

Monterey Regional Airport (MRY) Master Plan Study Meeting Summary

Meeting with: Planning Advisory Committee (PAC)

Meeting Date: November 18, 2014; 1:30 p.m.

Location: Airport District Board Room

Notes By: Chris Eberhard, CommuniQuest

Summary

The Monterey Regional Airport (MRY) Master Plan's Planning Advisory Committee (PAC) met for the fourth time on Tuesday November 18, 2014. Tom Greer, Airport General Manager, started the meeting by welcoming everyone and then introduced Shelley Glennon, Planning Manager and the Master Plan project manager, and Chris Morello, Grants Manager for the Airport District. He then asked Christine Eberhard from CommuniQuest to facilitate the meeting.

Ms. Eberhard reminded the PAC members about the ground rules that had been established at the first PAC meeting and that she is recording the meeting to help her in preparing the meeting summary notes. Ms. Eberhard thanked those PAC members that have already submitted comments and reiterated that all comments/suggestions are considered by the project team and where appropriate updates will be included in subsequent draft chapters. Formal written replies to each comment or suggestion are not part of the master plan process.

Ms. Eberhard also mentioned that there would be a public workshop the same evening from 5:30 p.m. to 7 p.m. with a brief presentation at 6 p.m. The public workshop has been advertised in the local media.

With that, Ms. Eberhard asked PAC members to introduce themselves and the organization they represent. After introductions, Ms. Eberhard turned the meeting over to Jim Harris, President of Coffman Associates.

Review of the Master Plan Process

Mr. Harris reviewed the agenda for this meeting and indicated that two draft Master Plan Chapters would be reviewed – the Airport Development Alternatives chapter and the Environmental Inventory chapter. He also distributed the Summary notes from the July meeting, and copies of “Topical Questions.” Mr. Harris said that Coffman Associates wanted to provide the questions and answers because several of the questions had been asked several times at past meetings and also there were a number of questions asked that were not really related to an Airport Master Plan but were of interest to the PAC.

Mr. Harris began his presentation (available on the project website) by discussing the study process, reminding members that the Airport works in partnership with the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) and that FAA is funding a majority of the project costs. He also reminded the group that the FAA reviews and approves only two parts of the Master Plan – the Forecast and the Airport Layout Plan (ALP). He also reminded members that the Master Plan is a demand-based plan, meaning that many of the project recommendations that result from this master planning effort would be triggered based on certain demand indicators.

As Mr. Harris reviewed the project schedule (available on the project website), he said that the next meeting will probably be in February 2015 (changed to March 10, 2015) and will be a very important meeting since it will be a presentation of the Recommended Alternative chapter. He asked that comments for the chapters discussed today be sent to Coffman Associates within about two weeks. Mr. Harris asked Ms. Eberhard to provide details about the public outreach process, which she did.

Presentations of Airport Development Alternatives Chapters

Patrick Taylor of Coffman Associates provided a presentation on the draft Airport Development Alternatives Chapter (again available as part of the study material, draft chapters, and on the PowerPoint presentation on the project website). He encourage feedback and said that today’s discussion would be helpful to Coffman Associates as they further refine the Alternatives and work toward the Recommended Airport Alternative. His presentation included information on the planning considerations that Coffman Associates took into account when evaluating the various alternatives. He

reviewed the issues associated with the Runway Design Standards discussed at the last PAC meeting.

Mr. Taylor provided an overview of the draft Terminal Expansion options as well as options for replacement of the Terminal Building. After each of these options, Ms. Eberhard asked PAC members for input. Mr. Taylor then discussed the North Side General Aviation Development options and there was another roundtable discussion on these options. Mr. Taylor completed his presentation with information on the North Side Access options. Ms. Eberhard led a fourth roundtable discussion for input on these access options.

Judi Krauss of Coffman Associates provided a presentation on the Summary of Environmental Inventory (available on the project website), which will be Appendix B. She discussed regional characteristics, on Airport resources and protected farmland. She also provided information on existing habitat on the Airport, special status species occurrences, and existing mitigation areas.

Following the presentations, Mr. Harris reminded the PAC that a public workshop would be held the same evening after the Planning Advisory Committee (PAC) meeting. Ms. Eberhard encouraged PAC members to attend these public meetings and also to notify their organization's constituents or other interested individuals or organizations.

The group discussed the next meeting date for the PAC and tentatively set for February (the final date the date of March 10, 2014 at 1:30 p.m. followed by a public workshop that evening in the Airport District Board room. Mr. Harris said that members would have about two weeks after the meeting to get any comments back to Coffman Associates. Mr. Harris reminded everyone that Coffman Associates takes comments received and incorporates changes as appropriate into the draft final document, but they do not issue a new draft chapter.

Mr. Harris then turned the meeting back over to Ms. Eberhard who led a group roundtable discussion of additional questions and comments. The PAC meeting ended at 4 p.m.

Advisory Committee Member Comments/Issues Raised:

*A PAC member asked what is the vision statement that is referred to in the planning documents for the Airport? *{The Airport District's "Mission Statement, Vision Statement and Core Values" was handed out to each member during the meeting as a result of this question.}*

* Are all those alternatives also in the next phase or are some thrown out? *{Right now we are considering all the options and evaluating primarily based on the design standards. It is too early to tell because this is the point when we would like your ideas about these and then we will evaluate more carefully; most likely it will be part of one alternative combined with elements from another alternative.}*

* A member asked about the waivers that are in place and how often are they reviewed? *{They are not specifically reviewed but they are part of the annual FAA Part 139 Inspection and they are reviewed as part of that inspection. From time to time the FAA will provide additional recommendations.}*

* A member asked if any new construction impacts these waivers? *{The Airport tries to meet standards as much as possible, particularly with new projects; but if it cannot, there is an FAA process and it must prove that it is still safe.}*

* A member asked if at one time the Airport was in compliance? *{Yes, over time the Airport has grown and also over time FAA has enhanced the standards and increased regulations. Many airports have non-standard issues.}*

* A member asked if the Airport is penalized if we don't meet standards? *{The FAA evaluates each waiver based on due diligence and "practicability."}*

* A member asked about the east end, it says 327 and 327.5 is needed? For .5 feet can't you just line it out? Do you really need it? Quibbling about .5 foot? *{In reality you are correct and that may be exactly what happens.}*

*A PAC member stated that if taxiway Echo is eliminated it will destroy the flow of traffic. *{We understand that it is important and convenient for pilots; the problem is it does not meet FAA design standards. It is not designed as a high-speed exit. Other options that meet design standards and achieve the same convenience can be considered.}*

* A member suggested maybe instead of a 90-degree make it a 45-degree exit and move it to the left. *{The problem may still exist even with the change suggested.}*

* A member commented that the tradeoff of convenience for safety isn't a good one.

* A member commented that in some options there are jet bridges and in some options there are no bridges, is that correct? *{Yes, that is correct.}*

- * A member asked if it is correct that there would be an 800 foot walk with re-use of the existing terminal and commented that this would be a very long walk. *{Yes it would be 800 feet and yes that would not be ideal or efficient.}*
- * A PAC member stated that many times it is more effective and efficient to tear down an older building than try to bring it up to code e.g. ADA compliance. It is barely functional as it is.
- * A member commented on the use of tugs and bridges; there are maintenance and cost associated with these facilities.
- * A PAC member asked if any of the Terminal options would require any interruption of service? *{All efforts would be made to limit any disruption of service. Building a new terminal building in a new location would likely be least impactful on continuing service as the current facility could still be used.}*
- * A member said the terminal is dated; the electrical and other aspects are so dated that it would be very costly to bring up to code.
- * A PAC member stated that the general aviation relocation would be an issue. *{This would require the displacement and relocation of the GA facilities.}*
- * A member followed the previous comment with the point that sequencing of new facilities would be important as any relocation was made. *{Correct. There will be a phasing plan over the 20 years of the Master Plan as any elements are implemented and to accommodate any moves necessary.}*
- * A PAC member asked if the consultants have talked with CalTrans yet about the access to Highway 68 options? *{No. However, Caltrans likely position on certain access options is considered when selecting a preferred alternative.}*
- * A member commented that parking will certainly be an issue and asked if the goal is 1200 not 1209? Concern that we don't want to lose parking. *{The plan is to provide enough parking to meet the forecast long term need which is approximately 1,200 spaces.}*
- * A PAC member said that he likes option 5L because can add onto either end for a "wing".
- * A PAC member mentioned the importance of keeping the view of the Bay from the Terminal, and particularly any Airport restaurant.
- * A PAC member asked if the new B737 and MD80s could fit with the design options? *{Yes.}*
- * A PAC member commented on 5N there is a loop that is a service road and that we need a service road and loading dock and wondered if it is feasible for freight and

cargo? *{There is a need for a loading dock which is separated from regular airport traffic, if possible.}*

* A member commented that Americans don't deal well with roundabouts and it would be best to avoid having one.

* A PAC member said there could be a concern with the North side option with crossing the general aviation runway and objections from neighbors in Del Rey Oaks. *{True, having commercial airlines cross the GA runway to get to and from the primary runway is potentially confusing and should be avoided, if possible.}*

* A PAC member asked about the costs associated with each design option? *{Coffman Associates said that is considered in the next steps.}*

* A member asked what does the FAA think about tunnels under runways? *{When it makes sense, the FAA does support tunneling under runways such as at LAX, EKO}*

* A member stated that relocating the terminal away from general aviation facilities is positive for security to keep GA away from the commercial aircraft activity but that keeping the terminal on the south side makes most sense because it already has the services like fueling.

* A PAC member said that offloading passengers from both ends of the aircraft is great – like a few airports do.

* A PAC member said that while they like the tunnel option it seems like the cost of maintaining the tunnel would fall to the Airport District and could be prohibitive.

* A PAC member asked about what appears to be long taxilanes leading to hangars on the north side options. *{As shown is about the longest we would recommend. The plan is intended to maximize the available land area.}*

* A PAC member asked if between 28L and 28R is that a run-up area? I hadn't noticed it before. *{No it is not an official run-up area.}*

* A member stated that it would be important to have GA parking near the new terminal and near the restaurant. *{This is challenging at commercial service airports because of the need for secure areas. Most airport will try to separate this activity.}*

* A member commented that whatever option is selected, noise will need to be considered as well as other issues from the neighbors.

* A member commented that whichever option is chosen, it will be best to stay on the airport with the access road and that the north side will have grade issues.

* A member commented that coming up Casanova is problematic, at very end of Casanova is County jurisdiction and there is Section 8 housing.

* A PAC member commented that there is undeveloped land that goes downhill into Del Rey Oaks that might be considered for an access road.

- * Comment that drainage is an issue in that area.
- * A PAC member asked if there is a way to get around the end of the west end? *{No there is not enough room for a public road}*
- * A member asked if the old Navy hangars are historic? The area is pretty unsightly. *{No, none of the hangars are considered historic, even though some were built as early as the 1940s (see Appendix B)}*
- * In the bottom left hand corner of airport, there are a lot of empty hangars.
- * A member commented that non-aviation use of certain GA is very important revenue source. *{The FAA position is that hangars should be reserved for aviation uses first.}*
- * Several members suggested that access should be considered first, it all boils down to access to the North side, and then build out probably off 218.
- * A member commented that if there isn't that much traffic, why not use a commercial street that already exists.
- * One PAC member said they like option #1.
- * One member said it makes most sense to purchase property.
- * A member commented that it is politically best to stay on the south side of the Airport and have access from Highway 68.
- * One member is concerned about chunks of concrete in a gully on the north side that were disposed of from the last Airport project and impacts water flow.

Action Items:

The Committee will receive draft working papers (and they will be available on the project website) prior to the next meeting, scheduled for Tuesday, March 10, 2015 at 1:30 p.m. in the District Board room.

#