Welcome!

Public Open House

for the

Ted Stevens Anchorage International Airport (ANC) Master Plan Update

Thursday, September 12, 2013
5:30 pm – 8:30 pm
Presentation at 6:15 pm
Coast International Inn
3450 Aviation Avenue
McKinley Room
General Ground Rules

1. Mutual respect, courtesy, and patience will allow everyone to participate.
2. Please help maintain an atmosphere where everyone feels comfortable, regardless of his or her opinion.
3. Please don’t interrupt anyone while they are speaking.
4. Please turn off cell phones.
A master plan is a comprehensive airport study that envisions the short-, medium-, and long-term development plans for the airport.

Master Plan Update Purpose:
To strategically position the Ted Stevens Anchorage International Airport (ANC) for the future by forecasting future needs and developing alternatives that will keep the airport efficient and economical.

Purpose of this Meeting:
To present information on work to date for the Master Plan Update, including:

- Public involvement and Draft Communications Plan
- Airport’s draft plan for future development
- Results of the alternatives analysis
- Next steps
To maximize stakeholders’ time and interest, we conducted our most intense period of public involvement during the school year (September 2012–May 2013).

### ANC Master Plan Update Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>J</strong></td>
<td><strong>J</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A</strong></td>
<td><strong>F</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S</strong></td>
<td><strong>M</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O</strong></td>
<td><strong>A</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td><strong>M</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D</strong></td>
<td><strong>J</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D</strong></td>
<td><strong>J</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **PUBLIC OPEN HOUSE**
- **WORKING GROUP MEETING**
- **TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING**

**July-Aug 2012**

- Project Initiation

**Sept 2012–Feb 2013**

- Inventory and Facility Requirements

**Jan-May 2013**

- Alternatives Development

**May-Sept 2013**

- Alternatives Refinement and Evaluation

**Sept 2013**

- Share Draft Plan for Future Development

**Nov 2013**

- Share Final Plan for Future Development

**Sept–Nov 2013**

- Implementation Plan and Airport Layout Plan

**Dec 2013**

- Final Report
What we’ve been busy with since May:

- 10 Stakeholder Meetings
- 10 Listening Posts that reached 280 people (Alaska Airlines Soccer Cup, Slam’n Salmon Derby, Loussac Library, Summer Solstice Festival, Live After Five, 4th Avenue, Spenard Farmer’s Market, Music in the Park, REAP Energy Fair, Big Wild Life Runs)
- 3 Presentations (Anchorage Chamber of Commerce, 2 Rotary clubs)
- 3 E-newsletters
As requested by the public, the Airport is sharing and responding to all comments received in comment response reports, available at this meeting and on the website. All comments received to date have been reviewed by the Airport and planning staff and have been considered in alternatives evaluation.

**Comment Response Report #1**
- Covers comments received through April 1, 2013
- The 75 comments received addressed a variety of issues, with a variety of viewpoints
- Each issue identified has a response

**Comment Response Report #2**
- Covers comments received April 2 through June 30, 2013
- The 350 comments received addressed a variety of issues, with a variety of viewpoints
- Later version will provide responses and be shared online, anticipated in October 2013

**Comment Response Report #3** will respond to comments received after June 30, 2013
Please don’t mess with the coastal trail. I understand the airport’s desire to expand, but running one of Anchorage’s few cultural treasures is the wrong way to do it. Develop elsewhere.

I am in favor of Alternative 1. There exists no proven need to expand the airport.

This alternative does not meet future demand; it removes the ability to grow in the future.

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.

ALTERNATIVE 5: Widely Spaced Runway

I agree there should be a Master Plan and on going planning for the airport. I do not agree to the expansion of the airport without due consideration of the trail system in the area.

I would like to lend my support to Alternative 2. It is by far the most logical. It is a truly conservative alternative, in that it would minimize spending on new facilities to achieve the desired capacity goals.

I support the continued development and operations of Ted Stevens Anchorage International Airport. The airport is one of the largest economic engines in Anchorage and the State of Alaska.

We are in the flight path and the noise does not bother us.

The local home owners, both to the North and South of the airport moved in well after the airport was planned and moved from Merrill Field. All of these home owners knew they were buying and/or building near an airport.

ALTERNATIVE 4: Closely Spaced Runway

There doesn’t seem to be much “bang for your buck” with this alternative. It won’t do as much to meet demand.

ALTERNATIVE 3: Optimize ANC

I do not support and am in fact tremendously opposed to expansion of the Anchorage airport.

I support the continued development and operations of Ted Stevens Anchorage International Airport.

I am writing in opposition to a new North/South runway being included in your Master Plan, the alternatives that will destroy large sections of the Coastal Trail and Pt. Woronzof Park if constructed. In the previous Master Plan in 2008, Alaskans made it clear that a new runway should not compromise our quality of life and does not belong in the Airport’s long-term plans. Now, with cargo down 25% since 2007, there is even less of a need for a new runway. Instead of including a new runway in the Master Plan, work to optimize the current infrastructure. I urge you to remove all alternatives for a North/South runway from the Master Plan.

I would like to remind the citizens of West Anchorage that it likely will have to be relocated, and that’s a-ok by me as long as it stays continuous.

We are the airport’s next door neighbors. Noise is tolerable unless it is a rainy day and other air lanes are in use. At this point, all the windows are closed, even in the summer and this is intolerable.

Noise is tolerable unless it is a rainy day and other air lanes are in use. At this point, all the windows are closed, even in the summer and this is intolerable.

The airport is already very noisy. Increased air traffic may make several neighborhoods surrounding the airport unbearable.

I do not support any solution that would maximize development and employment in the future.

Please ask that no change be made and leave the airport as is.

I am a user and supporter of the Coastal Trail and I see no reason to surrender that ability for a long-term questionable economic prediction.

This is burying your head in the sand. Alternative 3 creates no new growth, and is not realistic for passenger travel.

I support the continued development and operations of Ted Stevens Anchorage International Airport.

I support the continued development and operations of Ted Stevens Anchorage International Airport.

We are in the flight path and the noise does not bother us.

The existing character of the Tony Knowles Coastal Trail needs to be preserved.

The airport already very noisy. Increased air traffic may make several neighborhoods surrounding the airport unbearable.

ALTERNATIVE 2: Optimize AIAS (FAI)

How much would the Anchorage economy lose with this alternative? There would be a negative economic impact to Anchorage.

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.

Alternatives may work, but for how long?

This alternative provides planned capacity, and on going planning for the airport. I do not question the need for a new runway. Instead of including a new runway in the Master Plan, work to optimize the current infrastructure. I urge you to remove all alternatives for a North/South runway from the Master Plan.

I would like to remind the citizens of West Anchorage that it likely will have to be relocated, and that’s a-ok by me as long as it stays continuous.

We are the airport’s next door neighbors. Noise is tolerable unless it is a rainy day and other air lanes are in use. At this point, all the windows are closed, even in the summer and this is intolerable.

The airport is already very noisy. Increased air traffic may make several neighborhoods surrounding the airport unbearable.

I do not support any solution that would maximize development and employment in the future.

Please ask that no change be made and leave the airport as is.

I am a user and supporter of the Coastal Trail and I see no reason to surrender that ability for a long-term questionable economic prediction.

This is burying your head in the sand. Alternative 3 creates no new growth, and is not realistic for passenger travel.

I support the continued development and operations of Ted Stevens Anchorage International Airport.

I support the continued development and operations of Ted Stevens Anchorage International Airport.

We are in the flight path and the noise does not bother us.

The airport is already very noisy. Increased air traffic may make several neighborhoods surrounding the airport unbearable.

I do not support any solution that would maximize development and employment in the future.

Please ask that no change be made and leave the airport as is.

I am a user and supporter of the Coastal Trail and I see no reason to surrender that ability for a long-term questionable economic prediction.

This is burying your head in the sand. Alternative 3 creates no new growth, and is not realistic for passenger travel.

I support the continued development and operations of Ted Stevens Anchorage International Airport.

I support the continued development and operations of Ted Stevens Anchorage International Airport.

We are in the flight path and the noise does not bother us.

The airport is already very noisy. Increased air traffic may make several neighborhoods surrounding the airport unbearable.

I do not support any solution that would maximize development and employment in the future.

Please ask that no change be made and leave the airport as is.

I am a user and supporter of the Coastal Trail and I see no reason to surrender that ability for a long-term questionable economic prediction.

This is burying your head in the sand. Alternative 3 creates no new growth, and is not realistic for passenger travel.

I support the continued development and operations of Ted Stevens Anchorage International Airport.

I support the continued development and operations of Ted Stevens Anchorage International Airport.
As requested by the public, the Airport has prepared an updated plan for ongoing Airport-public communications, which will be adopted at the close of the Master Plan Update, available at this meeting and on the website.

**Plan Highlights:**
- ‧ Contact information
- ‧ How the public can best communicate to the Airport
- ‧ How the Airport can best communicate to the public
The Alternatives Evaluation Process flowchart depicts the process used to prepare and evaluate airport development alternatives. The process incorporates technical analysis and public input.

**Prioritized Goals and Objectives**

**Evaluation Criteria**

**Inventory**

**Aviation Activity Forecast (Demand)**

**Facility Requirements**

**Prepare Development Alternatives (5) (comprehensive airport plans)**

**Evaluate Alternatives**

**Share Airport’s Draft Plan for Future Development**

**Finalize Airport’s Plan for Future Development**

The flowchart indicates the following key stages:

- **Public Open House 2 – 9/19/12**
- **Public Open House 3 – 2/20/13**
- **Public Open House 4 – 3/21/13**
- **Public Open House 5 – 5/23/13**
- **Public Open House 6 – 9/12/13**
- **Public Open House 7 – TBD Nov 2013**
SAFETY — Maintain or enhance the **safe operation** of the Airport

- **CRITERIA** — **Meets or Exceeds Design Standards**: Does the alternative comply with applicable Federal Aviation Administration design standards, Federal Aviation Regulations, and other appropriate design standards that apply to Anchorage International Airport facilities?

- **CRITERIA** — **Consistency with Best Safety Practices**: Does the alternative incorporate the Federal Aviation Administration’s best practices for airfield safety and pilot situational awareness to the greatest practical degree?

EFFICIENCY — Maintain or enhance the **efficient operation** of the Airport

- **CRITERIA** — **Maintains or Enhances Operational Efficiency**: Does the alternative accommodate demand such that the Airport operates efficiently (e.g. with minimal delays) and at the desired levels of service throughout the planning horizon?

- **CRITERIA** — **Supports Adaptable Facilities**: Does the alternative include facilities that may be adapted to meet unforeseen changes in levels of demand and types of demand within the planning horizon and beyond?

- **CRITERIA** — **Ease of Implementation**: Can the alternative be implemented in a phased manner that does not unduly complicate existing operation of the Airport during implementation?

ENVIRONMENTAL AWARENESS — Minimize the impact of airport development through **environmental awareness**

- **CRITERIA** — **Noise**: Does the alternative minimize airplane related noise on noise-sensitive areas near the Airport?

- **CRITERIA** — **Recreation**: Does the alternative consider impacts to recreation lands on and near the Airport?

- **CRITERIA** — **Environmental Compatibility**: Does the alternative minimize general airport impacts on neighborhoods surrounding the Airport?

FISCAL SUSTAINABILITY — Enhance the long-term **fiscal sustainability** of the Airport

- **CRITERIA** — **Funding**: Can the implementation of the alternative be financed?

- **CRITERIA** — **Supports Revenue Generation**: Does the alternative provide opportunities to increase potential revenue generation?

LAND MANAGEMENT — Facilitate long-term Airport development through **strategic land management planning**

- **CRITERIA** — **Supports Aeronautical Use**: Does the alternative maximize the use of Airport land for current and future aeronautical needs?

- **CRITERIA** — **Land Use Compatibility**: Does the alternative meet Federal Aviation Administration on-Airport land use compatibility requirements and does the alternative minimize conflicts with nearby off-Airport land uses?

- **CRITERIA** — **Supports Adaptable Land Use**: Does the alternative include land use that may be adapted to meet unforeseen changes in levels of demand and types of demand within the planning horizon and beyond?
## Alternatives Evaluation Results

Ted Stevens Anchorage International Airport (ANC)

**Master Plan Update**

### SAFETY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Alternative 1 Minimize Development</th>
<th>Alternative 2 Optimize AIAS</th>
<th>Alternative 3 Optimize ANC</th>
<th>Alternative 4 Closely Spaced Runway</th>
<th>Alternative 5 Widely Spaced Runway</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meets or Exceeds Design Standards</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistent with Best Safety Practices</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### EFFICIENCY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Alternative 1 Minimize Development</th>
<th>Alternative 2 Optimize AIAS</th>
<th>Alternative 3 Optimize ANC</th>
<th>Alternative 4 Closely Spaced Runway</th>
<th>Alternative 5 Widely Spaced Runway</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintains or Enhances Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supports Adaptable Facilities</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of Implementation</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ENVIRONMENTAL AWARENESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Alternative 1 Minimize Development</th>
<th>Alternative 2 Optimize AIAS</th>
<th>Alternative 3 Optimize ANC</th>
<th>Alternative 4 Closely Spaced Runway</th>
<th>Alternative 5 Widely Spaced Runway</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Noise Impacts</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Impacts</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Compatibility</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FISCAL SUSTAINABILITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Alternative 1 Minimize Development</th>
<th>Alternative 2 Optimize AIAS</th>
<th>Alternative 3 Optimize ANC</th>
<th>Alternative 4 Closely Spaced Runway</th>
<th>Alternative 5 Widely Spaced Runway</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funding Potential</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supports Revenue Generation</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### LAND MANAGEMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Alternative 1 Minimize Development</th>
<th>Alternative 2 Optimize AIAS</th>
<th>Alternative 3 Optimize ANC</th>
<th>Alternative 4 Closely Spaced Runway</th>
<th>Alternative 5 Widely Spaced Runway</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supports Aeronautical Use</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Compatibility</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supports Adaptable Land Use</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend:** ○ = alternative does not meet or barely meets the criteria; ● = alternative somewhat meets criteria; ○ = alternative mostly meets the criteria; ● = alternative fully or almost fully meets criteria
## Airfield Alternatives Technical Analysis

### Table: Airfield Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Estimated Cost (in 2013 dollars)</th>
<th>Untenable Peak Delay Threshold</th>
<th>Average Annual Delay</th>
<th>Annual Delay Savings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 1</td>
<td>Minimize Development</td>
<td>$95 Million</td>
<td>243,000 annual landings and takeoffs</td>
<td>10.3 minutes per landing or takeoff</td>
<td>No savings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 2</td>
<td>Optimize AIAS</td>
<td>$47+ Million (cost of Fairbanks improvements and incentives)</td>
<td>282,000+ annual landings and takeoffs</td>
<td>&lt;10 minutes per landing or takeoff</td>
<td>$18 Million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 3</td>
<td>Optimize ANC</td>
<td>$110 Million</td>
<td>243,000 annual landings and takeoffs</td>
<td>7.2 minutes per landing or takeoff</td>
<td>$89 Million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 4</td>
<td>Closely Spaced Runway</td>
<td>$422 Million</td>
<td>243,000 annual landings and takeoffs</td>
<td>8.2 minutes per landing or takeoff</td>
<td>$39 Million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 5</td>
<td>Widely Spaced Runway</td>
<td>$887 Million</td>
<td>323,000 annual landings and takeoffs</td>
<td>5.7 minutes per landing or takeoff</td>
<td>$102 Million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes:

1. The technical analysis results shown pertain only to the airfield alternatives. This includes the runway, taxiway, and apron improvements at the highest levels of forecast demand of 282K landings and takeoffs.
2. The estimated cost of each alternative (in 2013 dollars) includes the capital, design, environmental, construction, and contingency cost of constructing runways, taxiways, and apron areas, and vehicular roadway infrastructure. Terminal, public parking, and other tenant driven improvements are excluded from the cost estimates.
3. The estimated cost of Alternative 2: Optimize AIAS does not include the cost of constructing necessary facilities at Fairbanks International Airport, which are not shown in the presented costs, is estimated to be in the range of $30 to $50 million dollars.
4. The untenable peak delay threshold is the annual operations level at which 30 minutes of peak hour delay would occur 10% of the time or more.
5. The average annual delay is the average time in minutes per landing or takeoff over the course of a year when aircraft are delayed due to congestion. The average annual delay for Anchorage International Airport when demand reaches 282K landings and takeoffs in a base case scenario (no changes made to the airfield) is 9.9 minutes per landing or takeoff.
6. Annual airline delay savings is the reduction in average annual delay for a proposed project or alternative, compared to a base case scenario. A delay cost savings is determined by multiplying the delay reduction (minutes per landing or takeoff) by an estimated cost of delay based on fuel, crew, maintenance, and other airline costs.
**Draft Plan for Future Development**

**Demand Dependent, Phased Approach**

1. **PHASE 1: MINIMIZE DEVELOPMENT**
   - “Meet FAA Design Standards and enable tenant development.”

2. **PHASE 2: OPTIMIZE ANC**
   - “Optimize use of existing Anchorage runways and consolidate terminal facilities.”

3. **PHASE 3: OPTIMIZE AIAS**
   - “Optimize use of existing Anchorage and Fairbanks Airports to meet cargo demand.”

4. **PHASE 4: WIDELY SPACED RUNWAY**
   - “Expand Anchorage with a new widely spaced N/S runway that meets highest levels of forecast demand.”

**GROWTH OVER TIME**
**Consolidate**

**FEATURES**

1. Remove North Terminal concourse; Maintain processor
2. Former North Terminal site used for cargo parking positions
3. New South Terminal concourse with 5 new gates at South Terminal (3 international gates)
4. 3 cargo parking positions relocated

---

**Preferred Terminal Alternative**

**How does the Alternative meet the Master Plan Update Goals and Objectives?**

**Safety**
- Ensures compliance with building code
- Complies with airfield design standards

**Efficiency**
- Provides highest level of service for passengers
- Supports Airport’s role within AIAS for international passenger traffic
- Can be phased with minimal interruptions
- Efficiently meets and is flexible to handle future increases in demand

**Fiscal Sustainability**
- Operating and maintenance cost-savings with consolidated facilities and services
- Best long-term return on capital investment
- Reduces long-term return on capital investment
- Supports revenue generation

**Land Management**
- Supports Airport’s long-term strategic vision
- Supports the highest and best use of existing land and existing facilities
- Preserves airport land for aviation related facilities
- Allows adaptive reuse of North Terminal processor

---

**LEGEND**
- New Gate
- Existing Gate
Phase 1: Minimize Development

LEGEND
- New or Upgraded Features
- Runway Protection Zone
- Runway Safety Area
- Runway / Taxiway
- Runway / Taxiway Removal
- Building
- Road
- Facility Conceptual Location
- Airport Support

Existing Features
- Runway Protection Zone
- Runway Safety Area
- Existing Tony Knowles Coastal Trail

PURPOSE
- Meet current FAA airport design standards
- Minimize capital expenditures by Airport
- Enable tenant investment in new facilities as they see fit

FEATURES
1. Angled taxiways replaced with 90-degree taxiways
2. Taxiway Z extended east to provide South Airpark access
3. Runway 15-33 widened and shortened to protect safety areas
4. Taxiway R extended to Runway 15 end and new bypass taxiway constructed
5. Air cargo and airport / airline support expanded in North Airpark as warranted by demand
6. Potential hotel site identified
7. General aviation / Regional Commercial Aviation and airport / airline support expanded in South Airpark as warranted by demand
8. New public roadway to accommodate future expansion
9. Fuel storage facility expanded as warranted by demand
10. Potential site for Ground Run-up Enclosure
Phase 2: Optimize ANC

Ted Stevens Anchorage International Airport (ANC) Master Plan Update

LEGEND
New or Upgraded Features
- Taxiway
- Aircraft Parking Position
- Road
- Terminal
- Airport Support

Existing or Previously Identified Features
- Runway Protection Zone
- Runway Safety Area
- Runway / Taxiway
- Runway / Taxiway Removal
- Building
- Terminal
- Road
- Facility Conceptual Location
- Airport Support
- Existing Tony Knowles Coastal Trail

PEAK LANDING PERIODS
2 runways for landings

PEAK TAKEOFF PERIODS
2 runways for takeoffs

PURPOSE
- Optimize the Airport to operate efficiently without major capital investment
- Modify daytime (7 AM - 10 PM) preferential runway use program to meet demand during peak aircraft landing and takeoff periods
- Would not change nighttime (10 PM - 7 AM) operations

FEATURES
INCLUDES ALL PHASE 1 FEATURES

1. Taxiways U and P extended; 4 pull-through cargo parking positions added as warranted by demand
2. Air cargo and airport / airline support expanded in North Airpark as warranted by demand
3. New concourse added at South Terminal with 5 new gates; New concourse accommodates domestic and international operations
4. North Terminal concourse demolished; Passenger processor remains
5. 3 cargo parking positions relocated
6. North Terminal site reused for cargo and regional airlines
7. Partial realignment of Postmark Drive
Phase 3: Optimize AIAS (FAI)

**LEGEND**
- Existing or Previously Identified Features
  - Runway Protection Zone
  - Runway Safety Area
  - Runway / Taxiway
  - Runway / Taxiway Removal
  - Aircraft Parking Positions
  - Building
  - Road
  - Facility Conceptual Location
  - Terminal
  - Airport Support
  - Existing Tony Knowles Coastal Trail

**AWWW Expansion Area**

**PURPOSE**
- Optimize AIAS system assets at Anchorage and Fairbanks International Airports
- Manage demand at Anchorage International Airport

**FEATURES**
- INCLUDES ALL PHASE 1 & 2 FEATURES

1. Fueling and apron improvements likely required at Fairbanks International Airport to accommodate additional cargo activity
2. May require investment in facilities by Airport and Airlines
3. May require incentives to encourage cargo airlines to consider a move to Fairbanks International Airport
4. AIAS cannot require airline relocation; Airlines must choose to use system assets efficiently
5. Would defer need for a new runway at Anchorage International Airport for up to 20 years if half or more of cargo tech-stops choose to use Fairbanks International Airport
Phase 4: Widely Spaced Runway

LEGEND
New or Upgraded Features
- Runway Protection Zone
- Runway Safety Area
- Runway / Taxiway
- Aircraft Parking Position
- Building
- Road
- Facility Conceptual Location
- Landside
- Airport Support

Existing or Previously Identified Features
- Runway Protection Zone
- Runway Safety Area
- Runway / Taxiway
- Aircraft Parking Positions
- Runway / Taxiway Removal
- Building
- Road
- Facility Conceptual Location
- Terminal
- Airport Support
- Existing Tony Knowles Coastal Trail
- Kincaid Park

PURPOSE
▸ Expand ANC and increase capacity by allowing for simultaneous arrivals and departures in all weather conditions
▸ Meets highest levels of forecast demand

FEATURES
INCLUDES ALL PHASE 1, 2, & 3 FEATURES

1. Air cargo and airport / airline support expanded in North and West Airpark as warranted by demand
2. 6 pull-through cargo parking positions added
3. Postmark Drive fully realigned
4. Existing parking / rental car demand managed or facilities reconfigured
5. New 8,000-foot-long x 200-foot-wide runway with taxiway connections (ADG VI, TDG 7)
6. Taxiway U segment removed
7. New runway requires realigning the Coastal Trail
8. Existing access to AWWU maintained
9. New West Airpark public and secure access tunnel
10. Would require acquisition to portions of land (Tracts A-1 and D-1) currently owned by the Municipality of Anchorage
Coastal Trail - Guiding Principles

The Tony Knowles Coastal Trail is a highly used and important community resource, and many comments have been made on the need to protect and maintain the trail. These draft Tony Knowles Coastal Trail Guiding Principles have been developed for future use in context with the Airport Master Plan Update. The principles recognize that should future Airport development impact the trail, mitigations and improvements should be considered in light of these guiding principles. Trail continuity is essential to serve community needs.

1. Accommodate the full range of Coastal Trail users and maximize free-flow operations (i.e., minimize conflicting driveways, roads, crossings, etc.)
2. Continue to function as a stand-alone trail (not principally associated with a road or other right-of-way).
3. Minimize impacts to the natural resources, environment, and ambiance of the trail.
4. Minimize impacts to the existing viewsheds and accessibility to those viewsheds.
5. Provide access for trail users to the trail’s surrounding natural environments.
6. Provide access and crossings for wildlife within and near the trail corridor.
7. Provide connections to other existing and planned trails.
8. Emphasize safety – to trail users, wildlife, intersecting trails and driveways, and adjacent and nearby land uses.
9. Minimize long stretches that are highly exposed to prevailing winds.
10. Consider opportunities to enhance and diversify the trail experience.
Winter weather exposure and lack of sun
- Install vegetative windbreak to shield trail users from the elements; include gaps to preserve views, enhance interaction, allow wildlife passage
- Consider shelter areas to provide relief from elements

Preservation of trail character
- Install scenic lookout areas in key locations
- Incorporate educational elements to highlight key trail and environmental features
- Restore and incorporate historic and cultural elements
- Use native vegetation for landscaping and planting

Wildlife habitat and movement
- Establish wider right of way outside of trail to accommodate wildlife
- Use vegetative windbreak for habitat and passage

All-season trail use
- Use weather-resistant surfaces and adequate drainage
- Tunnels could provide artificial snow, accommodate skiers and non-skiers year-round

Tide levels in relation to trail elevation
- Place trail above projected 100-year flood plain
- Raise trail on seawall

Feasibility of trail reroute from top of bluff down to shore level at Cook Inlet; significant elevation change
- Use retaining walls for stability; incorporate designs to enhance natural environment
- Address elevation changes using established safety guidelines for stability, slip resistance, proper grade, adequate drainage, rest areas

Integration with adjacent industrial land uses: Airport, AWWU, power substation
- Install runway overlooks, aviation-related interpretive/educational/historic signage
- Provide access to airport to encourage transportation-related and recreational trail use
- Incorporate other environmental, historical, and cultural resources
This letter from the Airline Airport Affairs Committee (AAAC) clarifies the Airlines’ position and current approach to potential additional capacity at ANC.

AAAC Letter

AIAS Airlines Airport Affairs Committee
Ted Stevens Anchorage International Airport - Fairbanks International Airport

September 5, 2013

Dear Deputy Commissioner Hatter,

As the Co-Chair of the Airport-Airline Affairs Committee (AAAC), we would like to thank you and your staff for the periodic updates and the support of the AAAC for the processes that have been undertaken to complete the AIAS System Plan and updates to the Anchorage and Fairbanks Master Plans.

As you and your team members are aware, the use of master planning to determine an airport’s long-term infrastructure needs and optimal land use is a best practice used by airports both nationally and globally, and strongly endorsed by the FAA and ICAO. We believe that this systematic and collaborative approach to examining the long-term infrastructure requirements for ANC and FAI is very important for evaluating all potential options and developing well-conceived future implementation plans. We operate in an industry that is marked by significant evolution and volatility, making forecasting the precise characteristics, level, and timing of future activity impossible. Rather than requiring the ability to perform long-term planning, we believe that these circumstances require a comprehensive evaluation of multiple alternatives to address a wide range of potential futures, and the development of phased implementation plans with operational triggers as prescribed in the FAA guidelines in lieu of timeline-based implementation plans.

We recognize that the nature of airport infrastructure development dictates that the AIAS take a planning perspective for potential options over a very long horizon of 20 years or more in order to preserve our ability to grow and operate safely and efficiently while meeting the State’s and the region’s long-term air service needs. We also support the protection of appropriate land use compatibility and the consideration of necessary land acquisitions as opportunities arise. We applaud AIAS for pursuing a two-step approach to infrastructure by pursuing a systematic planning effort as well as at the individual airports. There are few US commercial service airports which are operated as a system. While this system-wide perspective presents an additional level of complexity, we believe that the evaluation of alternatives for managing future growth potentially utilizing infrastructure at both airports as part of the AIAS System Plan and ANC & FAI Master Plan Updates are important for the strategic optimization of the System. The methodology of the System Plan process as briefed to the AAAC, including forecasting demand under a broad range of scenarios, the examination of the capacity of the infrastructure at both airports to meet that demand, and the exploration of opportunities to incentivize segments of ANC activities to FAI, all represent effective elements of a systematic approach to strategic long-term planning.

At the same time, we recognize that the System and the Airports cannot deny access to airlines wishing to land at either airport and cannot dictate which airport they will use. Airlines use a wide range of factors in determining which airport they will use. The AAAC is prepared to assist in future discussions among the carriers to facilitate promotion of and coordinated access to incentives if activity levels return to a level where the movement of traffic from ANC to FAI is beneficial to all airlines serving AIAS.

However, incentives, even accepted by some carriers, may only be effective at certain defined levels of activity with specific characteristics. Therefore, while cargo activity levels have declined in recent years at ANC, we believe that the capacity for continued long-term growth must be preserved by identifying the infrastructure and land that may be required to support these long term needs and to document these options through the FAA process of Master Plan Updates and Airport Layout Plans. When growth returns, the alternatives that have been identified as part of the System Plan and the Master Planning process represent reasonable alternatives for further consideration and refinement as part of future-federal environmental reviews processes to address future capacity needs and the avoidance of congestion which could cripple this important economic engine for the region.

We thank you for your continued strategic leadership and direction of the AIAS and your continued collaborative communication with the AAAC.

Regards,

Matthew Shaw
Alaska Airlines
Co-Chairperson
AIAS Airline Airport Affairs Committee

Kevin Hoffmann
UPS
Co-Chairperson
AIAS Airline Airport Affairs Committee
Next Steps – Implementation

Future phases of airport development would occur only if and when airline traffic levels show a pending need.

Additional development would be pursued only if and when airline traffic levels and delays show a real need. The Airport is planning proactively, but will implement reactively. Even if demand materializes, there would be many additional steps (including many opportunities for public involvement) prior to construction, including:

GROWTH AND DEMAND → CONSTRUCTION

- Legislative Approval
- Land Acquisition
- Environmental Studies
- Positive Benefit/Cost Analysis
- FAA Approval
- Airlines Approval
Baseline Passenger Enplanement Forecast: ANC

Baseline Cargo Tonnage (Enplaned/Deplaned and Tech. Stop) Forecast: ANC
Baseline Aircraft Operations Forecast: ANC

Comparison of Previous Aircraft Operations Forecasts for ANC

Historical and Forecasted Annual Aircraft Operations for Ted Stevens Anchorage International Airport

ANC returns to 2000 annual operations level levels in 2022
### AIAS Planning Study Summary of Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANC will reach unacceptable delays at 258,000 operations/year</th>
<th>Timeframe for 258,000 operations is unclear due to changing global economy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>International cargo operations could leave AIAS if delays become unacceptable</td>
<td>Lost international cargo operations at both airports = lost jobs, higher airport fees, potentially lost air service/higher fares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shifting half or more of ANC’s peak hour tech stop flights to FAI defers need for new ANC runway</td>
<td>FAI’s runway can handle the additional traffic but some investment in fueling facilities, aircraft parking, etc. would be required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIAS cannot force carriers to use FAI, but could consider encouraging them with incentives</td>
<td>Incentives are unlikely to be cost-effective until traffic rebounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If shifting traffic to FAI is unsuccessful, ANC would need additional runway capacity before it reaches 258,000 operations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Please provide your comments here.

☐ Fill out a comment sheet and place it in the comment box.

☐ You may also e-mail comments to:
  contact@ancmasterplan.com

☐ Mail your comments to:
  Katherine Wood, Public Involvement Lead
  c/o HDR Alaska
  2525 C Street, Suite 305
  Anchorage, AK 99503

Comments on the draft plan for future development are requested by October 10, 2013.

While you are welcome to submit comments at any point during the Master Plan Update process, comments on the draft plan for future development will be of most value to the planning team if received prior to October 10, 2013.