Welcome to the Aspen/Pitkin County Airport Improvements Environmental Assessment (EA) Public Meeting

Project Refresher:

Two Primary Projects:
1. **Terminal Area Improvements**: a new terminal, parking and associated projects.
2. **Runway Shift**: 80 feet to the west and widening up to 150 feet.

What is an Environmental Assessment?

- Requirement of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) to evaluate potential environmental impacts of a proposed project.
- Formal, national process based on Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations and FAA orders for how to comply with NEPA.

Meeting Goals:

- Review preliminary findings of several environmental resource categories including air quality, noise, and wetlands, among others, that were not addressed at the previous public meeting on September 29, 2016.
- Engage the community in dialogue and receive public comments on the preliminary findings.

Environmental Categories

Categories to Evaluate per FAA Order 1050.1F include:

- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Climate
- Coastal Resources
- Department of Transportation Act: Section 4(f)
- Farmlands
- Hazardous Materials, Pollution Prevention, and Solid Waste
- Historical, Architectural, Archaeological, and Cultural Resources
- Land Use
- Natural Resources and Energy Supply
- Noise and Noise-Compatible Land Use
- Socioeconomics Impacts, Environmental Justice, and Children’s Environmental Health and Safety Risks
- Visual Effects
- Water Resources (Wetlands, Floodplains and Wild and Scenic Rivers)
- Cumulative Impacts

Green highlights denote categories with preliminary environmental consequences addressed at today’s meeting; remaining categories were addressed at the previous public meeting on September 29, 2016.

- Note: in addition to the FAA-required resources, potential impacts to surface transportation were also evaluated as part of the EA.

How to Participate:

As you review the boards, there are several ways to comment:

- **Post-It Notes**
  - Do you have other comments? Please put your comments on post-it notes and place on the board in question.
- **Ask Questions**!
  - Ask anyone with a nametag for assistance.

Next Steps:

- Review Public Comments
- Release Draft EA with public comment period
- Public Hearing

Thank You for Your Participation!
Runway Improvements

Background

- **ASE currently has a 95 feet wingspan restriction in place based on a non-standard 320 foot runway to taxiway separation distance.**
- **Aircraft trends indicate that the aircraft with wingspans less than 95 feet will be phased out, with half of the U.S. fleet retired by 2021.**
  - With wingspan restrictions still in place, current air carriers would not be able to operate at ASE with future fleet.
  - **FAA will not allow another modification to standard to allow larger wingspan without ASE meeting FAA standards of 400 feet runway to taxiway separation.**
- **In order to have future Design Group-III air service at ASE, the FAA is requiring the airfield to be brought into FAA compliance for that Design Group.**

Purpose & Need

- **PURPOSE:** The purpose of this project is to meet FAA design standards, allowing ASE to keep commercial service in the long-term.
- **NEED:** The implementation of the runway reconfiguration will address the fact that the current airfield does not meet the FAA design standards for D-III aircraft due to the deficient separation distance between the runway and taxiway.

Runway Alternatives

**No Action Alternative**

- Airfield will remain “as is” operating under the 95 foot wingspan restriction.
- Air service will be reduced to turboprops; some operations will divert to business jets.

**Runway Reconfiguration Alternative**

- Airfield will be reconfigured:
  - Runway shift 80 feet west; Runway widening to 150 feet
  - Airfield brought into compliance with FAA design standards.
  - Aircraft up to 118 feet wingspan will be able to fly into ASE.
- All other alternatives in the airfield study would either not meet project purpose and need or would result in more impacts on the airport environs.
- Therefore, the minimal shift required to meet FAA design standards is the only Runway Reconfiguration Alternative brought forward into the EA (along with the No Action).
Purpose & Need

• East side improvements were recommended in the Master Plan due to:
  • Existing Terminal Area deficiencies
  • Apron issues
  • Operational issues
  • Roadway/connectivity issues

• PURPOSE: The purpose of the terminal replacement and associated east side projects is to optimize the safety and efficiency of the airport.

• NEED: The implementation of the terminal replacement and associated projects will address the following needs:
  • The existing terminal and terminal area is deficient in space with operational, safety and functional issues that do not currently meet the needs of passengers, staff and users.
  • Apron is deficient in size and currently slopes into the terminal, creating safety hazards.
  • GA Apron noise has been identified as an issue for surrounding communities and a need to mitigate this noise was identified in the Master Plan.

Terminal Alternatives

• No Action Alternative
  • Terminal will remain “as is”.
  • Existing needs of passengers and operations will continue to not be met.

• Terminal Alternatives 1 and 2
  • Terminal Alternatives assume:
    • The same disturbance footprint (entire East Side Terminal Area) for Terminal Replacement, roadway and parking improvements, noise wall and other associated projects.
    • Only one parking alternative brought forward (meeting existing number of spaces). Expansion of parking onsite through a garage or expansion of the lots was determined to not be feasible.
    • Pedestrian integration with public transit will be enhanced.
    • Two Terminal Alternatives differ in visualizations.
Air Quality

- Per requirements of the Clean Air Act, the EA will identify criteria pollutant emissions:
  - carbon monoxide (CO),
  - ozone (precursor pollutants NOx and VOC),
  - sulfur oxides (SOx),
  - particulate matter (fine and course particles - PM2.5 and PM10).
- Pitkin County area is subject to a State Implementation Plan (SIP) because the region had previous exceedances of the standard for course particulate matter (PM10).
- Air Quality in the region meets the standards (attainment) for all other criteria pollutants.

Terminal Alternatives

- Construction emissions: emissions due to the construction process.
- Operational emissions: Relative to No Action, the With Project scenario would increase emissions due to a slight increase in aircraft taxiway length.
- Conformance with the SIP: Project is expected to be de minimis* (100 tons per year).
  * de minimis emission levels are a threshold for air emissions caused by a federally funded project for an area that does not meet the standards.

Runway Alternatives

- Construction emissions: emissions due to the construction process.
- Operational emissions: Relative to No Action, the With Project scenario would increase emissions due to additional passengers and larger aircraft.
- Conformance with the SIP: Project is expected to be de minimis (100 tons per year).

Biological Resources

- All proposed improvements are located primarily on pre-disturbed ground.
- No listed endangered, threatened, or special status species are commonly found within the survey area.
- The United States Fish & Wildlife Service (USFWS) concurred with the EA assessment of no impacts and sent a letter of “no concerns.”
- With the piping of a section of Owl Creek (see Water Resources board) animals that once inhabited the area may move downstream or to another riparian system.

Climate

- Consuming fossil fuels/energy has been shown to contribute to climate change.
- The project is expected to change the quantity of energy consumed by airport facilities and airport activity.
- The EA will quantify greenhouse gas emissions from construction and operation of the project.

Runway Alternative

- Runway improvements are expected to increase aircraft-related energy consumption due to the larger aircraft and more passengers being served.

Terminal Alternatives

- Terminal facility-related emissions per square footage are expected to decrease.
- Slight increase in taxi distance associated with terminal improvements would result in an increase in aircraft emissions.
Noise

- Overview
  - 65 DNL noise contours were generated for existing (2015) and future (2023 and 2028) conditions for the No Action and Development Alternatives. Additionally, noise was modeled for the out year (2033) to show noise after five years of project implementation.
  - DNL (day-night average sound level) is the noise metric used for environmental analysis. DNL is the average noise level over a 24-hour period.
  - Noise between the hours of 10pm and 7am is artificially increased by 10 dB to take into account the increased sensitivity to noise during this period.
  - Noise contours are a series of superimposed lines that represent various DNL levels used to assess the relative aircraft noise exposure levels of different project alternatives.
  - Per FAA regulations, the threshold of significance for noise is an increase in noise by 1.5 decibels (dB) or more for a noise-sensitive area at the 65 DNL noise contour or higher.

Noise: Existing (2015)

2015 represents the existing/baseline year for noise analysis.
- There are no noise-sensitive land uses located within the existing 65 DNL contour.

Noise Walls

- Analysis for the noise walls was conducted using the Lmax metric, a single event noise metric.
- Goal is to reduce noise levels by 5 dB.
- The purpose of a noise wall is to mitigate for aircraft ground operations (including running auxiliary power units when the aircraft engines are off).
**Noise: Future (2023)**

2023 represents the opening year of the terminal.

- The 2023 DNL contour represents the first year of the completed terminal. This contour represents both the No Action Terminal and With Project Terminal Alternatives since they would be the same (no changes in operations or fleet mix).

**Noise: Future (2028)**

2028 represents the first year of operation for the runway.

- **No Action:**
  - The No Action Alternatives would result in a change in noise due to a change in fleet mix over time. (Note that this contour represents the No Action Runway/With Project Terminal as well, since the terminal project would not result in a change in operations).

- **With Project:**
  - The first year of implementation assumes a phase-in of regional jets with a wingspan greater than 95 feet.
2033 Out Year represents five-years hence for operation with the runway

• **No Action:**
  - The No Action Alternatives would result in a change in noise due to a change in fleet mix over time. (Note that this contour represents the No Action Runway/With Project Terminal as well, since the terminal project would not result in a change in operations).

• **With Project:**
  - The Out Year condition assumes a general change in fleet mix over time as older aircraft are retired, the business jet fleet is all Stage 3, and all CRJ-700 aircraft would be phased out.

---

**Noise: What if Scenario**

The What If Scenario discloses potential effects that might arise if the project induced enplanements or resulted in additional city destinations. Therefore, the What If Scenario assumes a high load factor.
Land Use

- Aviation-related land use planning is integral to safe, sustainable operations. There are no noise-sensitive land uses within the 65 DNL contour.
- The proposed improvements would not result in the disruption of any communities, the relocation of residences or businesses, or result in any changes to existing or planned land uses or zoning designations.

Surface Transportation

Vehicle Ground Movements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vehicle Type</th>
<th>% of Passengers</th>
<th>Average Passengers Per Vehicle</th>
<th>2015 Actual</th>
<th>2023 No Action</th>
<th>2028 Runway First Year of Implementation</th>
<th>2028 Runway Out Year</th>
<th>2033 What If Scenario Runway Out Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rental Vehicles</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>32,578</td>
<td>36,109</td>
<td>41,310</td>
<td>46,488</td>
<td>76,492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Vehicles</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>52,300</td>
<td>57,970</td>
<td>66,638</td>
<td>74,631</td>
<td>122,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Commercial Vehicles</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>93,088</td>
<td>103,180</td>
<td>118,040</td>
<td>132,835</td>
<td>218,572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>177,965</td>
<td>200,531</td>
<td>225,668</td>
<td>253,954</td>
<td>417,864</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• The breakdown in passengers by vehicle type (based on a 2009 curbfront survey) was applied to the forecasts of passengers to project the number of vehicle ground movements that would occur under various passenger enplanement scenarios.
• Ground vehicle movements each represent a roundtrip vehicle movement, which is a trip to the airport to drop-off the passenger and a trip from the airport back to the vehicles origin.

Minor modifications to surface traffic routing at the airport could occur with implementation of the terminal improvements. However, there would be no changes to access points.

The proposed projects would not cause any Pitkin County arterials or any Colorado State Department of Transportation (CDOT), City of Aspen or City of Snowmass intersections to change from acceptable to deficient levels of service.

Generalized Land Use Map

Terminal Site Plan 1: The Ridge.

Terminal Site Plan 2: The Pavilion.
Environmental Resources

Water Resources

- Water Resources in Survey Area (area surveyed by certified specialists):
  - Owl Creek
  - Owl Creek 100 Year Floodplain
  - Three wetlands
  - Two Tributaries to Owl Creek
  - Four Ditches

- Note that only those resources in the Study Area (proposed disturbance area for improvements) were evaluated for potential impacts

- The Terminal Alternatives would not have any significant impacts on water quality and no impacts to wetlands or non-wetlands.

- The Runway Alternative would require the piping of 1,670 linear feet of Owl Creek and would result in 1.5 acres of riparian area impact, which is associated with the 100-year floodplain of the creek. Piping of the creek would decrease sedimentation and wildlife hazards on the airfield.

- Coordination with US Army Corps of Engineers is ongoing.

Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative impacts are defined as “the impact on the environment which results from the incremental impact of the action when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions regardless of what agency or person undertakes such other actions.”

- The proposed improvements would not result in an adverse impact to land use compatibility, noise, or other environmental resources, aside from wetlands.

- The piping of Owl Creek is viewed as beneficial from the standpoint that sedimentation and wildlife hazards would be reduced. In addition, piping of Owl Creek would reduce evaporation and is of benefit in continuing drought conditions in the arid west. Because the purpose and need of the projects are to address safety requirements, and are not directed towards increasing capacity, cumulative impacts to water resources such as increased development near the Airport are unlikely to occur.

- The proposed improvements would not significantly combine cumulatively with other past, present, or reasonably foreseeable future actions.
Environmental Resources

Socioeconomic Conditions

Overview

- Socioeconomic indicators provide background for understanding social and economic development in an area. These indicators serve as a basis for assessment of potential socioeconomic impacts.

- For evaluation in the EA, the area of development includes:
  - Aspen
  - Snowmass Village
  - Pitkin County
  - Western Slope
  - Colorado

- The socioeconomic indicators evaluated include:
  - Population
  - Income
  - Employment
  - Tax Revenue
  - Tourism
  - Lodging

- No Action: The No Action Alternative would result in a reduction in enplanements/resort visitors (compared to the With Project scenario), but would increase operations of turboprops (only in out years).

- With Project: The proposed improvements would increase enplanements/resort visitors similar to what would occur under current fleet mix (status quo). (Note that this scenario reflects the FAA-approved forecast, and is reasonably foreseeable.)

- What-if Scenario: What-if scenario would result in an increase in enplanements/resort visitors that could occur from combined factors of greater aircraft capacity and potential increase in lodging capacity (growing RBO market). (Note that this scenario is not an FAA-approved forecast, and is not reasonably foreseeable.)

Population

- Annual growth rates in Aspen (1.3%) and Pitkin County (0.8%) are less than the 2% objective discussed in past planning documents.

- The State Demography Office population forecast for Pitkin County assumes that growth will continue at 2% or less through 2035.

Income

- While median household income is relatively high, the cost of housing, health care and other expenses makes families more vulnerable to changes in the economy.

Household Income Estimate (2015)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Income Level</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Household</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Household</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less than $20,000</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$20,000 to $24,999</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$25,000 to $29,999</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$30,000 to $49,999</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$50,000 to $69,999</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$70,000 to $99,999</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$100,000 to $139,999</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$140,000 or more</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Households: 7530

Median Household Income: $71,194

Median Household Income: $71,194

Source: US Census American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates

Percent Owners/Renters Spending More Than 35% of Income on Housing Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geographic Area</th>
<th>Mortgage Owners</th>
<th>Renters-Occupied Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Estimate (%)</td>
<td>Statewide Rank (of 44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pitkin County</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eagle County</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summit County</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montrose County</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: US Census American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates

www.pitkincountyconnect.com
www.aspenairport.com

Add to the conversation online:
Environmental Resources

Socioeconomic Conditions

Employment

- Sectors most impacted by tourism constitute 62.5% of total jobs in the County.
- Accommodations and food services make up 33.8% of total jobs.
- Overall economy more than $610,000,000.

Tax Revenue

- Retail sales show steady increase in recent years despite drop in total population (visitors plus residents) due to loss of hotel units in Aspen.
- Projections continue to show an increase in retail sales tax revenue.

Tourism

- Skier visits relatively flat but generally increasing since recession.
- WRNF visitation increased substantially with greatest growth occurring during summer season.
- Tourism economy generally stable and growing.

- Retail sales show steady increase in recent years despite drop in total population (visitors plus residents) due to loss of hotel units in Aspen.
- Projections continue to show an increase in retail sales tax revenue.

- Skier visits relatively flat but generally increasing since recession.
- WRNF visitation increased substantially with greatest growth occurring during summer season.
- Tourism economy generally stable and growing.
Environmental Resources

Socioeconomic Conditions

Lodging (Traditional Lodge Units)
- Traditional lodging inventory has seen a slight reduction since 2009.
- Economy lodge rooms have been identified as the most underserved segment of the current inventory.
- While annual and peak-season occupancy have increased in recent years the market has room to accommodate additional visitors.

Lodging (RBO Market)
- RBO market very dynamic and growing.
- Over 200 units added to RBO inventory in Aspen/Snowmass Village since May of 2015 (inventory at 994 as of November, 2016).
- Occupancy rate of RBO units is rising with peak occupancy occurring during summer.
- Currently no efforts to regulate the number of RBO units by local jurisdictions.

Economic Benefits of Project (Runway)

Potential New Upvalley Lodging Guests (Annual)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>New Units (Runway @ Terminal)</th>
<th>New Units (Runway @ Project)</th>
<th>Aspen Snowmass Traditional Market</th>
<th>HomeAway</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Action</td>
<td>25,402</td>
<td>25,402</td>
<td>53,520</td>
<td>53,520</td>
<td>53,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Project</td>
<td>54,759</td>
<td>54,759</td>
<td>54,759</td>
<td>54,759</td>
<td>54,759</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Potential New Visitors (Annual)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Reduction w/o Runway Project</th>
<th>Reduction w/ Runway Project</th>
<th>Visitors A - 2028</th>
<th>Visitors A - 2033</th>
<th>Visitors A - 2033</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Action</td>
<td>26,812</td>
<td>26,812</td>
<td>53,520</td>
<td>53,520</td>
<td>53,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Project</td>
<td>53,520</td>
<td>53,520</td>
<td>53,520</td>
<td>53,520</td>
<td>53,520</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Economic Benefits of New Visitors (Annual)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Action</td>
<td>$110,707,370.39</td>
<td>$214,786,038.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Project</td>
<td>$214,786,038.41</td>
<td>$429,572,076.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources:
- TGMC, LLC.
- Source: TMC, LLC.