

## Regional Airport Planning Committee Meeting Minutes

**9:30 A.M. – Noon**  
**Friday, April 1, 2011**  
**MetroCenter Auditorium**  
**101 8<sup>th</sup> Street**  
**Oakland, CA 94607**

**1. Call to Order**

Jim Spering called the meeting to order at 9:45 a.m. RAPC members and other alternates in attendance: Bates, Cisneros, Gibbs, Greene, Liccardo, Martin, Hauri, Randolph, Barrie, Garbarino, Miller, Acree and Palmeri.

**2. Public Comment**

There was no public comment.

**3. Minutes**

Mr. Martin motioned approval of the minutes. Mr. Bates seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

**4. Interim Chairperson**

The RAPC Chair position rotated to MTC in April 2010 per RAPC's Memorandum of Understanding. The incumbent has retired from MTC. Mr. Liccardo nominated Jim Spering to serve as Chairperson for the remaining 1 year. Mr. Garbarino seconded. The nomination passed unanimously.

**5. Institutional Arrangements Analysis Part 2**

Ms. Lindy Lowe summarized RAPC's strengths and weaknesses and provided recommendations for strengthening RAPC.

Ms. Lowe summarized four options: Option 1 will be a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) similar to RAPC which will: represent the broad interests in air travel in the Bay Area; provide a cooperative process for the development of the Regional Airport Systems Planning Analysis (RASPA) for the Bay Area for consideration by the parties to the MOU for incorporation into the plans of each party; provide a public forum: and serve as an advisory committee to the parties to the MOU and makes recommendations to the governing boards to the parties to the MOU. The proposed additions to the current MOU to strengthen RAPC would be to increase the number of members that are a party to and sign the MOU, to provide funding for a staff person to maintain RAPC on a day-to-day basis, and to provide a single point of contact and consistent participation in airport systems planning. Option 2 is Contracts and Agreements. The strengths are flexibility, ability to target a specific issue and quickly address the issue, and the parties are likely to have

authority to implement. The weaknesses are a case-by-case approach, may lack the big picture, issues important to the region are left to airports, airlines and local governments to decide, and it leaves out important partners and perspectives. Option 3 is a Joint Powers Authority. The strengths are funding and staff, ability to implement and plan more clearly, more recognizable and may make advocacy easier, and recommendations on funding and planning may be more acknowledged. The weaknesses are that a JPA is rigid and hard to change, provides no new authority, and requires a lot of work to create. Option 4 is the Regional Airport Authority. The strengths are the ability to implement, increased participation, would have funding and staff, and can bring a regional perspective to funding, planning, operations, capacity, demand management, GHG reductions, etc. The weaknesses are difficulty to enact, it would be rigid and hard to change, possible loss of local control, and it cannot directly address key issues as it would still lack authority, high costs

Ms. Lowe stated that staff recommends that the Committee pursue improving RAPC, rather than relying solely on the airports to establish contracts and agreements on a case-by-case basis or pursuing a new regional airport authority. This option would not preclude the pursuit of MOUs and contracts to achieve some of the goals of the study, and these tools could still be used in conjunction with the MOU for RAPC. Nor would it include immediately seeking new authority for regional agencies/RAPC. The improved RAPC would also not preclude further analysis of a Joint Powers Authority or new regional authority.

Committee Comment:

- There needs to be some financial commitment from each agency to pursue this.
- Having a Joint Powers Authority that includes BCDC, ABAG, MTC, SFO, OAK, SJC, and others that are necessary to be members makes sense.
- Build on what exists.
- Does an institutional arrangement matter as a vehicle, or do we need to get legislation to be able to implement congestion pricing? Response: If the Bay Area was to develop a new regional authority, that would be the furthest we can go with a congestion pricing strategy, but there would still be limitations that could only be removed by Congress and the FAA. With an MOU that enhances RAPC and also pulls in the contracts and agreements piece, we may be able to make progress on congestion pricing without a regional authority.
- It's premature to make a recommendation now, as the committee has not yet acted upon the vision and the implementation program that will be coming forward.
- How does staff go about funding permanent staffing? What is the reason that airlines do not participate? Response: The airlines likely do not feel a need to participate in RAPC based on its lack of authority

and its current structure—it has no consistent role in airport systems planning, has no staff to pursue relationships with airline representatives and has not done much to raise its concerns with Congress and the FAA. The airlines also have a shorter range perspective on things, and RAPC is looking at a longer range.

- Did staff look at the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey, which also is conducting systems planning with a regional authority in a metropolitan region, and if so, were there any lessons for our region? Response: The presentation made in February used them as an example, and staff also looked at other port authorities. It's clear that the port authority cannot just move traffic around because they are an authority – they have to go through difficult and subtle mechanisms to move traffic around. But without a regional authority, they would probably have an even more difficult time redistributing traffic among the airports under their control. .
- If the committee adopted the Vision and then talked about the role RAPC can play to help implement that Vision and what authority would be needed, it would make more sense when it's taken to the various agencies and airports.
- The Vision is to have an authority, and the authority should have the arrangements to help redistribute some of the traffic and do some of the planning. Although what staff is currently recommending is a good first step, we ultimately should pursue a regional authority.
- RAPC needs to have their own dedicated staff.

The committee agreed to wait on approving staff's recommendation. After they adopt the Vision, staff will bring the Institutional Arrangements back to the committee to link those two together to see how staff can deliver the Vision and what role RAPC can play to help do that. Chair Spering also requested that staff look at the Sustainability Project that MTC is doing, and noted that it brings to light a lot of the challenges that transit is facing. This may be a process that RAPC should go through.

## **6. Final Round of Public Workshops in March**

Ms. Lindy Lowe summarized the workshops that were held on March 22, 23, and 24<sup>th</sup>.

The workshop held on March 22 in So. San Francisco, staff presented the scenarios, walked through the problem statements, the analysis that was conducted, and the preliminary Recommendations. She noted that everyone seemed interested in the overall study. There were questions regarding High Speed Rail and several comments about the desire to reduce airport noise impacts in South San Francisco. It was noted that extending Runway 1 to handle more long distance flights would again raise concerns with filling the Bay.

The workshop held on March 23 in Oakland had the overarching theme of noise. Several individuals expressed concern with noise at the Oakland Airport. Many people present felt that the 65 CNEL noise metric is a poor measure of real noise impacts to communities and wanted to see an analysis of 55 CNEL and other noise metrics. There was concern about the Traffic Redistribution scenario and taking traffic from San Francisco Airport and moving it to Oakland, and what that would mean for noise in their communities. The analysis that was conducted demonstrated that there wouldn't be any additional residential land use within the 65 CNEL noise contour, but there would be increased number of residential units within the larger 55 CNEL contour. They also expressed concern about not pursuing Travis AFB or Moffett Federal Airfield for air cargo, which would relieve noise at Oakland Airport from cargo flights. .

Mr. Brittle reported on the workshop held on March 24 in San Jose, which had some discussion regarding Moffett Field. He referred the Committee to a letter submitted by the City of Mountain View, which stated that they do not embrace any future significant expansion of Moffett's aviation role. There was also more discussion about High Speed Rail and criticism of the State's estimates of High Speed Rail ridership as being inaccurate. Some people suggested that redistribution of air traffic among the three Bay Area airports might be helped if there was a high speed rail connection between each of the three airports. He stated that staff did present the fact that the noise contours would expand around San Jose Airport under the Traffic Redistribution scenario, but this did not spark any comment.

Chair Sperring stated that he attended the workshop in Oakland, and noted that most of the discussion was about very local noise issues. He recommended that in the future staff should separate the noise issue for another forum.

8. **New Business**

None.

9. **Old Business**

None.

10. **Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 10:41 a.m.