

## **Monterey Regional Airport (MRY) Master Plan Study Meeting Summary**

**Meeting with:** Planning Advisory Committee (PAC)

**Meeting Date:** July 8, 2014; 2 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 third time on Tuesday July 8, 2014. Tom Greer, Airport General Manager, started the meeting by welcoming everyone and then introduced 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 three draft Master Plan Chapters would be reviewed – the Demand/Capacity Analysis chapter, the Facility Requirements chapter and the Land Use Compatibility appendix. He also mentioned that the draft Forecast chapter presented at the last PAC meeting had been revised based on the discussion and comments received after the last PAC meeting.

Mr. Harris began his presentation (available on the project website) by discussing the study process, noting that the Airport works in partnership with the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) and that FAA is funding a majority of the project cost. He 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 be in November 2014 (tentatively November 18<sup>th</sup>) and will be a very important meeting since it will be a presentation of the draft Alternatives chapter. He asked that comments for the chapters discussed today be in to Coffman Associates within about two weeks. He asked Ms. Eberhard to provide details about the public outreach process which she did.

### **Presentations of Draft Master Plan Chapters**

Steve Wagner of Coffman Associates discussed the revisions made to the draft Forecast chapter that was then submitted to the FAA. Mr. Wagner then provided a presentation on the draft Demand/Capacity Analysis chapter (again available as part of the study material, draft chapters, and on the PowerPoint presentation on the project website). His presentation included information on airfield capacity factors, airfield demand versus capacity, terminal gate occupancy, and terminal building capacities and requirements. He also noted that one potential issue with the terminal building is not the number of gates at MRY, but rather that airlines are purchasing larger aircraft which could further constrain the terminal apron.

Patrick Taylor of Coffman Associates provided an overview of the draft Facility Requirements chapter (available on the website). This included information on the runway design standards, safety areas, taxiway areas of concern, airside requirements, and general aviation and support requirements.

Dave Fitz of Coffman Associates provided a presentation on the Airport Land Use Compatibility Analysis. He explained what an ALUCP is, what its purpose is, and what the components of an ALUCP are (available on the website). He also talked about who prepares, adopts and implements the ALUCP and noted that Monterey County is the responsible agency through their Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC).

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 the date of November 18, 2014 at 2 p.m. ( which has been changed to start 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 why the 1992 Master Plan had not been put on the airport website as agreed to at the April 15, 2014 PAC meeting. *{The discussion at the April 15, 2014 meeting was to not put the 1992 Master Plan on the website because it would likely confuse people since it is over 22 years old and has little value to this Master Planning effort especially since the Airport Layout Plan has been updated several times since then (most recently in July 2014). An offer was made to provide any PAC member with a hard copy of the 1992 Master Plan. The PAC member was provided with a hard copy at the beginning of this PAC meeting. (Subsequent to the PAC meeting, the 1992 Master Plan has been placed on the Airport website under the “About Monterey” tab.)}*

\*A PAC member asked to what extent the current terminal building can be used into the future and will its capacity be exceeded. *{The terminal building analysis indicates that certain functional areas are already at capacity, such as the hold rooms and the TSA screening areas. In terms of total area, by the long term a total of approximately 92,000 square feet is forecast to be needed (current is approximately 69,000 sf). The alternatives chapter will examine meeting the forecast terminal building needs.}*

\* Is the existing ramp adequate with the existing fleet mix? *{The total gross size is adequate but there is not enough depth. Essentially the existing commercial ramp is too narrow. This will only become more of an issue as regional airlines continue to transition to larger aircraft.}*

\* A member asked if the design requirements discussed are new FAA standards. The member wanted to know if the Airport was “legal” in regards to design standards. *{It was stressed that the airport is not “illegal”. The design standards are regulatory requirements and they do change periodically. When it is not feasible for an airport to fully meet a design requirement other options may be available which will be covered in the alternatives chapter.}*

\* A PAC member indicated that they did not think the discussion of the level of service on Highway 68 was accurate. *{The discussion in the draft chapter is a summary of the traffic study prepared for the EIR related to the Runway Safety Area project. The PAC member was invited to provide any additional information}*

*or sources. A new traffic study will be required as part of the CEQA documentation for the Master Plan.}*

\* A PAC member stated that the draft chapter indicates that the Airport can't accommodate simultaneous operations and wanted to know if that might change with advancements in technology. *{At a separation distance of 500 feet between the two runways technically cannot support simultaneous operations (700' is needed as a minimum). The standards could change in the future but there is no indication of that from the FAA currently.}*

\*A PAC member stated that the location of several hold lines are an issue and they would like to incorporate a solution in this Master Plan Study to resolve this issue. *{The issue is that the hold lines south of the runway on Taxiways F, G, J, and K are located within the RSA. The alternatives chapter of the Master Plan will present potential solutions.}*

\* A PAC member asked about the possibility of an adding an ILS approach to Runway 28L. *{It has not been considered by the FAA to date due to terrain east of the runway. There are advances including curved approaches which might be a possibility in the future.}*

\* A PAC member asked about the possibility of installing a camera so that tower personnel can see those areas that are not visible from the tower. *{This is currently being studied at LAX but has not yet been determined to be feasible. Another possible resolution to tower line-of-sight issues is to relocate or raise the tower.}*

\* A PAC member asked if any documents from other agencies include impacts on areas adjacent to the Airport and have those recommendations been considered in this Master Plan? *{Studies by other agencies are considered in the Master Planning process. In addition, a CEQA evaluation will be conducted on the draft Master Plan.}*

\* A PAC member asked if there will be a land use inventory, especially of uses on the other (north) side of the Airport. Will you look at permitted or prohibited uses? *{Current land uses of the Airport are discussed in the Inventory chapter. An overall on-airport land use drawing will be included as part of the Master Plan once a recommended development concept is determined. Per FAA guidelines, airport land is to be used for aviation purposes. If there is airport land that is not needed for aviation purposes now or in the future then the FAA can approve compatible non-aeronautical uses that enhance revenue for the airport.}*

\* A PAC member asked if adjacent jurisdictions and neighborhoods will have an

opportunity to comment on discretionary land uses on the Airport. *{Development of Airport property is discussed at MPAD Board meetings and the public can make comments and voice concerns.}*

\* A PAC member wondered whether or not a more participatory role in determining certain allowable land uses was available, especially uses that potentially impact airport neighbors. They wondered if the Airport had zoning regulations similar to a City where some land uses are restricted. *{As a federally obligated facility, the Airport property is first to be used for aviation purposes. If current and future aviation needs can be met, then excess property may be used for compatible non-aviation revenue support functions. The Airport Land Use drawing included within the Airport Layout Plan set identifies any excess property that could be used for revenue support. The FAA provides guidance on what is compatible with airport activity and what is not. MPAD is an independent district governed by an elected Board of Directors (BOD), the members of which represent the areas neighboring the Airport. Following FAA guidance, BOD makes the final determination if any particular land use is allowable. Airport staff and management desire to work with neighboring jurisdictions for the economic betterment of the region. The best method to participate in land use decisions of the Airport is to provide comments to the BOD at the regular open public meetings.}*

\* A PAC member requested a list of current uses on the Airport and the water uses for each of those uses. *{Coffman Associates is in the process of gathering water usage information which will be included in the Sustainability chapter. Water usage data by individual tenants is limited because there are only a few water meters for the whole Airport. In addition many Airport tenants do not have a water connection.}*

\* A PAC member commented that an airport like this (special district) isn't any different from an adjacent city, where the other agency doesn't have control but wants to have control. *{The Airport is an independent district; however, the Airport staff and management desire to work with neighboring jurisdictions.}*

\* A PAC member said they have a concern that the future plan for the Airport could result in the runway someday being considered too close to Del Rey Oaks thus putting the runway in jeopardy. *{The Master Plan and the associated Airport Land Use Compatibility Analysis will include recommendations to protect the airport from encroachment based on current FAA design standards.}*

\* A PAC member suggested that maybe the City of Monterey could have a better working relationship with the Airport, like they have with the Naval Post Graduate

School. *{The Airport supports a good working relationship with all neighbors.}*

\* A PAC member stated that any new lease or new land use has a hearing, it is on the Board agenda and is brought before the MPAD Board and there is an opportunity for the public to comment on the lease and the conditions of use. *{As a point of clarification, there is no hearing but leases of more than 5 years have to be approved by the BOD, and during the BOD review is an opportunity for public comment on the lease and conditions of use.}*

\* A PAC member asked if there is a list of prohibited uses of airport land. *{The Airport follows guidance provided by the FAA Order 5190.6B, FAA Airport Compliance Manual.}*

\* Will the Master Plan be discussing a noise curfew? *{No. Solutions to noise issues are typically analyzed in an FAA Part 150 Study which is not part of the Master Plan. However, noise contours will be developed based on the recommended development concept and any areas within the 65 CNEL will be identified and also evaluated as part of the CEQA documentation for the Master Plan.}*

\* Is a Noise Compatibility Plan (Part 150) Study part of the Master Plan? *{No it is not part of the Master Plan. It is a separate study.}*

\* Will District boundaries be examined for possible expansion in order to increase passenger demand? *{No. That is not part of an airport master plan study. Consideration of expanding the district boundaries is a State of California legislative action that could be initiated by the MPAD Board. Expanding District boundaries would have no effect on increasing the area that passengers will likely come to use the Airport.}*

\* A PAC member asked if Guidance Ordinance 308, from December 1979, is still effective? *{Ordinance No. 308 is on the books and deals specifically with a proposed Airport curfew. The FAA's position is that this curfew can only be a voluntary measure as Federal regulations supersede local ordinances.}*

\* A PAC member asked if it is possible to develop a summary sheet with conclusions regarding recommendations for Alternatives. *{Yes, that will be presented as part of the alternatives evaluation.}*

\* A PAC member asked about future north side access. *{It will be part of the Alternatives discussion at the next meeting and in the draft materials distributed before the meeting.}*

**Action Items:**

The Committee will receive draft working papers prior to the next meeting, scheduled for Tuesday, November 18, 2014 at 1:30 p.m. in the District Board room.

# # #