

MEMORANDUM

Date: July 21, 2015

To: Barbara Beaton, DOT&PF Project Manager

From: Robin Reich (Solstice Alaska Consulting) with input and review from Royce Conlon, PDC Project Manager

Subject: Summary of 07/21/2015 Stakeholder Working Group Meeting #2 – Seward Airport Improvements Project (#54857)

Introduction: Meeting Overview

This document provides a summary of the second Stakeholder Working Group (SWG) meeting held on July 21, 2015, for the Seward Airport Improvements Project. The meeting was held as a teleconference based in Anchorage. The meeting began at 11:00 am and ended at approximately 12:00 pm. Table 1 lists the meeting attendees.

Table 1. Meeting Attendees

SWG Membership	Name
Alaska Railroad Corporation (ARRC)	Jim Kubitz, Brian Lindamood, and Christina Hendrickson
City of Seward: Seward City Council	Christy Terry (joined the meeting mid-way)
City of Seward: City Manager/Community Development	Ron Long
Civil Air Patrol	Brandon Anderson
Federal Aviation Administration (FAA)	Mike Edelmann
Kenai Peninsula Borough (KPB) Seward/Bear Creek Flood Service Area, Water Resource Manager	Dan Mahalak
Lease Holder, General Aviation (GA) Pilot, Community Member	Dennis Perry
Alaska Department of Transportation and Public Facilities (DOT&PF) Maintenance	Sean Montgomery
DOT&PF Project Management, Central Region Design and Engineering	Barbara Beaton, P.E., Project Manager
DOT&PF Central Region Design and Engineering	Joy Vaughn, P.E., Consultant Coordination
Consultant: PDC Inc. Engineers	Royce Conlon, P.E., Consultant Team Project Manager
Consultant: PDC Inc. Engineers	Ken Risse, Civil Engineer
Consultant: Solstice Alaska Consulting, Inc.	Robin Reich, Public Involvement, with Olivia Cohn, Public Involvement Project Support

Meeting materials included the meeting agenda; draft “Forecast of Aviation Activity & Facility Requirements” technical (tech) memorandum (memo); and November 19, 2014 Stakeholder Working Group (SWG) Meeting #1 notes. These items were distributed via email prior to the July Meeting #2. Table 2 presents the meeting agenda to document the meeting objectives, goals, and format.

Table 2. Meeting #2 Agenda and Overview

<p><u>Meeting Objectives (Our Work Today)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Discuss the November 24, 2014 SWG Meeting #1 summary and action taken (provided in advance).• Answer questions regarding Final “Aviation Activity & Facility Requirements” technical memorandum (provided in advance).• Discuss the project’s status and next steps.
<p><u>Meeting Goals (Meeting’s End Result)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• SWG understanding of the Final “Aviation Activity & Facility Requirements” technical memorandum.
<p><u>Meeting Agenda (Topic and Timeline)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Introductions and purpose of the meeting (Robin Reich, Solstice Alaska Consulting) (11:00-11:15 am)• Welcome (Barb Beaton, P.E., DOT&PF) (11:15-11:20 am)• Questions regarding SWG Meeting #1 minutes (Robin Reich) (11:20-11:35 am)• Final “Aviation Activity & Facility Requirements” tech memo discussion (Royce Conlon P.E., PDC Inc. Engineers) (11:35 am-12:30 pm)• Status on other project activities and next steps (Royce Conlon) (12:30-12:45 pm)• Adjourn (12:45 pm) Thank you for your time and participation!

Introductions and Purpose

The meeting began with introductions, and Robin Reich, Solstice Alaska Consulting, reiterated the purpose of the meeting to review the final “Forecast of Aviation Activity & Facility Requirements” tech memo, discuss questions pertaining to that memo, review notes from the November 19, 2014 SWG Meeting #1 including documented action items, discuss progress since the November meeting, and review next steps.

Welcome

Barbara Beaton, DOT&PF, provided an opening statement. She clarified that the design team responded to issues brought up at the last meeting and updated the forecast memo accordingly. Ms. Beaton confirmed that the meeting would focus on discussing updates and answering questions, and she introduced Royce Conlon, PDC Engineers, to lead the discussion.

Discussion Regarding SWG Meeting #1 Summary

Royce Conlon, PDC, noted that at the last meeting the group discussed the draft tech memo. She asked if SWG members had questions or comments on this meeting or the summary of the meeting as documented in the meeting notes (provided).

1. **Vigor Alaska and Shell Alaska feedback.** Robin Reich, Solstice Alaska Consulting, noted that in advance of the meeting, Christy Terry of the City of Seward asked if the team had received letters of support from Vigor and Shell.
 - Ms. Conlon confirmed that this feedback was received. The receipt of letters from Shell and Vigor was documented within the Meeting #1 notes. This information was also incorporated as part of the tech memo.
 - Ms. Conlon explained that Shell and Vigor both provided “letters of support” for the Seward Airport and for the Seward Airport Improvements Project. Both letters noted that that each company’s future plans anticipate increased future use of the airport in support of anticipated, expanded operations. This relationship was noted in general terms (not quantified).
 - Ms. Conlon noted that the Vigor and Shell letters provide input that the airport use is growing, and the revised tech memo notes this anticipated future activity. She also noted that the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) cannot fund that future right now. She clarified that the FAA may support a 4,000-ft runway in the future, but for this project, in the near term and given the current use, FAA would likely fund only a 3,300-ft runway.
 2. **Additional data.** The project team was asked if the tech memo includes the additional operations data from the mid to late 1990s (referring to the SWG request at the last meeting to extend the planning period). The team was also asked about the tech memo’s discussion of wind coverage, approaches, and occasional excessive crosswinds (points of discussion from the last meeting).
 - **FAA input.** It was noted that Dennis Perry, with the DOT&PF and PDC, met with the FAA’s Kyle Christiansen regarding ways to improve runway reliability. The core of this discussion was the idea that it might entice a commuter company to offer services out of Seward Airport. The information from this meeting is appended to the tech memo. Because of the terrain, FAA
-

Flight Standards has indicated that an improved public approach would be difficult, if not impossible, to design in Seward. Outside this project, an improved special approach designed for an individual carrier or for specially qualified aircrew and equipment, however, may be possible.

- 3. Coast Guard interest.** It was asked whether the Coast Guard is interested in the Seward Airport.
 - The team responded that the Coast Guard was contacted, and the Coast Guard does have an interest in the Seward Airport in terms of both immediate and future needs. The team also noted, however, that FAA is not able to fund another federal agency's activities or needs. Designing the airport to a length and width to accommodate future use by the Coast Guard with C130 aircraft is beyond FAA's funding jurisdiction.
 - Ron Long, City of Seward, asked for clarification regarding the width of the runway. The team noted that the 4,000-ft option would include a 75-ft width. This option would not preclude Coast Guard aircraft from operating, but generally it is better to have a longer/wider runway.
- 4. Federal agency collaboration.** Mr. Long asked whether there could be a collaborative effort whereby each agency brings something toward the whole project, given that they cannot fund each other's needs.
 - Mike Edelmann, FAA, responded that there are complexities when multiple federal agencies are involved in a project, and he noted that it would not be a simple process. Extensive up-front coordination would be required, and it would not be as easy as the Coast Guard providing some extra money for a wider runway.
- 5. Additional questions/comments.** The floor was opened for additional questions and comments.
 - There were no questions, and SWG members thanked the team for preparing the materials and for incorporating their comments from the first SWG meeting into the process.

Discussion Regarding the Final "Forecast of Aviation Activity & Facility Requirements" Tech Memo

At this point, the meeting focus turned to reviewing the "Forecast of Aviation Activity & Facility Requirements" tech memo, which the team provided to SWG members in advance of the meeting. The team noted that the general finding of the tech memo is the need to respond to near-term needs and conditions while also keeping a prudent planning eye on the future. Ms. Conlon presented the key finding of the tech memo related to facility requirements:

- A runway length of 3,300 feet is the standard for Community Class airports, and Seward Airport is a Community Class airport. A longer, 4,000-foot runway is not precluded in the future to meet future needs related to commuter aircraft such as the Beech 1900 and/or the Dash 8. This project, however, will focus on a 3,300-ft runway to meet existing needs.
- 1. Elements of the planned improvement, a 3,300-ft runway.** Ms. Conlon explained the following components of a 3,300-ft runway:
 - The runway would be a reconstruction of Runway 16/34 (the existing crosswind runway).

- If improvements were made to the main runway (13/31), improvements would require other/additional actions to be taken to ensure functionality.
- Runway 13/31, the existing, main runway, would be closed.
- Runway 16/34 would be slightly offset to allow large aircraft to use the apron. Runway 16/34 orientation was chosen to maximize wind coverage.
- The elevation of Runway 16/34 would be raised above the 100-year flood level.
- Some Taxiways would need to be reconstructed to match runway modifications, others will be eliminated, and to meet current standards.

2. Discussion of a 4,000-ft option. The SWG asked for clarification regarding if the project could continue to consider the 4,000-ft runway as an option. Members asked: How much would the project need to change to accommodate the longer runway option? Would the project change by a small amount, or would it need to follow a completely different planning path?

- The project team confirmed that to change from a 3,300-ft runway to a 4,000-ft runway would involve adding 700 ft to the end of the runway. This additional length would fit at the end of the 3,300 foot runway; therefore, there would be no need for an entire relocation of the project to accommodate the additional 700 ft.
 - However, the team explained that work on alternatives analysis (the alternatives to carry forward for this project) includes consideration of funding. An alternative funding source would be needed to pay for the additional runway length as it does not qualify for FAA funding. Extra coordination would be required that would necessitate at a minimum a signed Memorandum of Agreement.
- Barbara Beaton, DOT&PF, also noted that any added length would change the environmental impacts, and that these impacts would need to be assessed for the longer stretch of runway.

3. Taxiway Discussion. Jim Kubitz, ARRC, noted that an ARRC access road is near Runway 16/34 (identified by SWG members as “the existing, short runway” or the “crosswind runway”). He asked if this runway were moved laterally, if there would be room for a taxiway, as well.

- The project team confirmed that there would be an existing taxiway between the apron and the runway.
- The project team noted that the taxiway would be expanded for design group B-II aircraft.
- Mr. Kubitz asked whether the taxiway would still be adequate if it were expanded later.
 - The team noted that the facility would accommodate aircraft with a Design Group II wingspan (up to 79-ft wingspan); it would not, however, be designed for Coast Guard aircraft.
 - Mr. Kubitz noted that he is trying to ensure that there is enough taxiway in the future if an expansion were to happen. He referenced the facility requirements documented on page 15 of the tech memo. This information is excerpted below.

Excerpt from the “Forecast of Aviation Activity & Facility Requirements” tech. memo, p. 15.

14075FB – Seward Airport Improvements
Revised DRAFT Aviation Activity & Facility Requirements
July 13, 2015
Page 15

Facility requirements are listed in the table below for three potential groups and compared with the larger of the two existing runways. Data collected and analyzed in this document supports the “Current Demand & Medevac” scenario. Currently, there is an insufficient number of operations by large aircraft to support the “Growth Scenario & Emergency Preparedness” column in the chart below. That scenario is included for future planning purposes.

Table 13 – Runway Dimensional Standards for Various Scenarios:

Feature	Current Based Aircraft Group	Current Demand & Medevac (King Air B200) Recommended for Near-Term Development	Growth Scenario & Emergency Preparedness (Beech 1900) Consider for Long-Term Development	Existing RW 13-31
Approach Category	A	B	B	B
ADG	I	II	II	II
Runway Length	3,300' (Note 1)	3,300' (Note 1)	4,000'/4,700' (Note 2)	4,533'
Runway Width	60'	75'	75' (Note 3)	100'
Visibility Minimums	1 mile	1 mile	1 mile	1 mile
Crosswind Component	10.5 knots	13 knots	16 knots	13 knots
Runway Safety Area	120' x 3,780'	150' x 3,900'	150' x 5,300'	150' x 4,749'
Object Free Area	400' x 3,780'	500' x 3,900'	500' x 5,300'	500' x 4,749'
RPZ	1,000' x 500' x 700'	1,000' x 500' x 700'	1,700' x 500' x 1,010'	1,000' x 500' x 700'
Part 77 Primary Surface	500' x 3,700'	500' x 3,700'	500' x 5,100'	500' x 4,649'
Part 77 Approach Slope	20:1 (Visual)	20:1 (Visual) (Note 4)	20:1 (Visual) (Note 4)	20:1 (Visual)

1. Minimum runway length for community airports per Alaska Aviation Preconstruction Manual exceeds FAA AC 150/5325-4B (2,750 feet for 95% of fleet or 3,250 feet for 100% of fleet) and King Air B200 published takeoff and landing distances.

2. The 4,700-foot runway length is based on FAA AC 150/5325-4B for aircraft over 12,500 lbs. but less than 60,000 lbs. (75% of fleet at 60% useful load). The FAA is circulating a Draft AC 150/5325-4C, which recommends using manufacturer’s airport planning manuals for all large airplanes (over 12,500 lbs.). The Beech 1900D specification and performance sheet lists a takeoff length of 3,737 feet. Discussions with the primary air carrier in Alaska using this aircraft indicated a need for a 4,000-foot runway to accommodate it. A 4,000-foot runway option is being considered, which would accommodate the Beech 1900 and other large aircraft such as the Dash 8 and Sherpa.

3. Runway width may be increased to 100 feet to provide for larger emergency response aircraft such as the C-130.

4. By definition, a non-precision instrument (NPI) approach runway means a straight-in approach is planned or has been approved (Part 77.2) SWD’s approach is currently a circling approach (RNAV [GPS]-A). Review of the FAA flight standards and local topography indicates a straight-in approach is not viable at Seward due to the mountainous terrain on all sides.

4. Land ownership. Clarification was sought to help understand land ownership boundaries.

- The project team answered that land ownership is being fine-tuned. The team noted ongoing work on the design to lessen impacts to ARRC property.
- **Discussion of potential conflicts between airspace and barge operations.** The project team asked for more information related to future planned use of the dredged barge basin between the jetty and track.
 - ARRC noted that this area is set up for barges and barge parking.
 - A member of the SWG commented that the barges could be moved closer to the freight dock so that cranes would not be located on the side of the runway.
- The area serves as a barge parking lot by the jetty; however, it is believed that there will not be room to do crane work in this location.

5. **Railroad access road.** Mr. Kubitz commented that the ARRC may have a small access road on the jetty to access barges. ARRC may need to move this to the east at some point. If ARRC is going to do this major project, costs will need to be justified and part of this cost justification is the need to access stored barges.
 - It was asked whether this access road would be public or private. Mr. Kubitz responded that it would be private (for freight access) and would be gated for security reasons.

 6. **Road in the Runway Protection Zone (RPZ).**
 - A SWG member asked if this regulation made a distinction between private or public roads.
 - Mike Edlemann with the FAA noted that it cannot be a public road; a service road, however, under certain conditions such as its having controlled access by the landlord (in this case the ARRC), could occur in the RPZ. Such a use would need to follow an approval process, but it could be approved.

 7. **Concluding thoughts about the planned improvement: one, 3,300-ft runway.**
 - Ron Long, City of Seward, thanked the group for this discussion and noted that the City of Seward would like to get a longer runway in the near future.
 - Dennis Perry asked whether the project is only considering a short runway.
 - Royce Conlon, PDC, responded that DOT&PF is planning for a long runway in the future, but working toward a short runway in the near term. The project team will ensure that plans do not preclude a 4,000-ft runway.

 8. **Short runway approach.** Dennis Perry shared that he has been doing considerable research as to the efficacy of a new approach into Seward. He has been discussing this with Grant Aviation, who believes that there is considerable merit to this idea. They would use an approach to the west side of the bay, which would support missed approaches and avoid mountain issues within proximity to the long runway.
 - Mr. Perry is planning to request an audience with Kyle Christianson, FAA, at the end of the summer. He thinks that this approach is good and compares well with other Alaskan cities with similar situations to Seward, such as Valdez, Kodiak, and Scammon Bay. In Valdez, Dennis noted that the missed approach is a right bay. When he has completed the missed approach in Seward in his personal airplane at maximum speed, he had 2/3 of the bay left, so he knows that the approach works well.
 - Mr. Perry would like a new approach to be on the table since it would require that if we made the decision, the approach could be done and any runway could be chosen, but it would mean staying to the west bay, especially Lowell Point.
 - Royce Conlon, PDC, commented that a brief discussion regarding the private versus public approach is provided in the tech memo. She noted that the FAA has concerns with the idea of having a public approach.

 9. **Impacts to the river.** SWG members asked if the team knows the upstream and downstream impacts at this time.
-

- The project team noted that impacts are not yet known.
- A member of the SWG commented that in the past there has been discussion regarding moving the river back to its original location, but this is not possible now.
- It was noted that the airport essentially serves as a dike.
- Christina Hendrickson noted that consulting after the meeting with Dan Mahalak (KPB Seward/Bear Creek Flood Service Area, Water Resource Manager) about the river would be the best point of contact.
- Dennis Perry commented that, eventually, the river could become a good float plane base.
- A comment was made about working to change the recent floodplain mapping (which now locates the airport in the floodplain). Discussion ensued with some noting the difficulty and/or futility of this course of action and others noting that there are ways to do this, and it should not be dismissed; (the structure is in place and may be somewhat difficult to navigate but is within our capacity).

Status Updates and Next Steps

To conclude the meeting, the following next steps were outlined.

- 1. Hydrology Report:** A hydrology report will be the next document that is prepared, and the team will provide a copy to the appropriate parties, including Dan Mahalak (KPB Seward/Bear Creek Flood Service Area, Water Resource Manager).
 - *Action Item: provide copy of the hydrology report to Dan Mahalak and other interested parties.*
- 2. Alternatives Analysis:** The analysis of alternatives is in progress. Key impacts under study at this time are right-of-way impacts and acquisitions, floodplain impacts, and cost. There could be a substantial cost element and a time element related to findings. Coordination with the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) will also occur.
 - Ron Long, City of Seward, noted that if this work references a map of the area, the subdivisions present in the river area could be misleading. These properties are almost all abandoned or have been deeded back to the City by the landowners because the land is not developable. He noted that there could be a decent amount of land if the project requires offsets or other criteria. There are houses that have to be bought back or torn down, and property values are reduced because they are on a floodplain.
 - The team noted that it was using the property assessment records to help determine the cost of property impacts.
 - Mr. Long responded that the Borough has an office that does the assessment, whose numbers the City accepts at face value. The City and the Borough have had properties deeded back to them.
 - Dan Mahalak noted that, for a point of record for parcels, a general rule of thumb is to add 20% value for in-town parcels and 10% value for parcels within the Borough for market appraisal. Increase the cost by 20% and 10% over the assessed cost.

- Action Item (consultant team): continue Alternatives Analysis; prepare to provide an update on progress.*

3. Closing Comments:

- **Next meeting.** The team noted that it will contact SWG members to plan for the next meeting. Currently, September is being considered for the next meeting.
 - Action Item (consultant team): prepare for and establish a time for the next meeting.*
- **Progress moving forward.** Royce Conlon noted that the team is continuing to make progress. It seems that there is a consensus on the facility requirements to look at a 3,300-ft runway in the near term and a 4,000-ft runway in the long term.
- **Additional input.** It was noted that if there are others who should be involved in this project, please let the team know.
 - Action Item (SWG members): inform consultant team if there are additional contacts who should be included in the next SWG meeting.*

Adjourn

The meeting concluded at approximately 12:00 pm. Thank you for your participation!