



## **Regional Airport Planning Committee**

January 8, 2009

**TO:** Regional Airport Planning Committee  
**FROM:** Staff of the Regional Airport Planning Committee

**SUBJECT:** Summaries of May and October Phase 2 Task Force Meetings

The Committee's Phase 2 Task Force has met two times since its creation in the Spring of 2008. The first two meetings were designed to provide the Committee with an overview of RAPC's role in the region, the findings and conclusions of Phase 1, the work program for Phase 2 and the major Phase 2 products for which staff will ask the Task Force to review and provide input and feedback. The next meeting of the Task Force is scheduled for January 9<sup>th</sup> where they will provide input to a draft survey instrument that will be presented by the consultant team and staff. The summary of this meeting will be made available to the Committee at its January 23<sup>rd</sup> meeting and will also be available to the public at that meeting.

Summaries for the first two Task Force meetings can be found below.

**Friday, May 23, 2008  
10:00 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.**

### **Meeting Summary**

**1. Attendees.** RAPC and Airport staff: Marisa Cravens, ABAG; Carolyn Clevenger, MTC; Joe LaClair, BCDC; Lindy Lowe, BCDC and Danielle Rinsler, SFO.

**2. Task Force Members.** Bena Chang, SVLG; David Carbone, SFO Roundtable; Arthur Feinstein, Environmental Concerns; David Lewis, Save the Bay; Michael Cunningham, BAC; Martin Pehl, Napa County Airports; Beth Lee, Buchanan Field; John Stout, Sonoma County Airport; Retired General Dale Baumler, Travis Air Force Base; Dave Needle, OAK stakeholder group; and John Holtzclaw, BAAQMD.

**3. Meeting Summary.** Members requested that name plates be provided for future meetings.

Dale Baumler requested that documents be mailed rather than e-mailed to him for the time being.

Members requested that they receive the Phase 1 Conclusions and Recommendations and the Task Force Roster by e-mail.

Lindy Lowe provided an overview of RAPC, including its role and authority in the region and in preparing the Regional Airport Systems Plan Analysis (RASPA).

David Lewis provided some historical perspective on RAPC and the RASPA. His primary conclusion was that he felt that RASPA had not lead to actual implementation and had not lead to policy adoption by RAPC's partner agencies—MTC, BCDC and ABAG. He expressed his hope that this process would not again result in a plan that did not lead to implementation or new policy direction.

Lindy Lowe provided a summary of the Phase 1 work, including the primary conclusions and recommendations from this phase of RAPC's work.

Joe LaClair presented an overview of the work that will be conducted in Phase 2. Task Force members asked questions throughout the presentation.

Michael Cunningham asked staff for clarification on the type of forecasts that will be done in Phase 2. He said that it seemed like the forecasts would not be as detailed as they had been in the past and that there seems to be a focus on scenarios over forecasts.

Staff confirmed that the forecasts were not going to be done at the same level of detail as those done for the 2000 RASPA.

Arthur Feinstein questioned the legitimacy of past forecasts and used the recent Oakland International Airport Master Plan Update as an example of forecasts that did not appear to be legitimate. He said that he felt that an independent expert review of the forecasts should be conducted to ensure the legitimacy of any forecasts that are developed in Phase 2.

Dave Needle responded that in the Oakland International Airport Master Plan there had been an independent analysis conducted by a consultant hired by a non-profit group and that the group that conducted it could be asked to review the forecasts done for RAPC.

Michael Cunningham said that he was not satisfied with the approach that RAPC is taking with the forecasts and that he thinks that the forecasts should be more robust and drive the scenarios rather than the scenarios playing such a primary role.

John Holtzclaw stated that he was interested in seeing how the forecasts take the impacts of climate change and fuel prices into account when determining the future demand for air travel.

Michael Cunningham noted that it is a very uncertain time and that conducting a forecast during such an uncertain time—fuel prices, the economy, climate change—requires that these things are considered and that the forecasts are based on these current conditions. It is unclear if demand will flatten out, continue to increase or something else.

David Lewis explained that RAPC made a decision when they adopted the work plan for Phase 2 to not emphasize the forecast and to not allow projected demand to drive the process but to place an emphasis on determining what we want as a region and the steps to take to get there.

Dave Needle said that the forecasts should be one input among many.

John Stout asked if the consultants will use the forecasts developed by the region's airports. Staff responded that those would be an input into the consultant's work.

The issue of SFO's use of SOIA came up and Danielle Rinsler responded that SFO continues to refine SOIA.

Arthur Feinstein asked if the land use evaluation that ABAG will do considers the natural resources and ecological value of the land. He would like them to evaluate the vacant lands for their resource value and have that documented as part of the work that ABAG is doing in the GA Land Use Study.

RAPC staff responded that Jones & Stokes is on contract for some of the environmental work and will look at the implications of implementation of various land development scenarios on the vacant lands, and this will include some assessment of the ecological status of the land. It was also suggested that GIS layers showing endangered species could be a useful way of documenting the information.

Arthur Feinstein did not agree that this was a sufficient approach and staff agreed that this information should be incorporated earlier on and that BCDC would partner with ABAG to develop this information and include it in the study.

Michael Cunningham suggested that redesign of air space and new runway infrastructure should both be considered and evaluated in Phase 2.

Arthur Feinstein stated that he is concerned the Task Force will not have an opportunity to give input on new runway options if they are not considered in Phase 2. He felt that if the other alternatives don't meet the projected air travel demand in the region that this might result in Phase 3 being pre-determined to include runway expansion without the same type of analysis being conducted on these runways as is being conducted for the Phase 2 alternatives.

David Needle stated that air space redesign should be considered at some point in the study.

RAPC staff noted that RAPC does not currently have the budget to analyze the redesign of the air space, however, the recommendations from Phase 2 might include requesting funding from the FAA to study the air space and might also have implications on the redesign. RAPC staff stated that the analysis of runway expansion is not included in the Phase 2 work, but they will be part of the scenarios developed. Phase 2 does not include analysis of any built solutions at the three main commercial airports. However, if Phase 3 includes the consideration of new or expanded runways at any of the three main commercial airports that this will be thoroughly analyzed and compared to the alternatives studied in Phase 2.

Danielle Rinsler stated that SFO supports air space redesign but they do not support looking at built solutions as part of Phase 2. They want to exhaust all other capacity options first.

Michael Cunningham said that he continued to feel that it was a mistake to not include built solutions in the Phase 2 work and that the concerns and direction that the region's commercial airports are taking by not looking at runway expansion do not necessarily reflect the region's concerns.

David Lewis noted that the work that was conducted for the 2000 RASPA focused primarily on runway expansion and that the focus in the current RASPA update was to provide the same type of analysis and focus on the other alternatives.

Arthur Feinstein asked if the build solutions include High Speed Rail (HSR). RAPC staff confirmed that it will evaluate the potential for air passenger diversion to HSR.

RAPC staff outlined the schedule and policy role of the Task Force, which is to advise the Committee on a policy basis.

David Lewis commented that the Task Force needs to think about how to make the Phase 2 work and make their work useful. The RASP is not a binding document, so the most he believes the task force can hope for is to develop a consensus around a vision that people can use to advocate for change. There can be points of agreement for people to pursue. In the past public outreach has been unsuccessful because the issues that RAPC has been covering have been too abstract. He said that it would be better to develop different visions and obtain the public's response to those visions, even those visions that are not possible now. This would make people more likely to participate in the process. Mr. Lewis also commented that we need to have forecasting, but we must identify why these forecasts will be any more accurate than the last RASP forecasts. Mr. Lewis requested that, while we have the airports presenting to the Task Force their future plans, we should have outsiders also come and present alternative ideas and other things the airports can do. Mr. Lewis also stated that most analysis of delay does not account well for our airports and does not account for problems in other parts of the national aviation network that cause delays at Bay Area airports.

Arthur Feinstein commented that forecasts and what future demand we're planning for are important. However, there is no work item for determining how much traffic the region actually wants to accommodate.

Danielle Rinsler noted that SFO has been looking at demand management and source of delays for some time now. SFO is pushing for more market-based solutions. She said that the work that RAPC and the Task Force is doing is important, particularly for longer range planning for the Bay Area system, but that there also needs to be a focus on immediate solutions for SFO and OAK and a de-emphasis on the forecasts and the projected dates that the demand for air services at the airports will outstrip supply.

Michael Cunningham asked if RAPC could get the airlines more involved. RAPC staff commented that the airline representatives had been called, but have not shown interest to get involved.

David Needle asked if there have been any attempt to get congressional leaders involved. He requested staff contact local offices.

Following a general discussion of the role of public input in evaluating alternative scenarios, the task force members agreed that getting public input at the stage when the alternatives are being chosen is important to ensure that the scenarios include all viable appropriate solutions.

David Carbone noted that there is a reference in Phase 2 to future institutional arrangements and asked for staff to explain the difference between Phase 2 and Phase 3 institutional tasks. RAPC staff explained that Phase 2 will outline the vision and need, and Phase 3 will actually be pursuing those recommendations.

The Task Force discussed the scheduling of future meetings and setting a future meeting date. It was agreed that the Task Force would meet bi-monthly and staff said that they would send out an e-mail to determine the best day for these futures meetings.

**Friday, October 3 2008**

**10:00 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.**

### **Meeting Summary**

**1. Attendees: RAPC and airport staff:** Chris Brittle, MTC; Marisa Cravens, ABAG; Joe LaClair, BCDC; Lindy Lowe, BCDC; Anne Henny, OAK; Danielle Rinsler, SFO. **Task Force Members:** General Dale Baumler (Ret.), Solano County; Dave Carbone, SFO Community Roundtable; Arthur Feinstein, Sierra Club (Bay Chapter); Keith Freitas, Buchanan Field; Dave Needle, CORC (Citizens Oversight and Reporting Committee on Oakland Airport Activities); Martin Pehl, Napa County Airport; Jon Stout, Charles Schultz Santa Rosa Airport. **Consultants:** Christina Cassotis, SH&E; David Hollander, SH&E. **Facilitator:** Nicholas Dewar, ICF Jones & Stokes.

**2. Introductions and Update.** All participants introduced themselves. Staff described the progress of RASP Phase 2 since the May meeting of the Task Force.

**3. Purpose and Role of the Task Force.** RAPC staff clarified that the advisory role of the Task Force means that the RAPC staff will present to RAPC the opinions of the Task Force and will also explain to RAPC any areas of disagreement within the Task Force. Staff also explained that Task Force members may present their opinions to RAPC themselves. Task Force members acknowledged their responsibility to provide information about the Task Force to their stakeholders and to represent to the Task Force their stakeholders' concerns.

**4. Consultant presentation on the consulting team and the Phase 2 Work Scope, highlighting the key areas for Task Force participation and timeline for the key work products.** See attached PowerPoint presentation.

**5. Discussion of Consultant's Presentation.** Funding sources for the implementation of the plan will not be identified as part of Phase 2, although the "Vision & Implementation Plan" will include some recommendations regarding possible funding sources.

The telephone survey will be conducted principally to better understand the criteria of the broader community so that this can shape the analysis in Phase 2. It may also be possible to use the survey to get an assessment of community support for various alternatives. Staff clarified that the Task Force will participate in the development of the questionnaire for the phone survey. The concern was raised that if the questionnaire is improperly crafted it could produce a conclusion or conclusions that are not a true reflection of the region's support, but rather a result of the way that the questions were crafted or which questions were included in the survey.

It was requested that Sonoma County's airport be described on the consultant's map as "non-hub commercial".

Climate change analysis in the consultant's work in phase 2 will not include any additional analysis on sea level rise beyond the analysis conducted by BCDC. The planning process will incorporate sea-level rise, but RAPC will not rely on the consultant for this. BCDC plans to publish maps with new sea-level rise data based on a 16-inch rise at mid-century and a 55-inch rise at the 100 year range.

Public meetings will be conducted in three, or perhaps four, locations (Central, South and North Bay, and perhaps also East Contra Costa County). The Task Force will preview the material for the Public Meetings and will have opportunities to contribute to this. Staff explained their interest in bringing public attention to these public meetings, and it was agreed that they will use the mailing lists of the Task-Force members to achieve this. It was agreed that substantial lead time will be needed for these notices so that all Task Force members can distribute the information effectively.

The sharing of information between airports was discussed. It was explained that airports have already completed significant studies on topics such as market-based demand management, environmental issues, and shared airspace. Staff explained that the Technical Working Groups will be a clearing house for information and it is hoped that representatives from the airports will attend these meetings.

Staff explained that, in Phase 2, road traffic expertise will be provided by MTC.

Staff explained that opportunities for Task-Force input to the scope of biological analysis will come later in the process when the range of scenarios has been narrowed. The concern was raised that this may result in the absence of biological analysis in the consideration of the broader range of alternatives.

**6. Review of Meeting.** Participants requested that:

- Future meetings start and end on-time;
- If meetings are planned to last 2 hours, they should be scheduled from 10:00 a.m. – 12:00 noon.
- The meetings be held in a larger room and that some of the members preferred meeting at BCDC;
- A list of action items be prepared at each meeting;
- The summary of the previous Task Force meeting be distributed immediately before the subsequent meeting.

**Regional Airport Planning Committee Task Force  
Schedule of Action Items**

<b>Item #</b>	<b>Date Initiated</b>	<b>Action Description</b>	<b>Person Responsible</b>	<b>Target Completion Date</b>	<b>Status</b>
1	10/3/08	Produce plan for involving Airports in the sharing of technical data	SH&E	10/10/08	<b>Open</b>
2	10/3/08	Produce plan for receiving Task Force input on the environmental analysis conducted for the Phase 2 scenarios.	SH&E	Mid-point scenario screening	<b>Open</b>