

MEMORANDUM

Date: May 1, 2016

To: Barbara Beaton, DOT&PF Project Manager

From: Robin Reich and Carla SlatonBarker(Solstice Alaska Consulting) with input and review from Angela Smith and Royce Conlon (PDC)

Subject: Summary of 04/20/2016Stakeholder Working Group Meeting #3 – Seward Airport Improvements Project (#Z548570000)

This document provides a summary of the third Stakeholder Working Group (SWG) meeting held on April 20, 2016, for the Seward Airport Improvements Project. This SWG meeting was held in Seward at the K.M. Rae Marine Education Building in advance of an evening public meeting. The SWG meeting began at 1:30 pm and ended at approximately 3:45pm. Table 1 lists the meeting attendees.

Table 1. Meeting Attendees

SWG Membership	Name
Alaska Railroad Corporation (ARRC)	Jim Kubitz, Christina Hendrickson, and Rene Murphy (a consultant employee under contract on ARRC master plan project)
City of Seward: Seward City Council	Christy Terry(Ms. Terry is also no longer a member of the City Council, but she has been asked by the mayor to remain on the SWG. She is an employee of the ARRC.)
City of Seward: Assistant City Manager/Community Development	Ron Long
Civil Air Patrol	Not in attendance
Federal Aviation Administration (FAA)	Mike Edelmann (participated by phone)
Kenai Peninsula Borough (KPB) Seward/Bear Creek Flood Service Area, Water Resource Manager	Dan Mahalak
Lease Holder, General Aviation (GA) Pilot, Community Member	Not in attendance
Alaska Department of Transportation and Public Facilities (DOT&PF) Maintenance	Not in attendance
DOT&PF Project Management, Central Region Design and Engineering	Barbara Beaton, P.E., Project Manager
DOT&PF Hydrologist	Paul Janke, Hydrologist
Consultant: PDC Inc. Engineers	Royce Conlon,P.E., Consultant Team Project Manager and Angela Smith, P.E., Project Engineer
Consultant: Hydraulic Mapping and Modeling	Ken Karle, P.E., Hydrologist
Consultant: Solstice Alaska Consulting, Inc.	Robin Reich and Carla SlatonBarker

Meeting materials distributed in advance of the meeting included the meeting agenda; final “Forecast of Aviation Activity & Facility Requirements” technical (tech) memorandum (memo); draft “Location Study/Alternatives Analysis” tech memo; and the meeting notes from the July 21, 2015 SWG Meeting #2. These items were distributed via email (basecamp file-share link and as an attachment) on Monday, April 18, 2016. A PowerPoint presentation (attached) supported the meeting agenda. Figure 1 presents the meeting agenda. The agenda documents the meeting’s objectives, goals, and format.

Figure 1. SWG Meeting #3 Agenda and Overview



SWG Meeting #3 Agenda and Overview



Meeting Objectives (Our Work Today)

- Review where we are in the process.
- Present the results of the Hydrology Report.
- Present alternatives developed to solve identified issues and needs.
- Present the advantages and disadvantages associated with each alternative.
- Gather input from SWG members on alternatives and their advantages and disadvantages.
- Gather input from SWG members on how to evaluate alternatives.

Meeting Goals (Meeting’s End Result)

- Shared understanding of the alternatives and their advantages and disadvantages.
- Shared understanding of the evaluation process and criteria that are important for ranking alternatives.
- Shared understanding of the project process, including next steps.

Meeting Agenda (Topic and Timeline)

- **Introductions and Purpose of the Meeting**
(Robin Reich, Solstice Alaska Consulting) (1:30-1:40 am)
- **Welcome** (Barbara Beaton, P.E., DOT&PF) (1:40-1:45 pm)
- **Recap of the Project and its Challenges**
 - Hydrology: Discussion of the Hydrology Report
 - Aviation Demand: Recap of Aviation Demand Report
 - Funding(Royce Conlon P.E., PDC Inc. Engineers) (1:45-2:00 pm)
- **Evaluation Process**
 - Presentation and discussion of draft criteria for evaluating alternatives.
(Royce Conlon) (2:00-2:15 pm)
 - **Project Alternatives with Advantages and Disadvantages**
 - Range of alternatives considered and viable alternatives
 - Advantages and disadvantages of alternatives.
 - SWG member comment.(Royce Conlon P.E., PDC Inc. Engineers) (2:15 pm-3:15 pm, with break as needed)
 - **Status on Other Project Activities and Next Steps**
(Royce Conlon) (3:15-3:30 pm)
 - **Adjourn** (3:30 pm)

Pre-meeting packet: final “Aviation Activity and Facility Requirements” report, draft “Alternatives Analysis” report, SWG meeting #2 notes

Thank you for your time and participation!

Introductions and Purpose

Robin Reich, Solstice Alaska Consulting, began the meeting with a welcome and introductions. She reminded participants that this was the third meeting of the SWG: the second meeting was held in July 2015 and the first was held in November 2014. She articulated the purpose of SWG meeting #3: to review the project process, including the results of the hydrology study, the finalized “Aviation Demand and Facility Requirements” tech memo, and the draft “Location Study/Alternatives Analysis” tech memo. She noted that the primary focus of the meeting was to discuss project alternatives in context with aviation demand, facility requirements, and hydrology information, and to gather input from SWG members on advantages and disadvantages of alternatives.

Welcome

Barbara Beaton, DOT&PF, provided an opening statement. She noted that the design team has been working hard on the project, and that the focus of the meeting is to bring the team’s work to the SWG and solicit comment. She explained that the team prepared the design and engineering information in two formats: the first format is the typical report format of the tech memos (these include the engineering details), and the second format presents the information in a more user-friendly way. She noted that the user-friendly format captures highlights and forms the content of the public meeting display boards and SWG meeting presentation slides. Ms. Beaton next introduced Royce Conlon, PDC Engineers, to lead the presentation and the discussion.

Recap of the Project

The following sections refer to the SWG meeting presentation slides, attached to this report.

Royce Conlon, PDC, provided a recap of the project by reintroducing the firms contracted by DOT&PF to work on the project (SWG presentation, slide 3). Next she provided an overview of the project process (SWG presentation, slide 4). She explained that the team was following a federal and state process to identify the alternatives to carry forward. She explained that the outcome of this current “project scoping” phase will be the identification of alternatives that will be advanced for further study in the environmental document. She noted that an important aspect of this phase is determining if only one build alternative and one no-build alternative advances, or if the project will identify more than one build alternative to advance with the no-build alternative. She noted that this discussion was next in the process.

Recap of the Project’s Challenges

Ms. Conlon next provided a summary of the project’s top challenges: hydrology, aviation demand, and funding (SWG presentation, slide 5). She explained that these challenges are important to understand because they inform what can be done (project solutions). She reiterated that the challenges the team is presenting today, as well as the alternatives, are not new to the SWG—they have been topics of the other two SWG meetings. She did note, however, that the public will be seeing this information for the first time at the public meeting later in the day. She noted that the SWG presentation slides are built from the display boards so the slides have text too small to read. It was noted that intention was not for SWG members to read this information now; Ms. Conlon explained she would verbally provide

highlights of the information on the slides. SWG members were encouraged to read all the information presented on the display boards after the SWG meeting or at the public meeting.

Ms. Conlon explained that the bulk of the SWG discussion for this meeting would focus on alternatives and their advantages and disadvantages, but that the team wanted to present the top three challenges to the SWG in the lay-person format as a reminder of the issues. The presentation slides are attached and contain the information presented at the meeting. Below are key points of the “challenges” presentation:

Challenge: Hydrology (SWG presentation, slide 6):

- See the attached SWG presentation for information presented.

Challenge: Aviation Demand (SWG presentation, slides 7 & 8)

- See the attached SWG presentation for information presented.

SWG Questions/Comments related to Hydrology and Aviation Demand Challenges

Question: Ron Long (City of Seward) posed a ***question related to the data used*** to determine the current and forecast aviation demand, as well as the facility requirements. He noted that the Seward Airport has had reduced capacity for the last three years. He asked if this reduced capacity was factored into the aviation demand study. Specifically, he asked whether the qualifying period of study used data from 2012, after the restrictions reduced the number of operations.

Answer: Ms. Conlon noted that the 2008 Master Plan recommended the same design aircraft. She also noted that the SWG asked for a longer study period during the SWG review of the draft “Aviation Demand and Facility Requirements” tech memo, and the team incorporated this feedback. She said that the planning period used to determine operations went back further than 2012.

- ***Post Meeting Follow-Up:*** To prepare the final “Aviation Demand and Facility Requirements” tech memo, the team reviewed FAA guidance and confirmed that historical data does not have the same weight when developing a forecast [for example the EAS program impacted historical numbers, but this program is not active and is not anticipated to be active in the near term]. This information was included in Table 5 and Table 6 of the final “Aviation Activity & Facility Requirement” tech memo for historical context.

Question: Mr. Kubitz asked for a ***definition of an operation***. What is the definition of “landing” in terms of an operation, and related to the 500 operation threshold?

Answer: Ms. Conlon said landing is one operation; a takeoff is one operation; a landing and a takeoff together count as two operations.

Comment: Dan Mahalak noted that the Seward Airport receives about five jets a summer. He said that this is a low number (when compared to the FAA threshold of 500 operations), but these five jets provide a big boost to some local economies. He raised the concern about alternatives that provide only a short runway, and ***commented that a short runway will significantly impact the “local economies” who depend on these jet landings.***

Response: Ms. Conlon confirmed that Alternative 2.2 is a 3,300-foot runway, and this runway would not support fully loaded jet landings. She noted that Alternative 2.2 would be developed to

not preclude a longer runway in the future, when demand warrants a longer runway to accommodate jets. She explained that Alternative 3.0 features a 4,000-foot runway, which is considered the “long-term” or “growth” scenario. Ms. Conlon noted that FAA funding would not support the construction of Alternative 3.0 at this time.

Question: Are “rotor ops” (helicopter operations) counted?

Answer: Ms. Conlon said only fixed-wing operations are counted/used in the aviation demand and facility requirements memo. Helicopters do not use the runway in the same manner; however, the alternative(s) selected for this project would not preclude helicopter operations.

Question: What about counts of C-130 operations, used by the Coast Guard? ***Aren’t C-130 operations factored into the project and part of the justification for facility requirements?*** (With humor: What about counts for the Osprey helicopter [used in advance of and during President Obama’s visit]).

Answer: FAA funds cannot be used to fund operations for other branches of government. Also, the 500 operation threshold applies, and the Osprey visits likely amounted to about 20 operations, so a “few” more would be needed.

The group’s ***comments indicated a desire for the project to fund improvements that would provide for a runway capable of serving jets.*** Ms. Conlon reiterated her understanding that no one wants to lose what they have, but on the other side it takes funds to maintain a larger facility, and “that’s where the rubber hits the road.” The aviation demand and number of operations indicate strongly that at this time this type of facility will not be supported through FAA funding. Mike Edlmann (FAA) confirmed Ms. Conlon’s statement.

Challenge: Funding (SWG presentation, slide 9)

Ms. Conlon highlighted the following information from this slide: 218 airports compete for Airport Improvement Program (AIP) funding in Alaska; of these, about 20 airports usually get funding from the program; AIP funds have not grown over the years, but the cost of constructing airport improvements has and will continue to grow (the money is not going as far as it used to); this is a competitive process (Projects rank higher if they have local or in-kind money to help; projects rank higher if they are off the road system, such as in Rural Alaska, where they depend on the airport for transport of food, fuel, medical supplies, etc.).

SWG Questions/Comments related to Funding Challenges

Question/Comment: Christy Terry, City of Seward, asked if the ***AIP process and evaluation consider the impact of an avalanche.*** Although Seward is on the road system, avalanches can block road access. Avalanches have blocked the road, and on one occasion for five days. This situation and the impact should be considered—it effects whether Seward stores have groceries and whether or not there is access in the case of a medical or another emergency.

Answer: Ms. Beaton, Ms. Conlon, and Ms. Smith together responded to this question, noting that one way of looking at this is that the avalanche’s impact is temporary, so Seward would not score as high as would a rural village with no other alternative access. On the flip side, Seward Airport may score higher on this issue than, an airport on the road system but with no avalanche potential, such as Birchwood Airport, because an avalanche could limit road access to Seward and this is not the case for Birchwood.

Question: Ron Long, City of Seward, asked for clarification of the statement that projects with a local match score higher. He noted that originally \$17 million was “earmarked” for Seward Airport improvements. He asked: ***did the earmarked \$17 million go to the Seward Airport Project or did it go into the AIP and to other projects?*** “Is there any fidelity at all with the original intent,” he asked?

Answer: Ms. Beaton said that the funds are in the AIP program, but not earmarked for the Seward Airport. The obligation of AIP funds for each airport, including the Seward Airport is a negotiation between the DOT&PF and FAA. DOT&PF is now trying to determine which alternative to bring forward into the design phase, so the design package can be developed in time to receive those funds for construction (currently 2018). Ms. Beaton asked if Mr. Long had or could acquire a local match to the FAA funding for project improvements, and Mr. Long responded that at this time the City of Seward has no in-kind match.

Alternatives Evaluation Process (SWG presentation, slides 10-12)

Next, Ms. Conlon turned the group’s attention to the evaluation process, as a precursor to the presentation of draft alternatives. She noted that the team would like to solicit SWG input on the following criteria that the team has used to evaluate alternatives: Cost; Ability to Serve the Community’s Needs; Safety, Engineering, and User Considerations; and Environmental Considerations (see SWG presentation slide 11). She noted that it is a tall order to balance these elements and keep them all in play. She explained that the Evaluation Matrix (included in the draft “Alternatives Analysis” tech memo and represented by slide 12 of the presentation) represents the project team’s evaluation process, which has resulted in the three alternatives presented today. She asked for SWG thoughts on this topic, and the following thoughts were voiced:

The group’s ***discussion centered on the need for high weighting of socioeconomic criteria.*** The following comments capture the highlights of the discussion.

Jim Kubitz (ARRC) noted the importance of ***strongly considering (and giving a high rank to) economic development, particularly the relationship between economic development and the airport’s support of scheduled air service.*** He noted that ARRC is interested in having scheduled air service to Seward for use in transporting ARRC crews. He said that the ARRC’s vision for an airport that serves this need/supports this economic activity is part of their planning process, and he noted that this plan does not jive well with FAA’s methodology for evaluating and identifying facility requirements (particularly the requirement of 500 jet aircraft operations to justify a longer runway). ARRC’s economic development/planning process and FAA’s airport planning process seem at odds. Ms. Conlon noted that it is not FAA requirements that are the barrier to a longer runway; it is the lack of future demand—the lack of intent by air carriers to provide scheduled service. She explained that the project team spoke with Ravn (formerly Era), and the team asked what it would take for them to provide scheduled service. She reported that Ravn told the team that it would take a reliable approach and passenger demand for them to consider scheduled air service to/from Seward. Ravn said that it is not economical for them to have scheduled service to/from Seward without a reliable approach because people can just jump in their cars to travel to Seward. Ms. Conlon then explained that the team (with SWG member Dennis Perry) discussed with FAA the idea of a new approach and learned that FAA did not support a public approach due to the surrounding terrain. The reality is that the weather is low in Seward. She said that the team discussed a Seward approach with FAA in terms of “how low can we go” and in terms of an approach that Dennis Perry has used. FAA acknowledges that pilots can be trained on special approaches (such as the special approach for the Juneau Airport) but FAA

communicated that these approaches cannot be public approaches. These special approaches require special equipment in airplanes, and specialized equipment on the ground to assist pilots in marking when they are over certain spots or landmarks. The reality is that certifying a new approach is slim. Mr. Long (City of Seward) noted that the issue is really about economics—can the air carrier make this route economically viable. He explained that the Essential Air Service contract in the past made the scheduled service viable—the program subsidized the air carriers, so canceled flights due to weather did not impact the viability of the route. This program is no longer active.

- **Post Meeting Follow-up:** The airline decided to discontinue flying to Seward due to a lack of demand and requested to be released from their contract. The release was granted. Attachment 6 to the final “Forecast of Aviation Activity & Facility Requirements” tech memo includes a summary of the conversation with the FAA on this topic (2/6/2015).

Christina Hendrickson (ARRC) noted that the team working on the Seward Marine Terminal Expansion Plan **have “hard” weights related to safety and socioeconomic development**. The ARRC has data and analysis that could be used to strengthen any socioeconomic discussions or justifications. When asked, Ms. Hendrickson noted that the ARRC projects have not evaluated the airport as a specific economic driver for ARRC or for port planning purposes.

Mr. Long expressed that it is **imperative that we maintain the 4,000-foot runway option or at least the capacity for this**. He said that “every breath in my body wants to build it today,” but he noted that he understands why it cannot be built now. Ms. Conlon reiterated that the near-term solution would be a 3,300-foot runway, and the long-term solution would be a 4,000-foot runway. She explained that in airport planning “near-term and long-term” no longer refer to years; instead the terms now relate to “thresholds” of use. In this case, the long-term solution gets triggered in terms of 500 operations.

Mr. Mahalak (KPB) expressed **the need to consider impacts to existing facilities such as current hangars, particularly for alternatives that raise the elevation of the runway**. Ms. Conlon explained that the apron elevation would not change; this was part of the reason for the offset of the proposed runway centerline as compared to the existing.

Project Alternatives: Advantages and Disadvantages

Ms. Conlon noted the focus of the rest of the meeting: to collect input on alternatives, as well as their advantages and disadvantages. Slides 13-16 present the alternatives, with their advantages and disadvantages. Comment highlights are noted below.

SWG Questions/Comments Related to Alternative 1.1

- Ms. Hendrickson (ARRC) asked about **river impacts to Lee’s property in the northwest. She noted that important ARRC infrastructure is located there, and she registered concern that this alternative would have negative impacts to ARRC facilities**. She noted that on this first review, Alternative 1.1 seems the least desirable alternative from the ARRC’s perspective.
- Mr. Long (City of Seward) asked about the **properties (unoccupied or occupied)** to the east that would be flooded. Ms. Beaton responded that some properties are described as having improvements in the Borough’s property database. She also noted that there is a Native allotment in this area. She said that property acquisitions for Native allotments are lengthy processes.

- Mr. Mahalak (KPB) asked about the **cost of this alternative and the costs across all alternatives**. Ms. Conlon responded that the costs shown on the matrix are only earthwork costs. The earthwork cost of Alternative 1.1 is about \$17 million.
- Mr. Mahalak (KPB) asked about the **runway protection zone (RPZ) land use regulations, and commented on recent approach “near-misses” related to cranes in the RPZ**. He noted that any changes or enforcement will be of interest to land owners. Ms. Conlon responded that there are additional regulations for newly constructed RPZs that are not enforced within existing RPZs.
- Mr. Long asked about the **status of the DOT&PF’s evaluation of the main runway’s strength**. He suggested that this test occur periodically, in different conditions and times of year. Ms. Beaton responded that the last test occurred two years ago, and that there is a plan to retest again next month (May).

SWG Questions/Comments Related to Alternative 2.2

- Members representing the ARRC expressed a need to **understand better the three-dimensional space related to the RPZ and other airspace boundaries to the north and the south**. They voiced concern related to ARRC’s planned infrastructure development.
- Mr. Mahalak (KPB) noted that **this alternative moves the runway closer to the Olsen property. This is the location of near-misses related to crane use on the property**.
- The group **discussed the RPZ and actions that might be needed to protect the RPZs or actions to protect approaches**.
- A member asked for clarification related to the additional runway length—to the north or to the south? Ms. Conlon explained that the extension would be to the south—out into the Velocity Zone (VE) (coastal erosion zone or tidelands). Mr. Long (City of Seward) asked if this **improvement into the coastal zone** is feasible. Ms. Conlon responded that the improvement would result in less than a 1-foot flood rise, which is considered an action that could be permitted. Ms. Beaton also responded that the feasibility of constructing within the VE zone had been discussed with the department’s Coastal Section. Designing protection against the design wave will be a simple process as the design wave is much smaller than in other areas of the state.
- Mr. Long (City of Seward) asked if there would be **property acquisitions related to floodplain impacts**. Ms. Conlon/Ms. Beaton answered that further floodplain and right-of-way impact assessments would be needed—at this point, floodplain impacts from Alternative 2.2 look similar to the existing floodplain condition. Acquisition will be needed for Alternative 1.1 as it causes significant changes to the existing flood conditions for private parcels in and across the river.
- Mr. Mahalak commented that **Alternative 1.1 looked to result in a 4-foot surface water rise. He commented that 1 foot or less of surface water rise is much more able to be permitted**.

SWG Questions/Comments Related to Alternative 3.0

- Mr. Mahalak (KPB) **cautioned against waiting too long to explore this alternative**. He noted that Alternative 3.0 might be precluded if the pending revised FIRM maps become effective. He also noted that Alternative 3.0 is in the coastal zone, and while coastal engineers say this alternative will be “okay” this is not necessarily what the regulatory process will allow. He **offered to share the GIS layers for the new FIRM boundaries, and suggested strongly that the**

project incorporate this FIRM boundary information relative to the project strategy of a near-term and long-term solution.

Post Meeting Follow Up: Designing into the VE zone was discussed with a FEMA representative and the State's Flood Manager. According to them, moving through the public process required to revise the FIRM map, to relocate the VE Zone boundary, will likely be easier than trying to revise the floodway boundary on the FIRM map. Changes to the VE zone boundary are not anticipated to impact private properties.

- Mr. Janke (DOT&PF Hydrologist) added to this comment, noting **that the VE zone could move farther north, which could affect Alternative 2.2 and Alternative 3.0 differently.**

Post Meeting Follow Up: The VE boundaries from the draft FIRM map are shown on the current alternative drawings.

- Mr. Kubitz (ARRC) asked about **property acquisitions from the Department of Natural Resources** (DNR) related to Alternative 3.0. Ms. Beaton responded that there would be property acquisition, but this would be a much quicker process between the two state agencies.

SWG comment pertaining to all alternatives

- **There is an unlighted crane on the Olsen property that is a hazard.** Suggestion that DOT&PF acquire the property or an airspace easement to remedy the situation.
- ARRC representatives asked: **What flooding and sedimentation impacts are anticipated as a result of the relocated runway (Alternative 2.2 or 3) and by allowing Runway 13/31 to breach, particularly related to proposed ARRC development downstream of the airport?** Mr. Janke, DOT&PF hydrologist, noted that this cannot be answered now because he does not know what development the ARRC is considering.

Open Discussion

Ms. Conlon ended the presentation with a request for open comments on the topic of "what are we missing," or "what do you like or don't you like"? The following record SWG comments:

Mr. Long (City of Seward) expressed that the team has done a good job with what they have been tasked with. He recognizes the resource constraints, so he sees that the answer is not Alternative 1.1. The next most desirable option is to serve the community's needs today and then tomorrow. He noted that he **likes Alternative 2.2 with the ability to add on, at least as much as anything.** He said this option is better than the no-build alternative. He expressed that letting the main runway go, however, is problematic—there is **value in protecting one's investment, particularly if the river were to shift again in the future away from the airport.**

Mr. Mahalak (KPB) offered the following comments:

- The project should drive the design by sound engineering practices and not by trying to escape regulations. Regulations can be overcome. He said that in **his experience the time and financial cost to obtain a conditional letter of map revision (CLOMR) from FEMA would be about two years and \$240,000. He noted that obtaining a CLOMR is required prior to any construction that requires modifying a FEMA flood insurance rate map.**
- One significant issue with both Alternatives 2.2 and 3.0 is that they cut off **floatplane access**. He noted that floatplanes travel from saltwater to freshwater using an access road at the airport that cuts across Alternatives 2.2 and 3.0 near the shoreline. He said that about five floatplane pilots would have no other option in Seward.

- **The cumulative impact costs of Alternatives 1.1, 2.2 and 3.0 should be compared.** Mr. Mahalak expressed the need to study hydrologically the impact of closing the runway, as well as related to socioeconomic concerns.
- The project should **consider the conversion of an asset like the runway rather than the abandonment of it.**
- Also, he expressed the need to **study hydrologically, the impact of this “retreat”**(from Runway 13/31).

Mr. Janke (DOT&PF Hydrologist) commented that he does not like Alternative 1.1 because it transfers the bank erosion and flooding issues elsewhere. He commented that under Alternative 2.2, the main runway is closed, and the river will have more of a natural channel. The cumulative impact of this change to a natural channel has not been studied. (Ms. Beaton noted that the plan was to leave the embankment for Runway 13-31 in place and let breaching of the runway occur naturally, over time. **Mr. Kubitz (ARRC)** commented on **RPZ conflicts on the south and on the north.** He asked for **more information related to height restrictions on ARRC property.** He noted that the ARRC is creating a new barge basin next to the flight path of Alternative 3.0. He raised a concern about any of the **alternatives changing the hydrology so that more sediment is deposited on DNR or ARRC property.**

Ms. Terry (City of Seward) commented that she is a **proponent of dredging.** She asked if this idea was given a through second look as suggested at the last SWG meeting. Ms. Conlon and Ms. Beaton explained DOT&PF’s position on dredging—that it is not a viable option given liability and operations and maintenance costs. Mr. Long and Ms. Terry noted that the **public will want to hear a strong message, one with data and background, to explain why other agencies can dredge** (ARRC and the City, for example) while DOT&PF will not. Ms. Terry also expressed the need for **more study of potential conflicts between Alaska Railroad operations (cranes, barges, etc.) and aircraft operations (penetrations to airspace) in the area of the jetty.**

Ms. Hendrickson (ARRC) expressed the need for **dialogue between ARRC and DOT&PF** on this project, including on topics such as **protecting existing infrastructure investment, use of pre-disaster FEMA funds, and the sharing of data, particularly for environmental impact categories.** She also expressed caution against using cost as a determining factor in a National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) document.

Mr. Edelman, FAA, encouraged the project to **justify improvements in terms of aviation safety** (object clearances, RPZs, etc.). He suggested that projects should not use cost to justify alternatives.

The group as a whole expressed the need to **weigh socioeconomic impacts highly** as evaluation criteria (see the earlier discussion on this topic). The group also expressed **the need for actions today that do not preclude a longer airport in the future,** AND work to achieve this future vision.

Next Steps

Ms. Conlon said that the next phase will be the environmental document (this phase has not yet been negotiated). Field work is anticipated in the fall. The project team would like to keep the SWG active throughout the process and that they anticipate another meeting during the environmental scoping process.

Action steps:

What	Who	When
Prepare/distribute SWG Mtg #3 notes	Project team to SWG	ASAP
Post public meeting notes to project website http://www.dot.alaska.gov/creg/sewardairport/index.shtml	Solstice	Done
Distribute final Hydrology Report to ARRC	Project Team	When it is finalized
Provide any additional comments by May 13, 2016, which is the official comment period set related to the public meeting and this information cycle	SWG	May 13, 2016
Share outline of ARRC's existing environmental documentation	Christina Hendrickson, ARRC, to Project Team	ASAP
Perform data "gap analysis"	Project Team	
Share (ARRC) environmental work and economic analysis to date (from ongoing ARRC planning work)	ARRC to Project Team	
Consider hydrologic and sediment impacts as a result of abandoning the main runway to ARRC properties	Project Team	
Coordinate with ARRC related to ARRC release of their interest in the lease area occupied by the aprons	Project Team	
Provide Far Part 77 elevations of Alternatives 2.2 and 3.0 to ARRC	Project Team to ARRC	
Provide more detailed information on ROW costs versus construction costs as part of analysis	Project Team	
Take a closer look at floatplane access with Alternatives 2.2 and 3.0	Project Team	
Take a closer look at the Olsen property and the suggestion to acquire the property or an airspace easement to remedy the situation with the crane.	Project Team	
Convey decision of what alternatives will advance to the next phase, Environmental Documentation	Project Team to SWG	
SWG meeting	Project Team and SWG	Potentially this summer

Adjourn

The meeting concluded at approximately 3:45 pm. Thank you for your participation!