

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: March 7, 2013; 11:00AM-1:00PM

Subject: Working Group Meeting #3

Staff Attendees:

John Parrott (ANC)

Jack Jones (ANC)

Teri Lindseth (ANC)

Evan Pfahler (RS&H)

Katherine Wood (HDR)

Allison Biastock (HDR)

Leslie Robbins (HDR)

Jessica Abbott (HDR)

Mark Mayo (HDR)

Working Group Attendees:

Dan Burgess, Sand Lake Community Council

Gordon Wetzel, Nordic Ski Association of Anchorage

Randy Roberts, UAA Aviation Technology Center

Cathy Gleason, Turnagain Community Council

Mort Plumb, Anchorage Chamber of Commerce

Thede Tobish, MOA Planning

Lynette Moreno-Hinz, Anchorage Cab Drivers Association

Bill Popp, Anchorage Economic Development Association

Julie Dodds, Visit Anchorage

Jim Bowers, Spenard Community Council

Matt Claman, Anchorage Airport Communications Committee

Mark Butler, Federation of Community Councils

Aves Thompson, Alaska Trucking Association

Meeting Overview

On Thursday, March 7, 2013, the Ted Stevens Anchorage International Airport (ANC) Master Plan Update hosted the third in a series of Working Group meetings. The purpose of this meeting was to provide Working Group members information about the inventory of existing conditions at the Airport, to discuss the alternatives development and evaluation process, and to develop draft evaluation criteria. 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 1:00PM.

Advertising

- Email to Master Plan Update contact list of approximately 500 addresses, including addresses for community council distribution
 - Email invite to participants and draft agenda sent in advance
 - Anchorage Daily News Legal Ad, 2/20/13
 - 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

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

Meeting Materials

- Handouts (Agenda, updated Fact Sheet and FAQs)
- PowerPoint presentation
- Materials Binder – one provided to each organization
- Goals and Objectives handout
- Evaluation Criteria Exercise handout

Meeting Summary

Introductions

John Parrott, Manager of the Ted Stevens Anchorage International Airport (ANC) welcomed participants 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 covered the following:

- An update of Master Plan Update progress to date
- Share the findings of the inventory of existing conditions
- Introduce the process that will be used to develop and evaluate alternatives
- Discuss next steps

The presentation is available at http://www.ancmasterplan.com/library/index_48_1620965334.pdf.

Presentation Q&A

Working Group member question: At the next public open house, can we do a show of hands to determine how attendees learned about the event?

Planning team response: We do ask attendees how they heard about the meeting informally at the open house sign in table, but we can certainly ask the question to the group as a whole.

Working Group member comment: The MSA (metropolitan statistical area) includes Mat-Su, Eagle River and Girdwood.

Working Group member question: How are enplanement statistics shown in the presentation used? Who is the audience and who is interested in that information?

Planning team response: Airlines and aviation planners are interested in that information.

- *Working Group member follow up:* Businesses looking to locate in Anchorage are also interested in that information.

Working Group member question: How about the per capita enplanements? Do we measure those for political reasons?

Planning team response: Since Alaska is not served with a road system, per capita enplanements are important information, especially as an input to forecasting. ANC's per capita enplanements are relatively high, at levels normal for a destination/vacation airport. Tourism in Anchorage plays a role in the statistic, but in addition, Alaskans fly more often than people in other locations.

- *Working Group member follow up:* This data serves as a benchmark for a planner. ANC "plays" a much larger role than one would think based on its population.

Working Group member question: What is the source of the data used for the comparisons in the presentation?

Planning team response: While the analysis is our own, the data comes directly from the FAA and the US Census.

Working Group member question: What airports are numbers 1, 2, and 3 in cargo throughput by weight? (ANC is number 4.)

Planning team response: 1) Hong Kong, China 2) Memphis, TN and 3) Shanghai, China

Working Group member question: What percentage of cargo traffic is gas-and-go as opposed to traffic that engages in ground activity, like FedEx and UPS?

Planning team response: We don't have that statistic right now, but we can find it.

Working Group member question: What is the asset value of the land and infrastructure at ANC?

Planning team response: This can be measured several ways. A recent study estimated the Airport's replacement value (i.e., the cost to re-locate the Airport) at about \$10 billion.

- *Working Group member follow up:* Another way to answer this question is that the Alaska Dept. of Transportation owns these assets, which are valued in the billions, but depreciate over time. DOT numbers will not include private assets.

Working Group member question: How do the new FAA standards affect the Anchorage Airport?

Planning team response: The new standards, FAA advisory Circular [150-5300-13A](#) published in January 2013, are an update to the existing Airport design standards. These standards will be applied over time as existing facilities are replaced. Most of the updates focus on changes to airport/airfield safety design, with a focus on improving pilot situational awareness. The revisions to this circular also cover standards to accommodate the changing fleet mix, including newer, larger aircraft. Alternatives developed for the ANC Master Plan Update will reflect the new FAA standards.

Evaluation Criteria Exercise

Katherine Wood presented an activity for the group, wherein each member of the Working Group was asked to draft evaluation criteria, while considering the Master Plan Update's Goals and Objectives, for each goal category: *safety, efficiency, environmental awareness, fiscal sustainability and land management*. It was noted that the *communications* goals applies to the entire Master Plan Update, rather than to the alternatives evaluation process, so the group did not need to draft evaluation criteria for that goal.

Evan Pfahler provided drafting guidance for evaluation criteria, noting useful criteria are:

- Measurable
- Indicative the caliber of service wanted at the Airport
- Reflective of the Master Plan Update Goals and Objectives

Working Group members were given approximately 15 minutes to work independently to try and draft at least two criteria per goal, for a total of 10 criteria. As a resource, members were provided a handout listing the Airport Master Plan's Goals and Objectives (copy available at http://www.ancmasterplan.com/library/index_46_2841117018.pdf), and a handout with the exercise's directions and guidelines on evaluation criteria (copy available at http://www.ancmasterplan.com/library/index_46_2327235747.pdf). Working Group members were also asked to relay any potential new goals and objectives that come to mind during this exercise.

Below are the evaluation criteria that Working Group members drafted during the exercise. After drafting their criteria, members were asked to organize them by goal and to place them on a poster specific to the goal. Katherine then went over each criterion with the group to group similar ideas, request clarification, and poll the group to see if any criterion was of more importance from their perspective.

Note: similar criteria are grouped as indicated by the Working Group members during discussion.

Safety

- Reduce number of accidents for 1) aircraft 2) ground vehicles 3) people
- Benefit: increase safety over status quo Risk: decrease risk over status quo
- Establish an ANC site specific check list – how does ANC differ from other airports?
- Assign all workers on taxi field with electronic identifiers and set up an overall tracking system to keep workers safe from potential danger; hit by vehicles and aircraft
- Track reported badge violations, safety training screening
- Inventory existing vs. new AC's, prioritize replacement by operations and condition
- Do facilities designs conform to latest standards?
- Does personal access to AOA provide safety to personnel?
- Has a formal risk assessment been completed for the alternative to ensure any added risk it poses to the operations of the aircraft remains at an acceptable level?
- Maximize separation of incompatible land uses
- Zero accidents, ensure most updated approach control (Next Gen)

Discussion:

- How are the evaluation criteria related to the Goals and Objectives? Isn't the wording similar? The planning team explained that the wording of criteria and Goals and Objectives are different, but content often overlaps because they are related. The group was asked to not be as concerned with the wording of the criteria they were writing, but to focus on the intent of the criteria. It's easy to re-word an idea into an evaluation criteria if we need to.

- Per metrics, how do we measure where we are vs. where we want to go? How can we measure improvement?

Fiscal Sustainability

- Does the plan ensure maximum efficient use of the limited amount of land on and near the airport?
- Return on investment hurdle – establish a long term asset ROI goal

- Does the plan understand the critical nature of the airport in maintaining high level of economic activity in Anchorage and in Alaska?
- Ensure oil production increases, as well as flow through TAPS
- Considering the value of tourism, ask what makes the South terminal so good, then do it to the North Terminal
- Does the alternative provide sufficient opportunities that support growth of non-aviation related businesses/tenants?
- Do system and operational plans provide for growth?
- Create an environment that attracts new businesses and keeps existing businesses happy
- Provide for methods that develop current available land and facilities into new or expanded lines of business, both aviation and non-aviation
- Respond to changing market conditions, extend market forces, and pursue redevelopment plans
- Pursue new uses and facilities that promote economic growth and jobs
- Have non-traditional use of airport assets been considered to generate necessary revenues?
- Based on dynamic and volatile global economic climate, evaluate alternative sources of revenue to lower dependence on Asian cargo operations.
- Identify major and minor fiscal issues – both current and future
Benefit: maximize opportunity
Risk: Reduce exposure to potential harm

Discussion:

- Should we reword this goal? Particularly the term “fiscal sustainability”? What is fiscal sustainability?
- There should be an economic component in it: “economic vitality.”
- The idea of maximizing revenue was proposed, but ANC noted that isn’t necessarily an appropriate goal because the airport is also a public service. We want ANC to be economically viable in 20 years.
- Opposed to maximizing revenue, how about maximizing revenue to cover costs?
- With flat budgets, maybe maximizing cash available to offset budget reductions is a better goal.
- “Fiscal Sustainability”, while a catch phrase is good – ANC is doing well and investing wisely.

Land Management

- See what noise study concludes, interview neighbors – then landscape and build run-up structures to match

- Does the alternative provide for appropriate buffers between incompatible uses?

- Does the plan listen to the wants and needs of the community for airport lands (as reflected by the opinions of the neighboring community councils)?

- Does the plan offer a good balance between proper airport development and the competing needs/wants (from the greater community) for this land?
- Identify major and minor land issues – distinguish community issues (WADP) and airport issues.
Benefit: positive for both community and ANC
Risk: conflict between community and ANC
- To achieve objective to best serve the Airport while minimizing impacts to nearby residents, the layout plan of the preferred alternative should refrain from proposing development and operations any closer to residential areas surrounding airport
- More efficient use of existing infrastructure (both private and public) to ensure airport growth can be accommodated within existing boundaries.
- Does the alternative address the need to further develop raw land into a more “building ready” status on a targeted basis that promotes the goals and objectives for fiscal sustainability?
- Do not build anything that would preclude higher and better use of the land
- Does the land use vision sync with projected growth?
- Does the plan understand that people’s homes (in neighborhoods near the airport) are critical to those residents as economic assets as well as places to live a productive life and raise a healthy family?
- Identify land areas that are infeasible or undesirable for development and provide alternate land uses at these sites that follow policies and recommendations of the WADP
- Incorporate new airport zoning regulations on appropriate sections of the airport
- Identify on Airport Layout Plan areas identified in the WADP (West Anchorage District Plan) and the public/community councils as areas to retain as public recreational/natural open space areas i.e. the Coastal Trail, Turnagain Bog, vegetation buffer along Raspberry and Point Woronzof roads, Spenard Beach Park, Connor’s Lake and Bog, and Little Campbell Lake
- Envisions and prevents future encroachment issues

Environmental Awareness

- Anticipates developing technologies for mitigation
- Reduce number of complaints from public due to noise
- Ensure compliance with regulations
- Does the plan attempt to minimize the water pollution, air pollution and noise pollution impacts on the surrounding physical environment?
- Continue monitoring water quality of Lakes Hood and Spenard.
- Has anybody checked air quality outside terminal at passenger pickup on a cold winter’s night at 1:30am?
- Does the commercial vehicle road access minimize idle time?
- Uses best available technology for controlling pollution

- Identify and catalog current and future issues
Benefit: determine ways to address
Risk: reduce exposure to potential problems
- Ensure environmental impacts remain acceptable if utilization of the alternative exceeds forecasted demand/usage
- Evaluate – mitigate – and respond to offsite impacts of new and expanded uses of operations including impacts to roads, utilities, trails, air/water quality, and neighborhoods
- Identify on the Airport Layout Plan environmentally sensitive areas that provide tangible benefits to preserve: wetlands (hydrology, water quality), and naturally wooded areas (wildlife habitat, buffering from incompatible uses)

Discussion:

- Suggest wording should be changed to “environmental consideration” – “awareness” does not translate into measurable or obtainable objectives or criteria, and is not strong enough. You can be aware but not change your behavior.
- More objectives need to be added to this goal. The current objectives do not cover all the applicable categories.
- Air quality should be at the top of this list.

Efficiency

- Move the taxicab line to the inside lane of arrival doors in order to speed up traffic
- Install button lights for passenger foot traffic to signal need for taxicabs
- Track wait time to identify bottlenecks, both aircraft and motor vehicle (bus, taxi, private)
- Ensure an acceptable ROI for Airport/DOT funds spent
Benefit: efficiency improvements over status quo
Risk: reduce/eliminate inefficiencies over status quo
- Does road and access design provide adequate space for safe and efficient maneuverability for commercial vehicles?
- Does system provide for electronic access to secure areas (AOA)?
- Reduce delays in late departure and arrivals
- Design and locate new facilities and redeveloped facilities to maximize flexibility of uses and to accommodate changing needs, operations and markets
- Determine when/how/which new uses could be accommodated offsite
- Utilizes and or repurposes existing facilities/capabilities before expansion/new facilities are completed

Discussion:

- There needs to be established alternative routes for vehicles, especially for when an accident/obstruction blocks a main road at the Airport.
- Maintains a separation between private and commercial vehicles on Airport roads.
- Improve communications in emergency situations.
- Taxi pick up areas at the Airport are not user friendly.

Next Steps

Three additional Working Group meetings are planned, the next of which will be held on Wednesday, April 3, 2013 on the fourth floor of the CIRI building. See the website for additional dates/information.

A general meeting summary will be distributed to the group.

Public Comment

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

Notes by: HDR Alaska