine Wood. The Q&A session ended at approx. 7:50pm. The meeting was closed at 8:00pm.

Advertising

- Two Anchorage Daily Newspaper ads (May 12 and 19, 2013)
- Legal notice in the Anchorage Daily News (May 9, 2013)
- Postcard (sent to zip codes 99502, 99503, 99509, 99515, 99517, 99518 = approx. 40,000 addresses)
- E-newsletter to contact list of approximately 680 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

132 people signed in to the event. Approximately 6 additional people attended but did not sign in. The sign-in sheets resulted in 82 new email addresses being added to the distribution list.

Media Coverage

A few days prior to the May 23 Open House, KTVA Channel 11 ran a story related to the draft alternatives. It ran on May 21: <http://www.ktva.com/home/top-stories/Airport-Master-Plan-Raises-Concerns-208420281.html>

KTUU/Channel 2 attended the event, resulting in a media story on the May 23 and 24 newscasts: <http://www.ktuu.com/news/ktuu-airport-proposals-raise-coastal-trail-concerns-20130524,0,256403.story>

Alaska Dispatch Reporter Jerzy Shedlock also attended and published a story: <http://www.alaskadispatch.com/article/20130523/opponents-anchorage-airport-expansion-pack-public-hearing> on May 23 in the online publication.

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
- Lake Hood Pilot's Association

Meeting Materials

- Handouts (comment sheets, agenda, fact sheet, and FAQs, draft alternative maps and accompanying notes, phone surveys)
- Introductory PowerPoint Presentation (played during Open House and covered progress to date)
- Main PowerPoint Presentation: Alternatives
- Station boards

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

The Q&A session lasted for 50 minutes, during which the Master Plan Update team answered approximately 25 questions.

Comments Received

27 written comment forms were received. Comments on these forms will be responded to in the Comment Response Report #2.

Presentations:

Intro Presentation

From 5:30-6:15PM a short PowerPoint presentation was repeatedly playing on the screen at the front of the room. This presentation covered basic information about the Master Plan Update, as well as a synopsis of Master Plan Update progress to date. The presentation can be viewed in its entirety here: http://www.ancmasterplan.com/library/index_84_1214249864.pdf

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
- next steps in the Master Plan process

The presentation lasted approximately 45 minutes. The presentation can be viewed in its entirety here: http://www.ancmasterplan.com/library/index_84_3323336179.pdf

Comment/Question Detail:

Comments Received at Open House Stations:

- Consider how to reduce noise levels impacting Anchorage
- You need to think about the impacts on wildlife – moose, birds, etc.
- The Airport needs good bike access, bike parking (including bike lockers) and a bike assembly station.
- Maintain the existing bike route.
- How are wetlands going to be affected? How will you mitigate their development? There is a very high water table in the Airport area, especially in the Northeast.
- Is the existing and newly discovered ground water contamination to be dealt with?
- Better public transportation options
- Protect the Coastal Trail – in its existing location
- Airport expansion is another state subsidy benefitting transnational corporations. Excessive corporate power wins again.

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 planning team responses have been supplemented to supply complete responses.*

Question from public: When you talk about growth, where do you see the growth?

Answer from the Master Plan Team: The FAA accepted forecast of aviation activity anticipates growth as follows:

- Operations (overall landings/takeoffs): 1.4% increase annually
- Passenger enplanements: 1.4% increase annually
- Cargo tonnage: 2.9% increase annually

Methods for the AIAS Forecast, which is being used for this Master Plan, have been accepted for use by both the Airlines and the FAA. The forecast has a baseline year of 2010, and was completed in 2012. It accounts for domestic and international activity.

Question from public: What about deicing fluid containment? Do we (ANC) have an exemption from the federal government?

Answer from the Master Plan Team:

ANC does not have an exemption from federal standards for airfield pavement deicing or aircraft deicing. ANC currently does and will continue to comply with federal standards for all deicing activity. The Master Plan Update includes an assessment of facility needs to ensure that deicing activity can be accomplished safely and efficiently and in compliance with federal standards throughout the planning period.

Question from public: Where is deicing fluid runoff going to now?

Answer from the Master Plan Team: The deicing fluids, sprayed on aircraft to ensure safe flight, drain to the airport's storm water system. This system is currently permitted under the Multi-Sector General Permit (MSGP) for industrial activities. The permit has various testing and Best Management Practices (BMP) requirements. Some of the BMP's that the airport incorporates into its storm water system for treatment are bio-swales, wetlands, retention areas, and ditch aerators. These are in addition to airlines and ground service providers' BMP's and their use of advanced deicing equipment to reduce the amount of aircraft deicing fluid sprayed. The Airport works closely with our tenants to minimize the impact deicing fluid has on Lake Hood, Lake Spenard and the environment once it leaves airport property and enters Cook Inlet.

Question from public: About the phone survey: Were there other questions asked than what was presented in the PowerPoint? If so, what were they and what were the answers?

Answer from the Master Plan Team: There were 16 or 17 questions asked in the phone survey. All questions and answers can be found in the Craciun Research Report. There are a few copies of this report in the back of the room, and it is also on the project website.

Question from public: The phone survey stated that 81% of the study respondents ranked the Airport as very important to the local economy. How many responses make up the 81%?

Answer from the Master Plan Team: Refer to phone survey report. It lists all the questions, the methodologies, the number of individuals surveyed, as well as the area in Anchorage where respondents reside.

Question from public: Can you prove how the Airport has impacted the local economy?

Answer from the Master Plan Team: Studies have been done by both the Institute for Social and Economic Research (ISER) at the University of Alaska and by local researchers at the McDowell Group. These reports state that 15,500 jobs in Anchorage are dependent on the Airport, about 1 in 10 jobs in the Anchorage Bowl, and the Airport produces approximately a billion dollars in payroll annually.

Question from public: Regarding Alternative 2: Does Fairbanks Airport (FAI) need additional cargo traffic? Do they have the capacity? How many additional services and facilities would FAI need? Is it appropriate to share traffic?

Answer from the Master Plan Team: Alternative 2 tries to balance the demand between FAI and ANC. This Alternative's assumption is that half of the cargo transit (or gas-n-go) operations at ANC would instead choose to use FAI. The AIAS Planning Study is currently assessing the feasibility of this Alternative. ANC cannot force airlines to go to FAI, and there is the potential for airlines to altogether leave the State if they cannot be accommodated at ANC. Based on AIAS Planning Study analysis, the FAI airfield would be able to accommodate additional cargo flights in the future without contributing to congestion at FAI. However, FAI would need to add parking positions, fueling stations, and other infrastructure investment to fully support the potential additional traffic from ANC.

Question from public: About the phone survey: It looks like the survey was conducted at the request of HDR, not a member of the public. The Airport should have asked for the public's input in creating the survey questions. There are some important questions left off including the potential Coastal Trail reroute.

Answer from the Master Plan Team: A member of the public at a public meeting early in the process suggested conducting a public survey. In reviewing public comments early in the process, the Master Plan Update team and the Airport agreed that a survey of public opinion about the Airport would benefit the process.

Question from public: The phone survey's result showing that 80% of respondents want the Airport to acquire land is flawed, as it did not mention the potential necessity of a Coastal Trail re-route should that land be acquired.

Answer from the Master Plan Team: The survey was conducted before the alternatives were developed and released for public review. Note: the phone survey is one of many tools the team is using in the planning and alternatives evaluation process. The results of the survey do not weigh more heavily than public comments, or Working Group/Technical Advisory Committee discussion, or other vehicles for public input.

Comments and Questions from member of the public: The stakeholder and sub-committee groups (Technical Advisory Group and Working Group) do not provide representation for private pilots and aircraft owners, which is the main reason you have an Airport. The phone survey asked questions but did not discuss them or tell of the impacts. What will happen to general aviation? Will Lake Hood pilots be able to fly? The Master Plan Update has not addressed the problem of airspace. Ted Stevens Anchorage International Airport is just one Airport in the Anchorage bowl. The Master Plan Update should look at Elmendorf and Merrill Field as locations to divert air traffic. In regards to the angled taxiways on the ANC Airfield, they were put in only twenty years ago and now you want to take them away? The primary runway should be the North/South Runway.

Answers from the Master Plan Team: The Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association/Alaska Airmen's Association is represented on the Master Plan Update Technical Advisory Committee. There is little the Airport can do to control the growth of general aviation or commercial air traffic. Pilots and airlines make the choice to fly in and out of the Anchorage International Airport. The Airport considers Lake Hood a critical asset to the community. The Master Plan Update draft alternatives were developed to minimize impacts to Lake Hood Airport facilities and operations. If there are any potential issues, they will be identified during the alternative evaluation process. Yes, the angled, high-speed taxiways were put in approximately 20 years ago. The FAA has since updated airport design standards and the angled taxiways are no longer desirable because they are located between two active runways. Improvements to the angled taxiways, if preferred, would likely be implemented when the existing taxiways are due for rehabilitation.

Question from public: Which alternatives will require approval from local, state and/or federal agencies and what is the process?

Answer from the Master Plan Team: The Master Plan Update sets forth a plan for the Airport but does not yield final approvals for any airport improvements. The *conditional* approval of the Airport Layout Plan (ALP) that accompanies the final Master Plan Update resides with the FAA, who will ensure the ALP meets current design standards. The MOA/Assembly does not approve the Master Plan Update, nor does the Alaska Legislature. Major projects recommended in the Master Plan Update are likely to require environmental reviews and approvals, complex funding strategies involving the State, FAA, and airlines, as well as approval from the Governor, and other state representatives.

Question from public: Isn't Point Woronzof Park owned by the Municipality of Anchorage?

Answer from the Master Plan Team: Yes, Point Woronzof Park is currently owned by the Municipality of Anchorage.

Questions from public: When are peak times for aircraft arrivals? Can we reduce peak operations?

Answer from the Master Plan Team: There are seasonal and daily peak periods. Seasonally the months of May to September are the busiest. Daily peak periods are from about 10:00AM until about 6:00PM. These hours are peak for two reasons:

- Seasonal peaks are a result of high tourist activity in Alaska during the summer months.
- Daily peaks are a result of cargo activity operating between Asian curfew controlled airports and Lower 48 cargo sorting hubs with strict deadlines for package arrivals.

Airlines have limited flexibility to spread out their peak hours evenly over 24 hour periods because they can't control the factors above. If they could easily do so, many would likely already have done so.

Question from public: Is the Airport addressing erosion at Point Woronzof?

Answer from the Master Plan Team: The Airport has requested that the Army Corps of Engineers to conduct a study to address erosion at Point Woronzof.

Question from public: Why can't the Airport share facilities at Elmendorf instead of spending money to build a new runway?

Answer from the Master Plan Team: Earlier this week, the Airport reached out to Joint Base Elmendorf / Richardson (JBER) regarding Department of Defense (DOD) military installations. The response was that supporting joint civilian-military operations does not meet the purpose of JBER and would not be endorsed by the DOD. If ANC is to consider the transfer of operations to another airport in Alaska, the best alternative is FAI, which is the scenario evaluated under Alternative 2.

Question from public: Airlines are not interested in going to FAI, so what would be the alternative?

Answer from the Master Plan Team: An AIAS Study is currently evaluating that feasibility of transferring cargo tech stop traffic from ANC to FAI. The Master Plan Update considers four other alternatives.

Question from public: When does community interest and quality of life supersede 'big business'?

Answer from the Master Plan Team: The Airport Master Plan Update goals and objectives are to seek reasonable balance among many competing interests. "Quality of life" is determined by a variety of factors including the strength of the Alaska economy.

Question from public: I am against any plan that impacts the Coastal Trail and Point Woronzof. How much weight do public comments have? Is there a percentage in making the final decision?

Answer from the Master Plan Team: All comments will be considered. The Master Plan Update team established goals and objectives and shared them with the public in September 2012 for comment. The goals and objectives will be used to evaluate the relative merits of the draft alternatives. A range of alternatives have been developed several of which already reflect comments provided to the Master Plan Update team seeking to limit growth of airfield infrastructure at ANC. There is not a percentage factor that will be given to public comment during the evaluation process.

Question from public: Alternative 5 will impact AWWU. I spoke to AWWU, and they said the Airport could take their current land if they pay the full amount to acquire it, and to relocate and replace AWWU (Asplund Treatment Plant) facility. The total would be approximately one billion dollars. When I asked AWWU about other locations they could relocate in the Anchorage bowl, they said there were none. AWWU is here tonight, what does AWWU have to say?

Answer from AWWU Representative: AWWU operates the Asplund Treatment Plant on the west end of the north/south runway. AWWU is currently a primary treatment facility and is permitted to conduct primary treatment as a result of Cook Inlet's tidal flows which create an active mixing zone dispersing waste water dumped into the Inlet by AWWU. An upgrade to a secondary treatment facility would be very costly and could have a significant financial impact to the AWWU service area. The operations at the primary treatment facility are AWWU's main concern, and therefore AWWU does have concerns about Alternative 4 and Alternative 5. Ideally, AWWU would like to use its existing infrastructure for the long-term. If there are new regulatory requirements and it becomes necessary for AWWU to expand to a secondary treatment facility, AWWU would need to use its land.

AWWU is working with the Airport as they enter the technical alternatives evaluation phase. No studies have been conducted regarding the possibility of relocating the plant or how much the relocation would cost. AWWU recognizes that both the Asplund Treatment Plant and the Airport are both necessary infrastructure for Anchorage. AWWU is working with the Airport to find mutually agreeable solutions.

Question from public: When will we know when Alternative 4 or Alternative 5 is needed? What are the aviation triggers and when will we see those triggers?

Answer from the Master Plan Team: When and if traffic exceeds capacity at ANC, delays will occur. AIAS asked airlines what they considered a reasonable level of delay with which they could still continue operating. The airlines answered that any more than 30 minutes of delay during peak periods would be untenable if it occurred on a regular basis. Once a preferred alternative is selected, the Master Plan Update team will develop trigger points for necessary improvements.

Comment from public: Alternatives 4 and 5 are nonstarters based on quality of life issues. The Airport seems to be soft-selling this stage of the Master Plan Update, especially if the next step is a park swap. Alternative 4 is currently on the Airport Layout Plan and therefore Point Woronzof Park has been a target for acquisition the whole time. The Airport needs to be upfront about this entire process otherwise the public will think there is subterfuge.

Questions from public: As far as projections with Alternative 4, to what extent are you taking into account technology, i.e. new landing systems? How do you know that in 30 years it will still only be able to provide additional capacity in good weather? All of the Airport's projections seem like they are premised on no downward growth (decline in activity). How does forecast consider ups & downs and declining cargo landings? Could cargo carriers overfly Anchorage in the future?

Answers from the Master Plan Team: Currently, the FAA says spacing between runways needs to be 4,300 feet for parallel simultaneous landings in poor weather. For future planning, the FAA says they anticipate that new technology will enable a closer spacing of 3,000 feet. Under either scenario, the runway shown in Alternative 4 is too closely spaced to provide simultaneous landings in all weather conditions. Per the aviation forecast, the 1.4% annual operations growth shown in the forecast is an average over the long term. Historical data shows there is typically an ebb and flow in traffic levels, but an overall trend of growth. In reality, traffic will go up and down from year to year, but the forecast shows overall growth over the next 20 years. Currently most airlines enhance their profitability by stopping for fuel at ANC. Future aircraft may have enhanced performance negating the benefits associated with an ANC fuel stop. However, no aircraft currently flying or under development would eliminate the benefits of a fuel stop at ANC on most routes between Asia and the United States.

Question from public: You don't have very specific plans for Alternatives 4 and 5 as far as impacts to the Coastal Trail. What conversations has the Airport had with other agencies? What is the Airport's plan for rerouting the trail?

Answer from the Master Plan Team: Under Alternative 4 or 5, the Airport would work with engaging trail users, interested stakeholders, and the public to define a re-route of the Coastal Trail. The Airport understands the impacts of Alternatives 4 and 5, and the importance of the Coastal Trail to users and the community. The Nordic Ski Association is a member of the Working Group and the comment period for these alternatives is still open.

Comment from Senator Hollis French: I wrote a letter to the Airport today voicing my concerns over Alternative 4 and 5. As I represent most west Anchorage residents who live near the Airport, can I see a show of hands of those who heavily oppose these Alternatives, to confirm I am aligned with my constituents? (Members of the public opposed to Alternatives 4 and 5 raised hands).

Answer from the Master Plan Team: There is a lot of diversity of opinion regarding this project, we are also hearing from residents who support Alternatives 4 and 5.

Question from public: The solution you are not putting enough weight on is Alternative #2, moving gas-n-go traffic to FAI. Let our sister airport in Fairbanks take the traffic. What is the percentage of ANC traffic that is gas-n-go? If it is a small economic impact to Anchorage, move cargo transit and tech stop traffic to FAI via Alternative 2.

Answer from the Master Plan Team: Alternative 2 is being considered equally with the other four alternatives. The gas-n-go traffic does have a significant economic impact on Anchorage and the Southcentral economy. These airlines pay a substantial share of the Airport's operational costs; if they leave and move to Fairbanks or to another airport outside of Alaska, costs for other airlines operating at ANC could go up.

Notes by: HDR Alaska