

# Regional Airport Planning Committee Draft Meeting Minutes

9:30 A.M. – Noon  
Friday, November 20, 2009  
MetroCenter Auditorium  
101 8<sup>th</sup> Street  
Oakland, CA 94607

1. Call to Order: The meeting was called to order at 9:32 a.m.
2. Public Comment: There was no public comment.
3. Minutes: It was moved and seconded that the minutes be approved. The minutes were approved as submitted.
4. Alternative Strategy for Accommodating Future Aviation Demand- David Hollander
  - A. Air Traffic Redistribution Scenario

David Hollander of SH&E made a presentation on the results of their analysis of potential traffic shifts from SFO to OAK and SJC in 2035 due to high delays at SFO and considering airline competitive strategies. Committee Member Greene stated that he thought the Redistribution Scenario should be called the Baseline Scenario as that is what is likely to happen.

Mr. Hollander responded that strategies being evaluated in other Scenarios, such as new Air Traffic Control technologies and demand management, may reduce delays at SFO and thus mitigate some of the natural shift in traffic that would otherwise occur.

Committee Member Martin commented that he expects to see traffic shifts occur much sooner than 2035. This would result in much faster growth in traffic at OAK and SJC in coming years.

Committee Member Novak noted that people visiting San Francisco don't associate the other airports with the Bay Area as much as SFO, and as a result SFO tends to get more traffic.

Mr. Hollander responded that airline service considerations, such as the amount of profit they can make and maintaining market share, are a critical part of how traffic will distribute among the Bay Area airport in the future. Airlines don't always act in a manner consistent with balancing capacity with traffic levels at each airport. The traffic distribution estimates looked at the history of service at each airport and trends in each airport's share of the domestic market. Some factors could produce higher shares at OAK and SJC, such as the very high level

of delay predicted for SFO in the Baseline forecasts, while other factors such as the continued presence of low cost carriers at SFO would argue for less of a shift. Some of the recent high shares in domestic traffic at OAK and SJC occurred during a period when United was facing bankruptcy and made major cuts in service at SFO. Also, American Airlines tried to establish a hub at San Jose, but has since abandoned that concept.

Committee Member Chu asked how a redistribution of traffic would affect the aircraft delays projected for SFO in the Base Case. Mr. Hollander responded that the next step in the study is to answer that question. Also, the Committee will be presented with information on what happens to the delays at OAK and SJC as well when traffic is shifted.

## B. External Airports Analysis

Committee Member Martin commented that there are quite a few short haul feeder flights from nearby areas to SFO, and this is not a good use of SFO's limited runway resources.

Mr. Hollander responded that in a free market airlines can select what is best for their operation, and United apparently feels that these feeder flights from smaller neighboring cities add to the strength of their connecting hub at SFO.

Committee Member Greene stated that combining the diversion impacts of both the internal and external alternative airports would vastly overstate the impacts of expanding service at alternative airports, and therefore, the data should be split out separately.

Mr. Hollander agreed that the current trend in the airline industry has been not to add new service points into system, but to consolidate service. Allegiant is one airline whose strategy is to identify underserved airports where there is no competition and to provide new service in these markets. The thought behind combining the information initially was that the boundary of the Bay Area is just a line on a map whereas all the alternative airports listed have the potential to serve some passengers that would otherwise use Bay Area airports.

Committee Member La Pier asked if, in the analysis of the potential new markets for service from the Sacramento Airport, the estimated demand includes or excludes air passengers from the Travis AFB catchment area?

Mr. Hollander responded that the demand estimates only include air passengers in the primary market area for Sacramento Airport as defined by the airport; this market area does not include the Bay region. Additional analysis could identify Bay Area air passengers who would use the Sacramento Airport due to its closer proximity. Likewise, the estimated air passenger demand for Travis AFB only includes air passengers from the Bay Area market shed.

Committee Member La Pier commented that Sacramento Airport has analyzed recapture of what he would call “leakage” from the Sacramento Area to the Bay Area airports and asked if there would be further analysis of new markets at Sacramento assuming the airport attracted more nearby Bay Area air passengers. Mr. Hollander responded that the study team would need to think some more about further adjustments in the methodology for estimating demand at the various alternative airports before moving ahead.

In comparing the demand at Travis AFB vs. new markets at Sacramento Airport, Mr. Hollander noted that Sacramento Airport already captures more than 2/3 of its market area passengers, so there are fewer passengers to recapture in the future. Also, international air passengers from the Sacramento area will probably need to continue to use SFO for many of these services in the future.

Committee Member Palmeri asked if the market demand estimates for the external airports are based primarily on local Origin/Destination demand, and Mr. Hollander replied affirmatively. Those taking a connecting flight to SFO would probably need to continue to do so for the services offered exclusively at this airport.

#### C. ATC (Air Traffic Control) Technology Scenario

Geoff Gosling gave a Powerpoint presentation on new ATC Technologies being considered for the New ATC Technology Scenario.

Committee Member McKinney commented that she would like to see the study team document some of the smaller types of capacity improvements that can also enhance runway capacity.

Mr. Gosling agreed it would be helpful to document these and that some of them had been discussed in the Technical Working Group addressing future ATC improvements. He also said he agreed that it would be useful to compare the results of the current RASPA capacity analysis with results from other studies that assumed these types of improvements.

Mr. Hollander added that one type of ATC improvement that doesn't show up in the RASPA runway capacity analysis is the effect of Required Navigational Procedures (RNP) on OAK's early morning departures. Currently OAK departures are staggered in between SFO departures to the south since there is only one southbound route. With RNP, there could be two separate routes so early morning departures from SFO and OAK could occur simultaneously without delays.

Mr. Gosling added that an important issue is to make sure there is enough capacity in the airspace for airports to run at their full runway capacity.

Committee Member Martin asked if the analysis assumes aircraft can land simultaneously at SFO in extreme weather conditions.

Mr. Gosling responded that such a capability would depend on the technology, and that the research is not yet complete. He added that there is a need to make sure the NextGen program keeps simultaneous landings on closely spaced parallel runways in bad weather as an issue to pursue.

Committee Member Spring observed that so much of what has been presented by the study team so far is very unpredictable, and wondered how the Committee will be able to develop meaningful recommendations.

Staff representative Brittle answered that long-range planning inherently has a lot of uncertainty and that staff and the consultants must use their best professional judgment to figure out the best solutions given all the unknowns. He mentioned that the work scope includes two tracking components to help identify future trends in demand and runway congestion, and that RAPC can use this feedback to adjust its recommendations. Mr. Brittle observed that it would be helpful if the final report addressed the question of uncertainty and how to cope with uncertainty in the ongoing planning process.

Committee Member Novak added that past history shows it is very difficult to anticipate future events in the airline industry (e.g., equipment, navigation aids). The study team is attempting to come up with reasonable, acceptable scenarios. It is a given that things will change, and we will need to adjust our thinking later on.

#### D. Demand Management

Mr. Hollander presented information on the Demand Management Scenario.

No discussion was raised on this section of the presentation.

#### 5. Old Business

The next meeting will be held on January 22, 2010

#### 6. New Business

#### 7. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 12:00 p.m.