

Regional Airport Planning Committee Draft Meeting Minutes

9:30 A.M. – Noon
Friday, February 26, 2009
MetroCenter Auditorium
101 8th Street
Oakland, CA 94607

1. **Call to Order**

The meeting was called to order at 9:35 a.m. by Vice Chair Chu.

The following Members were present:

Mayor Tom Bates
Councilmember Dean Chu
Mr. Cary Greene
Supervisor Carol Groom
Mr. Leander Hauri
Mr. John Martin
Ms. Kristi McKenney
Mr. Elisha Novak
Mr. Sean Randolph
Supervisor James Sperring

The following Alternate Members were present:

Mr. Tom Greer
Ms. Susan Palmeri

2. **Public Comment**

There was no public comment.

3. **Minutes**

It was moved by Committee Member Hauri and seconded by Committee Member Sperring that the minutes be approved. The minutes were approved as submitted.

4. **Progress Report/Schedule**

RAPC staff member, Joe LaClair presented a report of the progress to date and an updated Phase 2 Project Schedule. (RAPC Staff)

5. **Regional Airport System Planning Analysis**

a. **High Speed Rail (HSR)**

Geoff Gosling of the consulting team presented an analysis on the effects of High Speed Rail on demand for Bay Area air travel.

Committee Member Novak noted that the study is using fares to compare and asked about using other factors for comparison.

Mr. Gosling responded that the California HSR Authority's forecast is the data being using in the analysis. These data consider convenience (access time), waiting time involved in frequency (schedule delay).

Mr. Novak added that the forecast may be higher than reality. People's decision may be less logical than calculations show.

Mr. Gosling responded that the Mode Choice Model is based on asking real people what they would choose given location of stations, travel time, etc. People find travel experience on train more production than flying. On flights you spend a lot of time in security, not allowed to have laptops on whole trip, etc.

Mr. Novak commented that the public in this country is not as used to trains as Europeans. Comparison to Europe may not be accurate for estimating decision-making in this country.

Mr. Gosling responded that there are a large number of issues surrounding estimates of diversion that may not have been handled well by the California HSR Authority. We don't have the resources to redo HSR forecast.

Committee Member Greene asked if the California HSR Authority done their own diversion analysis?

Mr. Gosling responded that the consulting team has used the HSR Authority's analysis in effect. The HSR Authority calculated ridership that will use air, auto and HSR (if is built). HSR Authority has not presented results in this way because their interest in how many people use rail, not in where they come from or which air markets contribute. The consulting team had to go back and do analysis to break out airports.

Vice Chair Chu asked for clarification by stating that HSR Authority discusses diversion from airports, but doesn't break it down by airport.

Mr. Gosling confirmed Mr. Chu's statement and added that it has to do with how they did their analysis. Zone-to-zone analysis assumes that some people traveling from Walnut Creek, for example, might use airports, but the analysis does not break it out explicitly.

Committee Member Randolph raised an additional source for data is from the new HSR in China between cities with similar distance between Los Angeles and San Francisco. The air traffic has dropped substantially. However, the area has not used cars very much.

Mr. Gosling responded that the situation in Japan, and possibly China, is sufficiently different than that in the US and he is not sure how translatable the experience would be.

Mr. Randolph agrees about Japan, but China being very new and similar in the competition with airports, he feels is applicable.

Committee Member Bates asked why the analysis refers to Anaheim and wanted to clarify that the train will really be going to Los Angeles. Mr. Bates also commented that, since he is a frequent rider on the Capital Corridor and, although it is not high speed at all, the ridership has increased significantly. He notes that most passengers had their laptops out and their cell phones; it is also a much more pleasant experience visually, than air travel.

He feels people will appreciate the difference in comfort and convenience and that it may have a major impact on ridership.

Committee Member Martin commented that predictability is a major benefit that could drive people toward using HSR. How airports and airlines market the HSR will make a big difference in the benefit to both the customers and the airports.

Mr. Gosling added that how they price the service to Fresno or Monterey. Often, the airlines include the feeder flight for little additional cost. Therefore, if HSR were added as an additional segment of the travel rather than a separate ticket and fare, it would make a huge difference.

Committee Member Groom commented that the assumption of security screening may be optimistic. In the current climate she feels that there would be public outcry for high security.

Mr. Gosling responded that the current analysis by HSR Authority does not assume screening of passengers. A significant percentage of their ridership will be intra-regional travelers. These passengers will not stand for security screening.

Committee Member Hauri commented that his priority when using HSR in Europe was first, reliability, convenience and then cost. The mindset here is cost, then reliability.

Public Comment:

Francois Galla with Maxell asked if there will be sufficient time to include the 'Impacts to be Considered' in the public workshops? He feels the public would be very interested in these issues.

Staff replied that their goal is to present these in the Public Workshops.

Mr. Galla also asked if San Jose, San Francisco and Oakland Airports be included in the reports on Greenhouse Gas Emissions being mandated by the EPA.

Committee Member Greene is not aware of this mandate.

Mr. Galla said that Airport Council International is helping EPA determine the requirements.

Airport representatives responded that Airports already prepare a GHG inventory because there is a California requirement.

b. Demand Management

Geoff Gosling of the consulting team presented the analysis of potential effects of the demand management scenario to reduce congestion and improve efficiency of operations at the Bay Area airports based on projected runway conditions in 2035.

It was asked what measure would be used to implement Demand Management?

Mr. Gosling responded that SH&E laid out several alternatives which would be possible. For the purpose of this analysis there has not been a position taken on what measures would be appropriate.

Committee Member Novak commented that when you talk about limitations or caps on General Aviation Operations, no previous attempts have delivered successful framework. It's very difficult to force GA operations out of International Airports.

Mr. Gosling responded that there is not much benefit achieved from doing this.

Committee Member Palmeri asked Mr. Gosling to address the security issues involved with having transport to airports on public busses.

Mr. Gosling responded that they are not saying that passengers are volunteering to ride the bus but that the airlines would say that it's not worth it for them to continue to serve certain markets with regional aircraft.

Ms. Palmeri commented that they would need to re-evaluate Sacramento and Stockton.

Mr. Gosling raised another alternative which is the external alternate airport scenario in which they look at an increase in traffic airports like Sacramento and Stockton.

Committee Member Bates Is the Instrument Flight Rules (IFR) ideal? Mr. Bates asked if they have looked at it? What specific steps would be taken?

Mr. Gosling Within the Demand Management scenario, they have not looked at it. They did not want to be in a situation of making too many assumptions that show it is not reasonable.

Mr. Bates commented that the scenarios they've proposed don't seem to reach an objective. What is the solution?

Mr. Gosling responded that when asking what the benefit is from that, the answer from the analysis is, "not very much." If you wanted to get below IFR capacity doing nothing but Demand Management what would it take, it's not been addressed. It's worth looking at Demand Management along with other strategies to look at what combination get us to our target. They are getting there in post-target analysis.

Committee Member Martin agreed. It's a combination that is going to work and he thinks it is going to work pretty well. As San Francisco increases ridership, airlines will begin shifting passengers to other airports to avoid delays.

Public Comment: There was no public comment

c. Public Workshops

Joe LaClair (RAPC Staff) presented plans for upcoming public workshops and discussed desired outcome, ways to get good public participation, and useful public input at the meetings.

Committee Member Chu asked if the San Francisco meeting is actually taking place in San Francisco or in San Mateo County where the airport is located.

Mr. LaClair responded that the San Francisco Airport Roundtable offered to host the workshop. Location has not been decided.

Committee Member Novak suggested meetings be held in East Bay and the North Bay as well. He also commented that outreach efforts be made prior to the meetings.

Mr. LaClair commented that targeted outreach to specific airports is planned.

Mr. Brittle mentioned that there is budget for a second round of workshops. In the second round they will try to balance out geographic coverage as well.

Committee Member McKenney commented that if the San Francisco meeting is held in San Mateo County perhaps the South Bay meeting could be in Southern Alameda County to balance the meetings geographically.

Mr. LaClair referred to Mr. Brittle's previous remarks about geographic balance and wonders if it is viable to achieve geographic dispersion by holding second three meetings in different locations than the first?

Committee Member Greene commented that it would be confusing to the public if the locations were change.

Committee Member Groom asked what the cost of a workshop would be and would there be funds available to do a fourth workshop if determined it would be useful?

Mr. LaClair responded that they had a fixed budget and they can research the possibility of more workshops but the funding available is what determined the fixed number initially.

Committee Member Randolph commented that it is important that people from the East Bay have easy access to one of the planned workshops.

Public Comment:

Mary Griffin raised the point that BART terminates in Millbrae and that many of the Roundtable events are held in Millbrae and that it should be feasible to provide a shuttle but from BART to a nearby location.

6. Old Business
The next meeting will be held on March 26, 2010
7. New Business
8. Adjournment
The meeting was adjourned at 12:00 p.m.