Aspen/Pitkin County Airport Environmental Assessment BOCC Update

October 2017
Meeting Goals

- Update BOCC on:
  - EA Public Comments
  - Public Process going forward
  - Approximate Timeline
  - Next Steps
EA Reminders

- Two Proposed Projects, and Purpose and Needs
  - Eastside Terminal and Associated Landside Improvements
  - Relocate Runway 80 feet to the West to accommodate D-III Category Aircraft

- Evaluated Through Public Process Two Terminal Design Concepts and Associated Landside Improvements

- Design would be completed in next steps

- No Commitment from Airlines Concerning Actual Aircraft Types or Flights

- Federal preemptive restrictions
Draft EA Conclusions

- **No Federally Defined Thresholds of Significance Exceeded other Than Wetlands**

- **Minimal Wetlands Displacement Due to piping of Owl Creek**
  - Will require an individual Section 404 permit issued by the US Army Corps of Engineers and will require mitigation
  - Will be applied for after detailed plans prepared for runway shift
Summary of Responses

Air Quality and Noise Comments

- Based on this evaluation, no significant noise or air quality impacts would occur as a result of the proposed project relative to federal thresholds
  - Analysis looked at reasonably foreseeable conditions and fleet mix, including larger aircraft
  - No mitigation is required, no significant impacts
  - However, there are options to include potential non-required reduction measures such as the noise wall, preconditioned air hook ups, etc. in final design that could reduce noise and GHG footprint
  - These elements would be examined during design phase
  - Additional GHG reduction measures are being examined as part of a separate process (Climate Action Plan)

- The Airport cannot restrict aircraft from flying in and out of ASE, as it is a public use airport
- Airport must meet FAA design requirements
- Proposed project does not include the changing the general aircraft arrival and departure patterns (generally arrive from the north and depart to the north)
Summary of Responses

Terminal Comments

- Most comments related to elements that will be dealt with in the design phase (sizing, concessions, expense, features, sustainability, jet bridges, walkability).

Planning, Regulation and Site Questions etc.

- Emergency preparedness
  - In terms of emergency preparedness and response, the Airport fully meets all Federal mandated staffing equipment and training requirements for any aircraft incidents.
- Question of losing commercial service is not valid/FAA should make exceptions:
  - Jet aircraft with wingspans under 95 feet being phased out of fleet mix; could retain turboprop commercial service; Based on best assumptions and coordination with aircraft manufacturers
- Comments on existing/potential intersections
  - Site plan does not include any new intersections; assumes no new intersections in the planning period
- Question on parking, transit etc.
  - Site plan includes space for retaining the same number of spots as today; Recognizes that parking is a valley wide concern that may require separate study from a local level
  - Site plan includes more initiative link to transit
- Concerns that traffic may be impacted
  - Analysis showed no significant impact relative to Level of Service at the intersections
- Concerns about light pollution
  - Lighting impacts were analyzed and found to have no significant impact; Final design will need to meet design guidelines and Highway 82 corridor requirements
Summary of Responses

Water Comments

- Comments on impact to Owl Creek
  - Owl Creek impacts will require a permit with Army Corps of Engineers and require mitigation; mitigation will be coordinated with the Corps and locally (with interested parties such as Pitkin County Open Space) to identify a project to offset impacts

Other Comments

- Aspen Airport is the economic lifeline of the community
  - Economic analysis in the EA indicated that loss of jet commercial service would result in negative socioeconomic impacts to the valley
- Request to have runway improvements completed first
  - The timing of the projects will depend largely on availability of funding
- Question on why voters are not allowed to vote on the airport expansion, as it affects small town character
  - This action requires approval of the BOCC, but does not require a direct vote by the community.
- Request for more time to comment; thought notification was inadequate
  - Notification included newspaper ads, emails to stakeholders, social media, radio
  - Comment period was 45 days, above the normal 30 day comment period
  - Two public hearings held and online comment forum for ease of commenting
Public Process/Next Steps

- Second Reading/BOCC hearing November 15
- Submit to FAA if BOCC approves
- FAA issues findings
- Solicitation and Contracting with Consulting Team
  - Program Management
  - Program Financial Feasibility
  - Design Team
  - On call Planning and Environmental
  - On call Engineering
  - On call Financial
- Submit Application for Federal Funds