

Regional Airport Planning Committee Meeting Minutes

9:30 A.M. – Noon
Friday, January 28, 2011
MetroCenter Auditorium
101 8th Street
Oakland, CA 94607

1. Call to Order

Chairman Chu called the meeting to order at 9:40 a.m. RAPC members and other alternates in attendance: Bates, Dickinson, Gioia, Greene, Luce, Martin, McKenney, Novak, Randolph, and Spering.

2. Public Comment

There was no public comment.

3. Minutes

Mr. Bates motioned approval of the minutes with a minor correction changing “Vice Chair Chu” to “Chair Chu”. Mr. Spering seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

4. Demand Management Strategies for SFO

Mr. Scott Lewis, Anderson & Kreiger, made a PowerPoint presentation on airport Demand Management approaches within the current regulatory and legal context. He summarized the various issues associated with demand management, what it means, how it works, and some of the legal constraints.

He stated that there is clearly a need for local demand management to bring the demand for airport facilities into better alignment with airport capacity.

He commented on the role and authority of local airport proprietors relative to the Airline Deregulation Act, grant assurances required under federal airport aid programs, airline contractual agreements, and the rights of airports as a proprietor. He noted that local airport proprietors are heavily regulated by the federal government; for example, the Airport Noise and Capacity Act, limits the an airport’s ability to restrict airline access to an airport and restrict use of aircraft by airlines based on the noisiness of the aircraft.

Committee comment:

- Because there is three independently operated airports, with their own local economic interests, how do you overcome this type of challenge if you want to coordinate service development at the individual airports? Response: It’s not inconceivable that all three airports are better off with a coordinated result that redistributes some flights

around the region. The question is how to define it and how to implement it.

- Is there a perimeter rule in affect for Reagan National Airport?
Response: Yes, that's a federally imposed statutory rule.
- The coordination of all three airports will not occur unless there is some kind of legislation that would be required at the federal level?
Response: Yes, it could be federal legislation.
- Why do the airlines feel that they are not part of that problem?
Response: This is an observation of how their decision-making works. For example, in 2000 when the slot rule was suddenly lifted at LaGuardia Airport, the airlines attempted to put into that airport twice as many flights as the airport could possibly absorb. They were doing this for reasons that had a lot to do with their own competitive strategies and shows their decision-making tends to be very short-term, and very motivated by the bottom line.
- Looking at some of the regional authorities around the country, it doesn't seem that they have been very successful at moving demand around. Response: The Van Nuys situation has been successful – the Los Angeles World Airports (LAWA) actually pays for the deficit at Van Nuys Airport which off loads corporate general aviation traffic from LAX. LAWA can do that because both airports are owned by the City of Los Angeles.
- San Francisco made a tremendous effort to entice Virgin America to come to SFO, Southwest, then abandoned OAK to compete at SFO, followed by JetBlue. This creates a battle among low cost airlines that is congesting SFO; eventually one or more of them may succumb to the competition. So it's a rationale competition strategy for the short term, but may not be rationale in the long-term.
- Expand on the influence of airport delays and how that might affect behavior and demand. Response: Delay, if it becomes increasingly severe at SFO, at some point will likely force the airlines to move some flights to other airports. The problem is that the airlines' tolerance for delay is much higher then the public's tolerance for delay and extremely higher then the planner's tolerance.
- How does the role of a hub system affect the interplay between airports and airlines? Response: The hub system makes it much more difficult for the demand management techniques to work because those feeder flights are worth far more in revenue to the airlines than any penalties demand management might impose on feeder flights.
- The regional authority approach, while not be perfect, seems to improve the situation from what it would have been had their not been one. Response: If all that mattered was the problem of congestion delay, would the three airports be better served by being part of a unified system? Probably "Yes".

5. **Draft Vision and Implementation Analysis**

Mr. Chris Brittle summarized the Draft Vision and Implementation Analysis and focused on the staff recommendations. Mr. David Hollander from SH&E participated by phone, and Mr. Geoff Gosling was also present during the presentation.

Mr. Brittle stated that the report is the culminating product from the study, which contains all the technical work, recommendations for moving forward, and discusses the work scope that staff recommends to be pursued. He noted that prior to putting the recommendations together, RAPC staff interviewed the airports and consulted with SH&E. The report will be used for upcoming workshops.

The topics covered in the report are: 1) Study Vision and Goals, 2) Forecasts of Future Demand; 3) Runway Capacity and Delays; 4) Airport System Scenarios Evaluated; 5) Results of Goals Analysis; 6) Issues and Recommendations; and 6) Future Work Scope

He stated that the Vision component is essentially the Goals for the study: that Bay Area air passengers will have a choice of more flights (or trains) at more airports; there will be fewer weather-related flight delays; airport noise impacts on the regional population will be minimized; adverse air quality and climate change impacts will be minimized; surface travel to airports will take less time; and the airport system will support regional economic expansion.

Mr. Brittle reviewed the latest scenarios evaluated and indicated that Combined Scenarios A and B performed the best in relation to all the goals. Scenario C, a conceptual strategy for serving the high demand forecast combining all the strategies tested was not evaluated in detail but could achieve acceptable delays. He then reviewed the annual average delay results for SFO under Combined Scenarios A and B and discussed the projected increase in 2035 in the population exposed to noise of 65 CNEL or greater around SFO.

Mr. Brittle summarized the recommendations and noted that they are organized around the major issues that have been discussed during the course of the study. They are also consistent with RAPC's advisory role, and the recommendations anticipate some changes to RAPC as discussed in Part 2 of the Institutional Analysis (the next Agenda item).

Committee Comment:

- In 2007 there was a 5.7 minute delay in San Francisco. It seems that the delays at SFO are significantly more now than in 2001. What affect would the comparable number be now? Response: Mr. Bergener (SFO) said that in 2010 the comparable number would probably be

around 6 – 6.5 minutes. This includes all operations including the vast majority that are on time during good weather as well as the ones that are delayed when it's foggy. With fog conditions, like today, delays might be around an hour. He noted that the on-time performance for San Francisco is the lowest of the top 20 airports this year.

- The 2020 World Expo may be coming to Moffett Field. If this happens, it is estimated that there might be approximately 25 million visitors to the site over a 6-month period, of which 8-9 million will be coming mostly by air from outside the Bay Area. Keep this in mind when looking at runway capacity issues in the future as well as the availability of the Moffett airfield in the future.
- The recommendation on Moffett should not be limited to just its future potential as a general aviation airport. With two long runways, it can handle commercial aircraft suitable for air cargo.
- Staff needs to look at how we can effectively have some kind of regional entity that operates the three airports, showing the advantages, disadvantages, and implementation obstacles.
- One of the keys to dealing with air traffic congestion will be getting the FAA's NextGen air traffic management system implemented in the Bay Area.

Public Comment:

- Mr. McCarthy, USAF Retired, suggested that any planning notions addressing civilian air passenger or cargo use of Travis Air Force Base be carefully thought out before spending time on this concept. Staff needs to look at why these military facilities are serving their current role and the importance of this mission.

6. Institutional Arrangements Analysis Part 2

Due to the interest of time, this item was deferred to a later meeting in February/March 2011.

7. Final Round of Public Workshops in March

Ms. Lindy Lowe stated that the workshops are scheduled for March 22 in South San Francisco, March 23 at Oakland/MTC, and March 24 at San Jose City Hall. She welcomed any suggestions the committee may have in regards to the workshops.

Committee Comment:

- Is there any way of getting the information displayed at the airports?
Response: Yes, it can be distributed to all the stakeholder lists, the noise forum list and noticed at the airports.

Public Comment:

- Mr. McCarthy stated that there is a mutual interest and impact between general aviation and commercial carrier airports. Sea-level rise and crisis management interests will force the need to look at this issue.

8. New Business

None.

9. Old Business

None.

10. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 11:45 a.m.