

MEETING NOTES - DRAFT

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

Location: Coast International Inn, Anchorage

Subject: Public Seminar: FAA Grant Assurances

Date and Time: April 25, 2013; 6:00-7:00PM

Staff/Agency Attendees:

John Parrott (ANC)
John Johansen (ANC)
Jack Jones (ANC)
Teri Lindseth (ANC)
Katie Gage (ANC)

Gabriel Mahns (FAA)
Pat Oien (FAA)

Katherine Wood (HDR)
Allison Biastock (HDR)
Jessica Abbott (HDR)

Evan Pfahler (RS&H)

Public Seminar Summary:

On Thursday, April 25, 2013, the Ted Stevens Anchorage International Airport (ANC) Master Plan Update hosted a public seminar to present on the topic of FAA grant assurances. The purpose of this event was to share with the public information on the FAA Grant Assurances and how they relate to Airport planning and land use. A presentation was given by Evan Pfahler at 6:00pm, followed by a Q&A session facilitated by Katherine Wood. Airport Manager John Parrott and the FAA's Alaska Region Compliance Lead Gabriel Mahns were seated at the front of the room and participated in the question and answer session, which ended at approximately 7:00PM. The meeting was closed promptly at 7:00pm.

Advertising

- Legal notice in the Anchorage Daily News (March 6, 2013)
- E-newsletter to contact list of approximately 600 addresses, including addresses for community council distribution lists
- Email to Working Group and Technical Advisory Committee Members
- GovDelivery Notice
- State Online Public Notice
- DOT and Airport website
- Master Plan Update website
- ANC bulletin boards
- *What's Up* List Serv

Attendance

19 people signed in to the event. Approximately 4 additional people attended but did not sign in.

Media Coverage

No media was present at the event.

Stakeholder Organizations Present

- FAA Planning
- Turnagain Community Council
- Anchorage Chamber of Commerce
- UAA Aviation Class
- General Aviation Enthusiasts

Seminar Materials

- Handouts (comment sheets, fact sheet, and FAQs)
- PowerPoint presentation

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

The Q&A session lasted for 25 minutes, during which the Master Plan Update team addressed approximately 7 questions and comments.

At the end of the meeting, Katherine Wood promoted the upcoming May 23 Public Open House and Online Open House, as well as the May Working Group and Technical Advisory Committee Meetings.

Presentation:

Evan Pfahler gave a PowerPoint presentation that lasted approximately 25 minutes. The presentation focused on these issues/areas:

1. Airport and FAA missions and relationship
2. Define FAA Grant Assurances
3. Describe how Grant Assurances restrict airport land use
4. FAA Grant Assurances and Anchorage International Airport
5. Post Master Plan Project Implementation Steps

You can view the presentation in its entirety on the Master Plan website library:

<http://www.ancmasterplan.com/library/>

Comment/Question Detail:

A panel, consisting of Master Plan Project Manager Evan Pfahler, Anchorage Airport Manager John Parrott, and FAA Alaska Region Compliance Specialist Gabriel Mahns, answered questions from the audience.

***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: *If the Part 150 Study recommends areas on Airport property as noise mitigation buffers, what does the FAA think about that? Would such buffers, if created, be permanent or temporary?*

Answer from the Master Plan Team: The Part 150 Study is intended to evaluate Airport noise and examine mitigation options. It is possible that the study could identify mitigation such as a berm or a buffer – should it do so, it would be a rare opportunity wherein the FAA allows the Airport to use land for that purpose. It is doubtful such a buffer would be permanent as 1) Part 150 Studies

are regularly updated and 2) permanency would almost certainly require the Airport to completely release the land (no longer own the land).

Question from public: When were the FAA Grant Assurances passed? 1987?

Answer from the Master Plan Team: There have been several updates to the Grant Assurances language since they were passed. The following language is taken from the FAA's website and relates to the programs providing grant monies to airports for which there is an associated sponsor obligation to uphold:

Question from public: What is the History of the AIP?

To promote the development of a system of airports to meet the Nation's needs, the Federal Government embarked on a grants-in-aid program to units of state and local governments shortly after the end of World War II. The early program, the Federal-Aid Airport Program (FAAP) was authorized by the Federal Airport Act of 1946 and drew its funding from the general fund of the U.S. Treasury.

In 1970, a more comprehensive program was established with the passage of the Airport and Airway Development Act of 1970. This Act provided grants for airport planning under the Planning Grant Program (PGP) and for airport development under the Airport Development Aid Program (ADAP). These programs were funded from a newly established Airport and Airway Trust Fund, into which were deposited revenues from several aviation-user taxes on such items as airline fares, air freight, and aviation fuel. The authority to issue grants under these two programs expired on September 30, 1981. During this 11-year period, 8,809 grants totaling \$4.5 billion were approved.

The current program, known as the Airport Improvement Program (AIP), was established by the Airport and Airway Improvement Act of 1982 (Public Law 97-248). Since then, the AIP has been amended several times, most recently with the passage of the FAA Modernization and Reform Act of 2012. Funds obligated for the AIP are drawn from the Airport and Airway Trust fund, which is supported by user fees, fuel taxes, and other similar revenue sources.

Question from public: Is ANC required to collect fees as a part of the FAA Grant Assurances?

Answer from the Master Plan Team: No, but Anchorage does collect landing fees, which allow it to provide the level of service to passengers and carriers that it does. It is up to an Airport to decide whether it will collect fees.

Comment/Question from public: Your presentation dealt with the Anchorage International Airport with no focus on the General Aviation (GA) side of the facility: Lakes Hood and Spenard. How can you seek the Airlines approval/input for projects and not the GA community's approval/input? Per Grant Assurances, don't they require equal access to the Airport? ANC has regulations that don't allow equal access, how is the Airport meeting that grant requirement?

Answer from the Master Plan Team: The presentation this evening is geared towards the Anchorage International Airport Master Plan Update, but the planning team understands that ANC shares facilities with Lake Hood and Lake Spenard. Per the Airlines, there are significant differences in the Airport's relationship with the Airlines and with the GA community. Per access, the FAA works to ensure safety at Lake Hood and Lake Spenard, and there are many variables involved with operating GA aircraft and commercial aircraft in the same area – it requires a balance.

Question from public: What about 4(f) parkland? How does that process affect lands currently used as parks?

Answer from the Master Plan Team: If the Airport has a proposed use for land it owns that is currently being used as parkland, a determination would have to be made if Section 4(f) of the 1966 Department of Transportation Act applies. Section 4(f) simply requires that alternatives to use of publicly accessible park and recreation land be assessed. Section 4(f) may apply even for existing Airport lands if they are available for public park and recreation use on a temporary basis. It is for this reason that the Airport may discourage future park and recreation use on Airport land as it may result in a costly encumbrance to re-use of Airport land to serve its intended purpose: aviation.

Follow Up Question from public: Does that mean that land used as a park might “never be used” or would it be OK to use it – as long as you mitigate?

Follow Up Answer from the Master Plan Team: That is difficult to answer. But, if a proposed action has no alternative, and can't be mitigated, that does not necessarily mean the proposed project would be stopped.

Question from public: Can the General Aviation community benefit from revenue generated by commercial activity at the Airport?

Answer from the Master Plan Team: Yes.

Question from public: When FAA grant funds are issued, is the FAA obligated to look at a facility to ensure compliance?

Answer from the Master Plan Team: If an Airport was seeking funds to re-surface a runway, for example, the FAA would look at the maintenance records for the runway, when it was last resurfaced, etc. to determine if it is worth the cost to resurface.

Question from public: In the 1950's Lake Spenard was dredged, but in past years there has been no maintenance of that dredging and slips are deteriorating. Why?

Answer from the Master Plan Team: Some areas of Lake Spenard are funded with AIP money. There are also engineering questions, what is the life cycle? In some cases the FAA has a say on maintenance projects, but if the FAA did not participate financially in previous improvements, it may not have a say.

Comment from the public: ANC and Fairbanks International (FAI) have landing fees and are self-sustaining. Other airports in the state have no landing fees and are not FAA compliant, and are in very poor repair and unable to receive funding for upgrades because they are non-compliant. The Anchorage Airport is doing a great job maintaining facilities for commercial and general aviation and sees a great benefit from FAA compliance and FAA funding.

Question from public: *The West Anchorage District Plan identified on- and off-site compatibility tools such as conservation easements. Where do they fall into the FAA Grant Assurances?*

Answer from the Master Plan Team: Creating a conservation easement would require a two step process 1) the Airport would have to want to limit the availability of property for airport use, and 2) the Airport would need to convince the FAA to give airport owned land away for no compensation. FAA noted that the question they would ask would be – how does this action benefit civil aviation?

Question from public: *Is one of the Grant Assurances “to consider surrounding community interests?” That is vague language, and if it is accurate – how is it ever achieved?*

Answer from the Master Plan Team: That language comes from Grant Assurance 6, which addresses consistency with local plans. If an Airport’s plan and a local plan are inconsistent, one or both of the plans may benefit from revision. This Grant Assurance is designed to require coordination and a public process.

Notes by: HDR Alaska