

# Regional Airport Planning Committee Draft Meeting Minutes

9:30 A.M. – Noon  
Friday, September 25, 2009  
MetroCenter Auditorium  
101 8<sup>th</sup> Street  
Oakland, CA 94607

## 1. Call to Order

The regular meeting of the Regional Airport Planning Committee was called to order at 9:50 a.m.

## 2. Roll Call

Chair Richard Garbarino  
Vice Chair, Dean Chu  
Terry Barrie  
Tom Bates  
Cary Greene  
Carole Groom  
John Gioia  
Leander Hauri  
Mark Luce  
John Martin  
Kristi McKenney  
Elisha Novak  
Jim Spering  
Susan Palmeri

## 3. Approval of the meeting minutes of June 26, 2009

Minutes were approved.

## 4. Public Comment

## 5. Regional Airport System Planning Analysis (RASPA)

### Schedule Update

## **Baseline Capacity and Delay Analysis**

Geoff Gosling from Aviation System Consulting delivered a presentation on the Baseline Capacity and Delay Analysis on behalf of the RASPA consultant team. David Hollander and Beverly Jones from SH&E participated by conference call. The presentation described the analysis methodology used to estimate airport capacities of the three primary airports and projected delays in 2020 and 2035 at the forecast demand levels, assuming existing airfield conditions and no enhancements in air traffic control technology or procedures. Mr. Gosling noted that these will be addressed as part of future work to evaluate the different airport system development scenarios to be considered in the RASPA update.

The presentation discussed the coordination that was undertaken with Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) personnel at the air traffic control towers at each airport and the Northern California Terminal Radar Approach Control (TRACON), as well as planning staff at the three primary airports. It then described the two models that were used to calculate airfield capacities under different weather conditions, traffic conditions, and operational configurations, and the resulting delays at different demand levels, and discussed the delay thresholds that were adopted to establish the projected airfield capacities.

The presentation then reviewed the principal analysis assumptions and results at each airport in turn, including the airfield layout and key operating factors, the forecast aircraft demand and traffic composition, and the hourly profile of forecast operations relative to the maximum hourly capacities under both visual flight rules (VFR) and instrument flight rules (IFR). The projected changes in resulting average aircraft delay for both VFR and IFR conditions, as well as the average for all weather conditions, was shown for current (2007) and forecast 2020 and 2035 demand levels. For each airport, the presentation showed the demand level in terms of annual aircraft operations at which the overall average delays were expected to reach thresholds of 12 minutes and 15 minutes per operation. In the case of Oakland International Airport (OAK), the presentation compared these results to those given by a recent study of the ultimate airfield capacity undertaken for the Port of Oakland using a different analysis methodology, noting the similarities and differences in the two approaches, and the fact that both studies resulted in the same estimate of the maximum annual capacity in terms of annual aircraft operations.

The results of the analysis showed that forecast hourly demand levels for 2035 were well within the VFR capacity at OAK but slightly exceeded the IFR capacity for part of the day, whereas forecast hourly demand levels for 2035 were well below the IFR capacity for all hours at San Jose International Airport (SJC). The resulting average delay levels suggested that OAK would reach its airfield capacity at a level of annual operations some 20% to 25% above the forecast 2035 demand levels, while SJC had significant capacity to accommodate additional demand above the forecast levels. In contrast, the forecast hourly demand levels for 2035 at San Francisco International Airport (SFO) were well above the IFR capacity for large parts of the day and even

exceeded VFR capacity during the peak hour. This led to very high levels of average delay, reaching an average of about 65 minutes of delay per operation under IFR conditions in 2035, and an average under all conditions of about 20 minutes of delay per operation. As a result it was projected that SFO would reach its airfield capacity well before 2035.

The final slide of the presentation showed the resulting airfield capacities expressed in terms of annual enplaned and deplaned passengers, compared to the forecast demand in 2035. The projected capacity at all three airports exceeded the forecast passenger demand for the region as a whole by a comfortable margin. However, while OAK and SJC had sufficient airfield capacity to handle the forecast demand (particularly SJC), the analysis projected a shortfall of capacity at SFO of between 7 and 9 million annual passengers.

Mr. Gosling then invited questions and comments from Committee members.

Mayor Bates asked why the proportion of instrument weather conditions was higher at OAK than at SFO. Mr. Gosling explained that while in general OAK had somewhat fewer hours of instrument weather conditions than SFO, the figures shown in the presentation combined results for several different weather conditions and operational configurations into the two broad categories of VFR and IFR. He agreed that the results appeared counterintuitive, and suggested that this resulted from the way that the various weather conditions had been combined. He promised to look into this and provide a more detailed explanation by the next meeting.

Kristi McKenney stated that the analysis performed for the Port of Oakland looked at the effects of delays on airline schedule integrity and suggested that a 12 minute average annual delay probably would be too high for an airport with their type of operations.

Susan Palmeri (San Joaquin County) asked about the assumptions on fleet mix, load factors, etc. that was behind the conversion of the estimated capacity from the number of annual aircraft operations to annual passengers. Mr. Gosling responded that these were based on the projections that had been developed in the prior forecasting effort and Chris Brittle added that the consultants had presented the forecasts at the last RAPC meeting and that the full report on the forecasts was part of the material provided at this meeting for Committee members.

### **Target Analysis Approach to Evaluating Alternative Airport Systems Scenarios**

Chris Brittle introduced the proposed Target Analysis approach for evaluating alternative airport system scenarios.

Supervisor Spring stated that in addition to the criteria shown in the target analysis, the economy was important and that we need to think about how restrictions on aircraft to reduce delays might also affect the economy. He noted that we are in very difficult times and don't want to do things that will cause people to pay more for their

trips. Chris Brittle said that the economy was important and has traditionally meant equating airport activity with the number of jobs that airports support, although this was not something that the study had planned to consider.

Kristi McKenney agreed that a measure that shows how the alternative scenarios to be considered in the RASPA affect the economy is absolutely needed. Mr. Brittle said that staff was open to new measures and would appreciate help in defining one for the economy

Mayor Bates observed that his understanding is that aircraft global warming emissions are largely beyond any local controls. If we can't control them, RAPC needs to know who we can talk to get aircraft engine emissions lowered. Mr. Brittle mentioned that this is true, but that some actions, like air passengers purchasing CO2 offsets for their trips, similar to a new program at SFO, could be done locally.

Cary Greene stated that he does not think it necessary to look at aircraft GHG emissions, but rather report on ground access emissions from trips to the airports since that is something that could be affected locally. Mr. Brittle agreed that emissions from vehicles traveling to and from the airports needs to be included in the Target Analysis.

Elisha Novak stated that moving flights to General Aviation airports under current laws and regulations is not easy or even feasible.

Mayor Bates inquired about RAPC's abilities to limit emissions and whether this would be limited to efforts to reduce VMT (vehicle miles traveled) related to accessing airports through parking costs. Is it possible to control General Aviation demand through pricing? Where can RAPC apply pressure if this is its goal?

Leander Hauri indicated that he thinks that in the Reliever Airport Scenario it will be difficult to remove general aviation business aircraft from San Francisco Airport because Half Moon Bay is not a viable alternative and San Jose is probably too far away.

John Martin stated that it would probably be good to lower the percentage of general aviation corporate aircraft, but from a practical standpoint SFO still needs to serve these aviation users. It would be hard to tell corporate leaders like the Chairman of Bank of America that they can't land at SFO when they need to do business in San Francisco.

Mr. Greene suggested that the Reliever Airport Scenario ought to look at relocating the smaller piston powered aircraft from air carrier airports rather than focusing on the corporate jets, which are compatible with airport operations. Mr. Brittle responded that the smaller aircraft probably didn't have a great impact on runway capacity as they do not generally use the same runways as the commercial airlines, and that was the reason for looking at the corporate jets which do use the same runways.

Michael La Pier (Sacramento Airport) asked staff to explain a little more about what they were thinking in terms of how average aircraft delay reflected the passenger's experience. Mr. Brittle indicated that the main connection is that high delays would reflect a condition where flights were being delayed and perhaps canceled, which means service is not that reliable.

Susan Palmeri (San Joaquin County) asked if staff was looking at airport emissions as well as aircraft emissions. Mr. Brittle said the air quality emission analysis would focus on the aircraft ground emissions, such as APU (Auxiliary Power Unit) emissions, but that the future assumption is that gates would have electrical power so running the APUs would not be needed. He also indicated that at prior meetings the airports had made separate presentations on how they were reducing GHGs from on-airport operations they control and that it appeared they were making good progress.

### **Public Comment**

Michael Sarabia stated that the HSR alternative was not viable and too expensive.

Howard Beckman said whereas he thought earlier regional studies had not focused adequately on general aviation airports and their impacts on communities, the Reliever Airport Scenario went too far. RAPC should be looking for communities that want these operations and avoid those that don't.

## **6. General Aviation Airport Land Use Study**

Marisa Cravens, ABAG Regional Planner, presented an inventory of land parcels around General Aviation Airports. To create the inventory, ABAG mapped Safety Zones and the 65 dB noise contour for each airport and included all vacant land that fell within these boundaries. The inventory includes cost protection scenarios for the potential purchase of vacant parcels, using FAA funding, to purchase parcels in order to reduce future noise and safety risks.

Elisha Novak gave an overview of the FAA's land acquisition purchasing program. The program's roots are in the 1970 Federal Governments Uniform Relocation Assistance and Land Acquisition Act, which established reimbursement for property at fair market value. The federal government typically reimburses 80% of funds, but offers up to 95% for other airport improvements. Funds for acquisition are low priority and reimbursement can be slow. He also noted that FAA safety areas are different from those recommended by Caltrans, which are much larger.

Supervisor Luce stated that habitat protection near airports can be integrated with noise and safety protections.

Supervisor Spring stated that in addition to vacant land, the inventory should consider aging industrial and commercial land as potentially developable. He asked if preserving airports were a high priority for the jurisdictions, suggesting both that a toolbox for preservation be created and that local jurisdictions be brought into the process.

It was stated that emergency services at the airports should also be highlighted.

Supervisor Spring also requested a prioritization of GA Airports with strategies for protecting them, including easements and zoning. This should be directed at engaging new elected officials.

Supervisor Gioia stated that RAPC may want to request FAA funds for specific plans around key airports.

Supervisor Spring reiterated that jurisdictions should have front end consideration in such a process.

Mayor Bates stated that while the inventory suggested that such a prioritization of GA parcels was in order, this process had not yet occurred and asked RAPC staff for more information on how to evaluate the GA airports.

#### Public Comment

Howard Beckman reiterated that the Alternative Airports/Reliever Airports scenario should rely on community support for or against the expanded use of the airport.

### **7. Federal Airport Funding Reauthorization**

Vice Chair Chu introduced Robin Hunt, District Manager, FAA San Francisco Airports

Ms. Hunt updated the Committee on the current status of the Reauthorization.

Vice Chair Chu asked if the airports received any allocations for stimulus money?

Ms. Hunt informed the Committee that airports received 1.1 Billion in stimulus money. 75% of the funds have been distributed in grants and 25% has been allocated.

Vice Chair Chu asked how the FAA plans to fund the next generation of Air Traffic Control system?

Ms. Hunt commented that the future funding has been allocated more to the Corporate Jets more than to Next Gen. Future funding will probably be provided as before, from the trust fund. This will limit available funding.

### **8. New Business**

The next meeting of the Regional Airport Planning Committee will be held on October 23, 2009.

**9. Old Business**

**10. Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 11:45 a.m.