

Monterey Regional Airport (MRY) Master Plan Study Meeting Summary

Meeting with: Planning Advisory Committee (PAC)

Meeting Date: July 7, 2015; 1:30 p.m.

Location: Airport District Board Room

Notes By: Chris Eberhard, CommuniQuest

Summary

The MRY Master Plan's Planning Advisory Committee (PAC) met for the sixth and final PAC meeting on Tuesday, July 7, 2015.

Christine Eberhard, CommuniQuest, began the meeting by going around the room for introductions. She reminded the PAC members about the ground rules that had been established at the first meeting. She also reminded PAC members that the meeting was being recorded to help her in preparing the meeting summary.

Review of the Master Plan Process

Jim Harris reviewed the study process (available on the project website) including key issues driving the Master Plan including elements as to, "Why a Replacement Terminal."

Mr. Harris reviewed the project schedule (available on the project website), indicating that the consultants are about halfway through the study process. He reminded the PAC that the Master Plan will require environmental review based on CEQA prior to adoption by the Airport District.

He reviewed the agenda for this meeting which included review of: the Recommended Development Alternative and the Capital Improvement Plan, as well as new material regarding the Airport Layout Plan (ALP), the Environmental Overview (Part 2) and the Sustainability Management Plan. Mr. Harris thanked PAC members for their comments on the Draft Recommended Development Alternative, noting that several changes to the Final Recommended Development Alternative, particularly on the north side where *consideration was given to planning for an extension of Taxiway B to the Runway 28L threshold*, were adopted because of their comments.

Following his presentation, Ms. Eberhard asked each member of the PAC to provide any additional questions or comments (provided in the Issues and Comments section below).

Summary of Environmental Evaluation

Judi Krauss, Coffman Associates provided an overview of Appendix B, Part 2, the Summary of Environmental Evaluation (available on the website). As part of her presentation Ms. Krauss reviewed the Environmental Regulations Affecting the Airport Master Plan Process and explained the differences between the NEPA and CEQA studies. She noted that Appendix B of the Draft Final Airport Master Plan focuses on NEPA resource categories because it is an FAA-funded study, but that additional environmental analysis within CEQA will also occur before the MPAD Board will take discretionary approval action on the proposed Airport Master Plan.

Ms. Krauss reviewed the NEPA Environmental Impacts that will be studied, the On-Airport Land Use Plan, and MRY Biological Resources. She also provided slides and information regarding the Special Status Species Occurrences at different locations on the Airport's property.

She finished her presentation with a slide regarding next steps in the process and initial NEPA documentation. She said that the MPAD Board is likely to direct staff to prepare an Initial study on the board-recommended Airport Master Plan alternative as the defined project for purposes of CEQA.

Following her presentation, Ms. Eberhard asked each member of the PAC to provide any additional questions or comments (provided in the Issues and Comments section below).

Sustainability Plan Part 2: Sustainability Management Plan

Eric Pfeifer of Coffman Associates then presented a brief overview Appendix D, Part 2, Sustainability Management Plan (available on the website).

As part of the Sustainability Management Plan, Mr. Pfeifer reviewed the Sustainability Performance Targets and the Objective Evaluation including the evaluation criteria and funding sources for the District to use to determine what is feasible to implement and evaluate sustainability performance.

Following his presentation, Ms. Eberhard asked each member of the PAC to provide any additional questions or comments (provided in the Issues and Comments section below).

Next Steps and Final Discussion

Mr. Harris reminded the group that this was the last meeting of the PAC but that the overall Master Plan process will continue through the required environmental process. He reviewed next steps including District Board actions required. He said that they expect to have District action on the CEQA Initial Study (IS) (if the

Board approves moving forward with the IS at the August 12, 2015 Board meeting) in the Fall of 2015. He said that they anticipate the District could potentially adopt the Final Airport Master Plan in the Spring of 2017. He encouraged PAC members to continue to use the project website to stay up to date regarding the study as it moves forward.

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.

He said that members would have until July 21, 2015 to get any comments on the draft material presented at this meeting back to Coffman Associates. Mr. Harris reminded everyone that Coffman Associates takes comments received and incorporates changes as appropriate, but they do not issue a new draft, nor do they respond to comments received.

Mr. Harris then turned the meeting over to Ms. Eberhard who led a final group roundtable discussion of additional questions and comments and asked for any public comments.

Mark Bautista, Deputy General Manager, Planning and Development, thanked each PAC member for their time and attendance at the six meetings. He said that the Committee's comments and feedback on the draft material was critical to the success of the project. Mr. Harris and Ms. Eberhard echoed his thank you to PAC members. Numerous PAC members thanked District staff and Coffman Associates for the well-done study materials and presentations, indicating that they think the Recommended Development Alternative is in keeping with their comments. The PAC meeting ended at 4 p.m.

Advisory Committee Member Comments/Issues Raised:

* A PAC member asked if the taxiway is shifted 52 feet, does that establish the required 400 feet of separation? *{No, we have evaluated and discussed this with the FAA. The agreed upon solution is moving it 327.5 feet, the same as the east end. This will require FAA approval in a "Modification to Standard."}*

* A PAC member asked if the reduction in schedule flights is indicative of a reduction in growth and how does MRY compare with other communities? And is general aviation in the same predicament? *{Most all communities with airports similar to MRY have experienced similar issues. The airlines are transitioning to larger aircraft but the markets have adjusted and seem to be stabilizing. As far as general aviation., it is broken into two categories in the study – private ownership is down across the country, not just at MRY, but corporate aviation is picking up and is still seeing growth, here and elsewhere.}*

- * A PAC member noted that he thinks there is dissatisfaction with the Airport due to the reduction of flight services
- * A PAC member asked if the FAA has approved the Forecast? *{Yes; The FAA has approved the Forecast portion of the Airport Master Plan}*
- * A PAC member asked if with the new entrance would there be a new stoplight? *{No probably not.}*
- * A PAC member asked if the public would have opportunities to have comments on any development? *{Any proposed development will need to go through Board approval and there are opportunities for comment and also any proposed development would have to go through an environmental process.}*
- * A PAC member asked what the reason for Airport development is – is it to gain revenue? *{While that is one reason, airport development is also in response to demand and meeting current FAA design standards}*
- * A PAC member asked whether the plan includes a perimeter fence and would there be a perimeter roadway? *{There will be improvements to the perimeter fence, but not to the perimeter roadway.}*
- * A PAC member said he is concerned with the sequencing of the general aviation hangers scheduled for 2019/2020 to the north side. He asked that the District not force general aviation to relocate until the terminal is for certain going to be built. He also said he is concerned if there is enough space planned for future general aviation growth.
- * A PAC member commented that an option previously mentioned would be for general aviation aircraft to move its operations to Marina Airport, especially during special events.
- * A PAC member asked about cost estimate #20 and which of the three options for North side access was used to determine the cost estimate? *{Coffman Associates used the most expensive of the cost estimates.}*
- * A PAC member stated that when the old Terminal is torn down, the area should be used for aviation; it is an important area for aviation use.
- * A PAC member said that the adjacent easement still needs to be two acres. *{The Airport is currently working with the Navy on adjustments to the existing aviation easements over their property.}*
- * A PAC member said that regarding to access to the North side, the community is reluctant and that general aviation could be cut off from airlines, a restaurant and other services that are of value to general aviation.

* A PAC member noted there are water runoff problems and traffic associated with the Airport but that the Airport does not share in the costs of these impacts.

* A PAC member said that the recommended development is going to be very costly.

* A PAC member commented that growth needs to be paid for (Economic Development is key)... we should not forget the projections.

* A PAC member thanked Coffman Associates for a good study.

* A PAC member said that the Airport needs embarkments and tourism is needed and that the study has provided the necessary information thanks to Coffman Associates. He said "what do tourists want?" they want modern facility with good access and reasonable fares.

* A PAC member asked if the environmental process includes local neighbors? {Yes it does}.

* A PAC member mentioned that we should have a commentary at the end of the chapters for the issues discussed during the PAC Meetings (for transparency of government). *{The PAC Summary Notes does accomplish this and is available on our website for the public to review}*

*A PAC member commented that this is a very ambitious project...very, "pie in the sky."

* A PAC member asked if the wells are for use on the north side? {No, right now staff is studying the wells to see if the water can be used for non-potable uses}.

* A PAC member asked if the sustainability information will be posted on the project website? {Yes, it will be posted along with the other study materials}.

*A number of PAC members commented they appreciate the expertise and professionalism that went into this Draft Final AMP

* A number of PAC members complimented Coffman Associates on the Airport Master Plan study and gave the team a round of applause.

Public Comments

Included in the PAC meeting agenda was a time for Public Comments. There were a few individuals from the public that attended the PAC Meeting and sat down and listened in to the PAC discussions. During the public comment period, the following was stated:

* Member of the public stated that the Airport needs full access and that consolidating the access points is good but that it is too close to the other intersection at Olmstead. He also said he likes the loop but suggest a full loop would be best option. He said his agency would be willing to consider giving wider access to Olmstead or that the access road near Tarpys could be an option with an adjacent auxiliary lane.

Action Items:

Mr. Harris requested PAC members to review the draft document materials and provide comments back to Coffman Associates by July 21, 2015. He also noted that the summary notes from this PAC meeting will be distributed to the PAC members and posted on the website as soon as they are available.

#