

Regional Airport Planning Committee Draft Meeting Minutes

9:30 A.M. – Noon
Friday, October 23, 2009
MetroCenter Auditorium
101 8th 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
Tom Bates
Roger Dickinson
Alice Fredericks
John Gioia
Leander Hauri
Mark Luce
Kristi McKenney
Elisha Novak
Sean Randolph
Jim Spering
John Bergener
Susan Palmeri

3. Approval of the meeting minutes of September 25, 2009

It was moved by Committee Member Roger Dickenson and seconded that the minutes be approved.

The minutes were approved as submitted.

4. Public Comment

5. Regional Airport System Planning Analysis (RASPA)

a. Proposed Alternative Airport and Reliever Airport Scenarios

Chris Brittle introduced the strategy of the recommendations from the analysis.

Joe LaClair discussed the regulatory context of the for the Alternative Airport analysis from BCDC's perspective.

David Hollander, SH&E made the presentation

How does this transfer to reduction of delays?

That will be the next step in the analysis.

Does it look like it will make much of a difference?

Mr. Hollander replied that the analysis indicates that potential development at these secondary airports could produce a 2% reduction in 2035 aircraft operations at SFO. While this would help a little, he wouldn't expect this type of reduction to come close to solving the airport's projected delay problem.

How accurate can the analysis be with the changes in transportation that will occur in the next 25 years?

Mr. Hollander agreed that there is a lot of uncertainty in the numbers. He stated that the analysis used Sonoma County, which currently has air service, as a guide for service development and likely capture rates at the other airports. Also, the analysis used ground access times from MTC to incorporate future ground congestions. Finally, projections of future trip generation were based on forecasts of population and income from ABAG.

What factors have been identified which would make the estimate too low or too high.

Mr. Hollander responded that he thought it would more likely be too high. He said that the estimates very much depend on the ability to get airlines to serve the secondary airports. He noted that over the past several years, airlines have contracted and pulled out of smaller airport markets. Another downside is that some of the destination airports, like Los Angeles International Airport and San Diego International Airport, will have their own capacity constraints. He said that the consultants intentionally tried to present a reasonable but optimistic scenario to assess what the potential of the secondary airports might be.

Committee Member Randolph asked if the estimate of the potential diversion factored in price.

Mr. Hollander responded noted that fare penalties at the secondary airports would limit their ability to attract passengers. He said that the analysis does implicitly incorporate price by basing secondary airport capture rates on actual experience at Sonoma County Airport. The maximum capture rate assumed is 60%, so the analysis

does not assume that the secondary airports capture all of the traffic generated in their core catchment areas. So, the assumptions allow for some use of the primary airports due to fare differentials.

Committee Member Hauri commented that even with BART extensions, congested drive time would be higher than the projections.

Mr. Hollander stated that the definition of the core catchment areas were based on MTC's 2035 AM peak drive times which reflect future ground congestion.

Vice Chair Chu asked if there was analysis performed considered the recapture of passengers from the Travis area that are currently using the Sacramento Airport?

Mr. Hollander agreed that Travis could potentially support more air services if it recaptured some of the locally generated passengers that are using Sacramento. He replied that the analysis did not specifically consider the recapture of passengers using Sacramento. He noted that the area between Travis and Sacramento is somewhat sparsely populated and produces a relatively small number of trips. He also said that the analysis presented was primarily focused on the potential impacts at the primary bay Area airports.

Committee Member Bergener commented that diverting demand is not really possible. There are proponents and opponents of airport development. He would like to make sure that the discussion about serving demand locally is framed correctly going forward.

Committee Member Novak asked if the consultants were aware that both Sonoma County and Moss Field are in the late stages of environmental review to extend the runways beyond the minimum requirement.

Yes, and those potential runway improvements were considered in the selection of airports.

Committee Member Gioia commented that diverting demand is a large part of this when the passengers are presented with more choices. He asked for Committee Member Bergener to clarify his comment.

Committee Member Bergener responded that the language "diverting" and "shifting" implies that we can force people to go to different airport locations and it's not the case.

Committee Member Luce asked if the analysis considered passengers from other markets visiting the North Bay area, specifically Sonoma and Napa counties?

Mr. Hollander replied that the analysis includes the Bay Area ground origin or destination of both residents and visitors to the area.

Committee Member Luce also asked if when referring to Travis Air Force Base is it assumed that it is no longer operated as an Air Force Base in the future?

Mr. Hollander said that the analysis assumes at least joint use of the Travis Air Force Base.

Committee Member Bates commented that, per Mr. Randolph's question, price and convenience would be a huge factor in deciding which airport to utilize. Mr. Bates also points out that when trying to get the airlines to use the secondary airports, he wonders what kind of reception there will be from the airlines to provide the kind of service that would be within the price and attractive enough at a time and frequency to be competitive.

Mr. Hollander said that if fares and/or services are not competitive with the primary airports, they secondary airports will not be able to attract passengers. He went onto say that the secondary airport analysis builds in the convenience factors in terms of airport access through the definition of core airport catchment areas with at least a 30-minute drive time advantage over the closest primary airport. He also noted that the analysis assumes similar services to what is available at Sonoma County Airport today. While there may be a slight fare penalty at Sonoma County today because of the economics of a 70-seat regional jet versus a 140-seat narrow body, under a future congested scenario there will likely be fare increases at the primary airports.

Committee Alternate Sue Palmeri asked how are you evaluating air space analysis with regard to approaches and the effect it might have on major airports if using some of the secondary airports?

Mr. Hollander responded that air space issues are not being analyzed in this study.

Ms. Palmeri brought to the Committee's attention that air space over Travis is so congested that they are now using Stockton airport for practice approaches.

McKenney commented that airlines will chose to serve an airport based on their economics. If they cannot make money, they will not serve an airport. Ms. McKenney would like to see the economic information added into the full report and what kind of fares would be needed for an airline to be profitable at these secondary airports.

Chris Brittle brought back the question about how the Committee goes about discussing the airports as they go out and talk about the scenario. If anyone has further advice it would be helpful. Mr. Brittle would like to get a reaction to the airports which have been chosen as a primary scenario.

Committee Member Spering commented that there are a lot of unanswered questions before saying this is a viable option.

Committee Member Gioia commented that it is important to understand what the local issues are as well as talking to the local communities about what the regional issues are.

Chris Brittle mentioned that they have misplaced the speaker cards for this morning, however, he is aware that there is 1 person who would like to speak to this issue. There is also now a quorum.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

David Lewis, Executive Director, Save the Bay

Mr. Lewis commented that the analysis is excellent. He would like to remind the Committee about the context and purpose for this work.

Chris Brittle commented that initially they thought there might be some role for an alternative cargo airport. They are not finding that need. This conclusion was supported by the Forecast Working Group as well.

Mr. Brittle also commented on the advice from the last meeting, related to the GA reliever airport scenario, that there are business jets that do need to fly into the San Francisco airport. In consideration of this comment, the GA reliever airport scenario has been redefined. The 2007 level of GA jet operations at SFO and OAK will be held constant over the forecast period. However, the projected growth in business GA at would be accommodated at the reliever airports in the GA reliever scenario. San Jose does not see the need for a GA reliever airport and will be assumed to accommodate all of the forecast GA jet growth in the GA reliever scenario.

Since they do not need Moffett as a reliever airport for San Jose, they looked at the Rising Sea Levels and the possibility of San Carlos, Palo Alto and possibly Reed-Hillview closing due to flooding, etc. Moffett came in as an option for operations to cover the closing of those airports.

They are asking for concurrence of the redefinition of Reliever Airports.

If the Committee would like them to talk about the Moffett option as they go out and talk to the public, they'd be receptive to that as well.

Committee Member Speering raised the point that with all of the corridor changes, expansion at the airports seem critical.

Mr. Brittle responded that this phase of the study is to look at the alternative options without adding runways in the bay. If they run out of alternatives, they will go back and look at the possibility of expansion.

b. Revised Target Analysis Approach

Chris Brittle introduced this as the second part of a Target Analysis to what they reported at the last meeting. A PowerPoint presentation was made.

6. New Business

The next meeting of the Regional Airport Planning Committee will be held on November 20, 2009.

7. Old Business

8. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 11:50 a.m.