

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

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

**Meeting Date:** March 10, 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 fifth PAC meeting on Tuesday, March 10, 2015. Tom Greer, Airport General Manager, started the meeting by welcoming everyone. Mr. Greer then introduced Christine Eberhard from CommuniQuest.

Ms. Eberhard 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**

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. He also indicated that while the FAA does not approve the overall study, they do review and approve the forecast portion of the study as well as the Airport Layout Plan (ALP).

As Mr. Harris reviewed the project schedule (available on the project website), he said that the next meeting will be in early summer, probably near the end of June or July 2015 and will cover three key areas: FAA Drawings (Airport Layout Plans), environmental overview and the sustainability element of the master plan. He also reminded the PAC that the master plan would require environmental review based on CEQA prior to adoption by the Airport District.

He reviewed the agenda for this meeting which included the following: the Recommended Development Alternative, the Capital Improvement Plan, Sustainability Baseline Assessment (Appendix D) and Land Use Compatibility Analysis (Section 4 - Appendix F).

Patrick Taylor, Coffman Associates provided an overview of the draft Recommended Development Alternative chapter (available on the website). As part of his presentation Mr. Taylor reviewed the Airside Recommendations, the Terminal Recommendations, explained "Why a Replacement Terminal" and "Why Not Other Options?" to answer likely questions about how Coffman

Associates narrowed down the various options to the selected draft Recommended Alternative. He then reviewed On-Airport Land Use and Landside Recommendations.

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).

Mr. Taylor then presented a brief overview of the Project Phasing/ACIP. Mr. Taylor then provided a presentation on the Capital Improvement Plan (available on the website).

Next, Dr. Lee McPheters from Arizona State University provided a presentation on the draft Economic Benefit Study, Appendix G. (again available as part of the study material, draft chapters and appendices, and on the PowerPoint presentation on the project website).

Mr. Eric Pfeifer of Coffman Associates provided a presentation on the draft Sustainability Baseline Assessment (Appendix D). His presentation included a Greenhouse Gas Emissions Inventory, Energy, Waste Management and Recycling opportunities and performance, Ground Access and Transportation opportunities and performance, Water Quality, Noise and next steps in the sustainability analysis.

Mr. Dave Fitz of Coffman Associates provided a brief presentation on the Airport Land Use Compatibility Analysis (Policies and Criteria) in Appendix F, Section Four. Mr. Fitz reviewed the policy recommendations of the 2011 CALTRANS Land Use Compatibility Handbook. Next he reviewed the MRY Noise Exposure Contours, the MRY Compatibility Factors Map, the Safety Zones at MRY, and the MRY Part 77 airspace maps.

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.

Mr. Harris reminded the group that the last meeting of the PAC will be held this summer sometime between late June and early July 2015. He said that as soon as a date has been confirmed they will send an email to all the PAC members.

He said that members would have until March 24<sup>th</sup> 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. However, all comments are filed and

documented and can be used for future reference.

Mr. Harris then turned the meeting 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 noted that the red and yellow lines seem to be right through Del Monte Aviation *{Due to the need to shift Taxiway A to a uniform distance from the runway, a portion of the Del Monte Aviation apron leasehold (approximately 50 feet) would be required. It is anticipated that aircraft would be parked further to the east and west. }*

\* A PAC member asked if there is any new material that is going to be presented after this meeting? *{Yes, Airport Layout Plans, Environmental Overview, Sustainability & Draft Final Revisions}*

\* A PAC member noted that there is an issue of how to taxi from the north area to 28L. Will the northeast GA area be accessible to the large runway? *{It is expected that small GA will use the short runway. Consideration will be given to planning for an extension of Taxiway B to the Runway 28L threshold}*

\* A PAC member asked if the 2<sup>nd</sup> level boarding improvement is a major cost? I'm concerned about operation costs increasing in the long run. Realistically, do we have enough operations to maintain these costs? *{There are costs associated with second level boarding such as aircraft tugs, and airport staff; however, it was emphasized that modern airports of the size of MRY should have second level boarding.}*

\* A PAC member asked if there can be an analysis on the costs of having 2<sup>nd</sup> story boarding vs. ground level boarding? *{Such an in-depth analysis would be a special study of the overall airport finances and is typically undertaken outside the Master Plan}*

\* A PAC member said that the 2<sup>nd</sup> story boarding is important for ADA compliance and overall passenger convenience. This recommendation is preferred. *{We can look into using a combination of 2<sup>nd</sup> level and ground level boarding}*

\* A PAC member noted that they would like to see the traffic study to get a better understanding of the intersection at the new access points...This would be looked at during the CEQA Process? *{Yes that is correct, it will be analyzed as part of the environmental process.}*

\* A PAC member noted that they are supportive of consolidating access points on Highway 68 into one access point. My concern is the parking lots against the scenic highway and the traffic that the new terminal complex will produce.

- \* A PAC member said that the Airport currently operates hangars in three different locations. I think having hangars in different locations is highly desirable.
- \* A PAC member commented that reducing traffic on Casanova (neighborhood streets to the north of the airport) should be considered when drafting land uses in this area.
- \* A PAC member noted Northside Access Options 3 and 4 are a “no go”. The member’s agency will only consider access off the 68 Highway. We prefer the Highway 68 access option.
- \* A PAC member asked what would happen with the old terminal? *{It would be removed to be able to use that area}*
- \* A PAC member noted that the Navy is currently working with the Airport on adjustments to the existing aviation easements over their property. *{One graphic seemed to indicate that a new easement was needed west of the runway, so the graphic will be adjusted for inclusion in the next printing.}*
- \* A PAC member asked what the \$4.50 PFC charges go for? *{The PFC charges go to specific capital projects that are approved by the FAA}*
- \* A PAC member noted the recommended terminal complex location is a good place to have it, however, would like to see the traffic study for this project.
- \* A PAC member noted from a tourism industry perspective, 2<sup>nd</sup> story boarding is preferred, so that the Airport is seen as a modern and convenient airport.
- \* A PAC member said that the consultants have done a really good job
- \* A PAC member said that especially with all the push pulls, the project is at an excellent spot to go forward with the recommendations.
- \* A PAC member indicated that the recommended option reflects the PAC meetings and seems to be a good solution.
- \* A PAC member stated that given all the challenges for a solution, the option selected is straight up and going in the right direction.
- \* A PAC member noted that the whole process has been good and will be interested in surface parking solutions.
- \* A PAC member recommends protecting hangar leasees from being priced out of the Airport when relocating.

\* A PAC member asked if the Economic Benefit include operational expenses? If not, it should. *{It does not. The Economic Benefit study follows FAA guidelines so that the evaluation of the economic benefit of airports can be comparable.}*

\* A PAC member asked if the Economic Benefit include construction costs? *{It does not.}*

\* A PAC member asked what the Jet Center needs 3.4 million gallons of water for? *{The numbers are based on Cal-am water data we received...however we will look into it to ensure accuracy and revise it if necessary}*

\*A PAC member asked what the FBOs use water for? *{Aircraft cleaning and re-stock of potable water as well as typical uses associated with operating a large-scale business enterprise.}*

\* A PAC member asked if there is an assumption that the GHG Emissions Inventory includes vehicle fleet being turned into hybrids/electric in years to come? *{No, the inventory is meant to reflect existing conditions. Proposed initiatives such as converting the MPAD's fleet vehicles to hybrids/electric will reduce GHG emissions.}*

\* A PAC member asked if this can be done for aircraft as well? *{New aircraft fuels are being tested with the hopes of replacing the existing AvGas fuel, which contains lead. The FAA anticipates a replacement fuel to be identified sometime in the next couple of years.}*

\* A PAC member asked if neighbors are aware of the voluntary noise abatement program? Doesn't think most don't know of this program. *{Information regarding noise abatement is available on the Airport's website and all neighbors/citizens may contact the Airport for any other questions.}*

\* A PAC member asked if surface elevations include trees? *{No, just terrain}*

\* A PAC member noted the need to look at different alternatives for north side GA and other locations for hangars. However, need to solve the access issue before hangars can be developed.

\* A PAC member commented that overall all a good job on the study and the recommended alternative.

\* A PAC member commented that their one concern is the MP is not talking about long-term maintenance/operational costs (this is likely to be a scary number).

\* A PAC member asked what is the timing of CEQA? *{Once we have a draft plan (project description) in place, we will start the CEQA process... an EIR will be*

*prepared that will provide a detailed analysis of short term and intermediate term projects, while the long term projects (for which we do not have detailed information) will be addressed at a programmatic level only. Other items that will need to be covered in the EIR include the overall on-airport land use plan and the proposed Sustainability policies.}*

**Action Items:**

The Committee will receive draft working papers prior to the next meeting, scheduled for a Tuesday in late June or early July 2015 in the District Board room. PAC members will be notified as soon as the meeting date is scheduled.

# # #