

Regional Airport Planning Committee Meeting Minutes

9:30 A.M. – Noon
Friday, June 25, 2010
MetroCenter Auditorium
101 8th Street
Oakland, CA 94607

1. Call to Order

Vice Chair Chu called the meeting to order at 9:32 a.m. RAPC members and other alternates in attendance: Barrie, Bates, Fredericks, Greene, Groom, Hauri, Lai-Bitker, Luce, Novak, Randolph, Spering, Rickelton, Bergener Bautista, Palmeri, and Cisneros

2. Public Comment

There were no comments from the public.

3. Election of Chair

Mr. Spering motioned approval for the nomination of Vice Chair Chu for Chairperson. Ms. Lai-Bitker seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

Nominations for Vice Chair will take place at the next meeting.

4. Minutes

Mr. Green reported the correct spelling to the name of Mr. Carl Honaker who represents the General Aviation Airports not Livermore Airport.

Mr. Bates moved approval of the minutes. Ms. Lai-Bitker seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

5. Mid-Point Summary Report

Mr. Chris Brittle stated that the Mid-Point Summary Report was developed by RAPC staff and the consultant. It was available at the workshops and served as a basis for the presentation that was made at the workshops.

Mr. Brittle introduced Mr. David Hollander who made a Power Point presentation, which detailed the information presented at the workshops-- demand forecast, the capacity analysis, the scenarios and the goals.

Committee comment:

- Sonoma County is preparing an environmental report for their proposed runway extension, which is part of a strategy to develop airline service to new destinations. Three airlines stated, in writing, that even if the airport gets the longer runway, they are not making any

commitment about service. The FAA is reviewing this work, but given the airline response, the growth in air passengers may be less promising than currently assumed.

- Screening Analysis Results – It would be helpful to have a numerical analysis where it actually ranks the six scenarios under each of the goals, along with some overall ranking. Staff responded that the numerical information for each goal is included in the back of the report.

ACT Technologies-it is surprising that the new ATC technologies do not make much difference in climate protection and clean air. Consultant Response: New ACT Technologies will have an impact on the national scale, but for the Bay Area they do not change the total number of aircraft arriving and departing at each airport which is the main reason for differences between Scenarios. There is a slight reduction in GHGs and criteria pollutants from reduced taxi delays produced by this Scenario.

6. **Mid-Point Screening Analysis and Recommendations**

Mr. Chris Brittle proposed three new scenarios to pursue during the remainder of the study. Scenarios A, “Modest Traffic Redistribution with Demand Management and Modest Air Traffic Control Technology”, and Scenario B, “Major Traffic Redistribution with Demand Management and Modest Air Traffic Control Technology”, would be evaluated for all the Goals using the 2035 Base Case forecasts and the same methodologies that were used for the original six Scenarios. The third Scenario, Scenario C, “High Growth Scenario”, is an illustrative Scenario that demonstrates how the 2035 High demand Forecast—if demand grows faster than the Base Case—could be served.

Mr. Brittle stated that staff will be comparing the new scenarios to the Base Case as was done for the original six Scenarios. While High Speed Rail is not explicitly being assumed as part of new Scenarios A and B, it would likely improve the goal results even further if it was included as part of the mix..

In conclusion, Mr. Brittle noted that the Task Force expressed a strong interest in having High Speed Rail and the full air traffic control technology aspect included as part of the continuing discussion and in the institutional analysis to come. Mr. Brittle recommended that RAPC approve the definition of the three new scenarios for further analysis and discussion for the remainder of the study.

Committee Comment:

- Is there sufficient budget in the study to analyze Scenarios A-C? Staff Response: Because of budget constraints, staff was not going to do a full analysis for Scenario C, because that would involve much more work associated with a complete new set of forecasts (the High

Forecasts). There is budget available for a full analysis of Scenarios A and B.

- Scenario A should be used as the Baseline (without Demand Management) as it is the true “No Project” alternative that is likely to happen anyway (i.e., some traffic redistribution between airports and some modest ATC improvements).
- HSR should be included in the Scenarios. A similar approach could be used to that taken for the MTC Regional Transportation Plan where the transportation system was evaluated with and without HSR.
- Moffett Federal Airfield– What is the status of this airport as it doesn’t show up anywhere in the work. Staff Response: Based on the analysis to date, staff doesn’t believe there is a viable air passenger or air cargo role for Moffet. However, it may be viable in terms of a larger general aviation role which is not being addressed as part of this study.
- What is driving the increase in regional population exposed to airport noise around SFO? Staff Response: It’s due to growth in aircraft operations and the fact that regional Focus Growth projections increase density around transit nodes which bring more population into the SFO noise contour.
- San Jose Airport passenger demand-Projected growth in the region is going to the south – why isn’t that reflected in the air passenger forecast for San Jose Airport? Consultant Response: Forecasts of the future geographic origins of air passengers in the region took into account both the current location of air passenger ground origins from MTC’s most recent air passenger surveys, and then ABAG’s latest demographic forecasts for different parts of the Bay Area were applied to adjust these patterns to 2035 conditions.
- Demand Management-need more information on who decides how these strategies will be implemented.

Mr. Tom Bates motioned for staff to move forward with scenarios A and B with modifications as they come along. Mr. Jim Spering seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

7. Mid-Point Public Workshops Summary Report and Project Website

Ms. Lindy Lowe stated that as part of the Regional Airport Study, three public workshops were held – one in South San Francisco, one in Solano County, and one in Oakland - to provide the public with information on the findings of the study, obtain feedback on these findings and the design of the study and inform the public of how to stay involved with the study. She stated that approximately 85 people participated in the workshops, while others provided comments through the study website.

RAPC staff and consultants designed a variety of materials, including study boards explaining the six Scenarios, a Mid-Point Screening Summary Report to summarize the study findings to date, a one page summary of each of the

scenarios and a study website to support the workshops – www.regionalairportstudy.com.

In closing, she stated that more detailed information about the workshops is provided in the Mid-Point Public Workshops Summary Report, and is available on the study website.

Committee comment:

- What are we doing with public response? Staff Response: Staff did give a direct response to some comments at the workshops. Some of the comments that were heard will likely show up again in the Vision and Implementation plan. Staff will carry forward not only the comments heard at the public meetings and comments from the website, but comments from Stakeholders prior to the public meetings.
- There has to be a mechanism to let people know how staff is responding to their comments. Staff Response-staff will post all the comments on the website and will provide additional responses to these comments. .

8. **New Business**

Chairman Dean Chu stated that at the June 23rd MTC meeting it was suggested that there be a presentation on RAPC's study to one of the MTC's subcommittees. He asked BCDC and ABAG if they think there is a need for an update to one of their general committees. Staff Response: Both BCDC and ABAG agreed that it would be a good idea to update their committees as well..

Chairman Chu announced that the San Jose International Airport is opening a new terminal, which will have twelve gates. The ribbon cutting will be held on Saturday, June 26, 2010, and then it will be open for operation on June 30, 2010.

9. **Old Business**

The next meeting will be held on October 22, 2010

10. **Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 11:00 a.m.