

TRK Master Plan Update, Runway Feasibility Study, and Flight Procedures Public Outreach and Feedback

May 18, 2022

Executive Summary: The Truckee Tahoe Airport District (TTAD) is currently undergoing a number of studies, plans, and analyses, including an Airport Master Plan update, a feasibility study of a potential third runway at KTRK, and developing new instrument flight procedures for submission to the Federal Aviation Administration. In an ongoing effort to ensure transparency and public participation throughout these projects, TTAD has implemented several strategies to solicit public feedback.

In addition to discussions during regular TTAD Board meetings, ACT meetings, and through the airport's traditional communications channels, TTAD recently held two public meetings to introduce the initial phase of the 2015 – 2025 Master Plan update and the draft instrument flight procedures.

TTAD encouraged meeting attendance by offering two options: one meeting was held online and one meeting was held in person. The meetings were very well attended by district constituents, both non-aviators and airport users. The subjects of the third runway and flight procedures dominated the conversations, but the public also used the opportunity to ask questions and share comments on a range of airport related topics.

Virtual Meeting

Wednesday, April 20, 6:00 – 8:00pm

In-Person Open House Meeting

Tuesday, May 3, 5:30 – 9:00pm

Consultants and subject-matter experts in attendance at the meetings included representatives from Flight Tech Engineering, Mead & Hunt, HMMH, Aviatrix Communications, TTAD Board members, and TTAD staff.

Virtual Meeting

68 people participated in the online meeting on April 20. Airport Director Kevin Smith welcomed the audience, and Brad Musinski of Mead & Hunt provided details about the potential for a third runway at KTRK. The audience was then asked to move into one of two breakout rooms: Master Plan and Runway 16/34 or Instrument Flight Procedures. While Mr. Musinski and airport leadership answered questions about the runway and master plan updates, Alec Seybold from Flight Tech Engineering and airport staff

fielded questions and comments about the draft instrument flight procedures being proposed for the airport. The comments and questions received can be found in Attachment B, 4/20 General Public Comments. All staff and consultants remained until there were no more questions from the audience, and the meeting adjourned shortly after 8:00 p.m.

Recordings of the meeting, including the two breakout rooms, have been posted to the truckeetahoeairport.com website.

Open House

67 attendees provided their details on the sign-in sheet (See Attachment E), but not everyone who attended signed in. At the height of the meeting, approximately 100 people were in attendance. The level of participation was well regarded by airport staff, board members, and airport consultants.

There were no official presentations at this meeting; it was formatted as an open house, with subject-matter experts stationed around the room, ready to answer questions about specific topics: airport master plan overview, environment and noise, third runway overview, third runway flight procedures, and instrument flight procedures. All staff and consultants remained until there were no more questions from attendees, and the meeting ended at approximately 9:00 p.m. The general consensus from consultants and airport representatives was that the in-person open house was more valuable than the virtual meeting, as there were more opportunities for one-on-one conversations and to answer questions about attendees' personal relation to airport operations—questions that might not have been asked in a virtual meeting setting.

The comments and questions received can be found in Attachment C, 5/3 General Public Comments. Attendees also had the opportunity to provide written, official comments; these are found in Attachment D, 5/3 Submitted Public Comments.

Advertising and Promotion

To promote the meetings and encourage attendance, TRK staff utilized a wide variety of channels:

- Posted meeting details in the banner position and under Airport Community News on the **website**
- Posted meeting flyers in the **terminal building kiosks and bulletin boards**
- Ran a 10 day **101.5 live radio reads**
- Ran ¼ page meeting ads **Sierra Sun** weekly editions
- Posted ads on the airport **Instagram and Facebook accounts**
- **Organic social media** posts encouraging attendance
- Utilized partner channels like the **Truckee Chamber** weekly community eblast
- **Campaign E-Blasts** sent to 1,255 subscribers
- Direct personal **email invitations** to 291 Noise Reporters
- **Email** to 252 airport tenants (both hangar and commercial), flight instructors, CAP, EAA and the tower staff

When attendees signed in at the open house, they identified all of the above methods as how they heard about the meeting (see Attachment E). In other words, the wide-ranging methods to reach the community were successful, and it is recommended to continue this strategy as the master plan update continues.

Public Feedback

General public feedback was gathered at both the virtual and in-person meeting. While not official public record, the questions, comments, and concerns have been noted and are found in Attachments B and C.

Public Comments

15 written public comments were received at the May 3 meeting. 3 commentors specifically mention being in favor of further investigating the third runway concept, and 7 mention being against the idea. No public comments regarding the flight procedures were collected.

Found in Attachment D, these public comments should be considered part of the master plan public record.

Attachments

Attachment A: Sample Advertisement

Attachment B: 4/20 General Public Comments

Attachment C: 5/3 General Public Comments

Attachment D: 5/3 Submitted Public Comments

Attachment E: 5/3 Attendance Sheets

Attachment A: Sample Advertisement for Public Meetings



The Truckee Tahoe Airport District strives to be a good neighbor, and is currently working on two efforts to improve efficiency and safety and reduce aircraft impacts in the region.

Join us on April 20 to learn about the proposed new flight procedures for the airport and the ongoing analysis of a potential third runway.

Ask questions to subject-matter experts and provide your feedback on the projects.



Wednesday, April 20, 2022
6:00 – 7:30 p.m.

For info and Zoom link, visit:
truckeetahoeairport.com



Connected by more than a runway.

Attachment B: General Public Comments and Questions during Virtual Open House

April 20, 2022

Public Comments/Questions

Note: multiple bullets may be from one commenter; comments are paraphrased based on notetaker's interpretation of comments provided at meeting.

Third Runway

- With anticipated traffic on 16, the gliders land on 20, jets on 16? Wouldn't they disrupt each other?
- You didn't do enough investigation with pilots or pilots in charter operations.
- What's the difference between adding 16/34 and widening 2/20?
- I have real concern with the methodology here. We don't want to spend hundreds of thousands of dollars for a study to find that this isn't an option if there are better options.
- Pilots would rather lengthen 2/20 because of wind.
- Include more of the economic costs when evaluating alternatives.
- Is the main driver of the third runway to reduce noise?
- Recommended departure procedure on 02 is almost exactly the same as 34.
- If you have a longer runway 2/20 then climb gradients would improve on Runway 2 departure.
- Third runway is too far away for people to use.
- Consider obstacles: mountain ridge, missed approach procedure for 16. These are concerns.
- Throttling up on a missed approach generates noise.
- Third runway displaced thresholds:
- Pilots want to use the longest runway.
- Widening and lengthening 2/20 has continued pilot support, so why is this left out of the analysis?
- It's not the number of takeoffs that cause noise, it's how and when they're low over my house.
- If we have more runways, will that mean fewer aircraft or more aircraft?
- What is the usable runway with the displaced threshold?

- Air traffic control saying arrivals into 20 and dep out of 29 can happen simultaneously because they're going in different directions. This diversifies the noise so not one neighborhood is getting the full brunt of takeoffs and landings. More efficient than 16/34.
- Lengthening and widening 2/20 reduces big planes circling and I don't favor spending \$40 million on this runway.
- The mixed traffic of planes and gliders feels less safe. There's not a benefit to spreading out the traffic because you don't know where people will be. It adds a new level of complexity in the airspace when all three runways are open at once.
- Stick to the two perpendicular runways and make them as viable as possible for the most people.
- Is there an opportunity to bring in the tower and how they see the third runway operating?
- Bring in experts from FAA/NTSB about how this all will conflict.
- I am against anything that would increase aircraft traffic.

Flight Procedures

- SIGNA Departure off Runway 29 makes the most sense from a practical standpoint. There was widespread understanding that this procedure was simple, usable, and reduced the duration and miles traveled over our community. People really favored that one.
- What is proposed decision altitude (DA) to Rwy 16?
- What about a VASI or PAPI for other runways?
- In the previous presentation discussing visibility numbers for Rwy 16/34, why was the information shared in nautical miles vs statute miles?
- What will new minimums be if we upgrade with RVR sensors?
- Pilot who flies a piston aircraft questioned opposite-direction operations (ODO) that may contribute to conflicting traffic upon approach over the "truck scales."
- Glider pilot who joined from other breakout room expressed concern for glider traffic given the Rwy 16 approach and Rwy 34 departure. They stated operating off Rwy 20 "doesn't make sense." Soaring is specialized, and soaring has the right of way over a powered aircraft. Gliders and tow planes make short landings.
- How many new runways have been built at U.S. airports in the last 10 years?
- Is there an opportunity to lengthen Rwy 2/20 by 500-700 feet? This may increase operations with a lengthened runway.
- Single-engine piston aircraft pilot questioned the Rwy 16 missed approach procedure.
- What about widening and lengthening Rwy 2/20? This runway is popular today as it gets pilots out of weather.
- What could be gained by adding a new approach to existing Rwy 11/29?
- Are static flight path exhibits shown on TRK website?
- NorCal/Oakland Center directs arrivals from the west; Rwy 11 is an improved approach; Rwy 20 is the preferred approach.
- Oakland Center coordinates approach to TRK with all "feeder fixes"

- Key point is that Oakland Center is managing simultaneous arrivals/departures at smaller airports, with traffic increases and fleet mix diversity; when there is bad weather, South Lake Tahoe is impacted.
- Rwy 16/34 LPV (vertically guided approach) will benefit non-pilots, due to the following: 1,000 feet lower, prevents missed approaches, reduces noise and fuel burn, and prevents circling to another runway that may not be of sufficient length.
- Diversifying traffic: Pilatus aircraft can land on Rwy 20; business jets need to circle to land from Rwy 20 to Rwy 29 (longest runway).
- Question if night operations are available during winter, excluded from arriving at night after 5 p.m., LPV and 5,900 feet - still won't open up to night operations due to terrain and an unlighted approach.
- For the Rwy 16 approach, whose problem are we solving? What is the scenario to construct a new \$44 million runway and make it cost effective? Rwy 11/29 is used by large business jets during calm-wind conditions; during wet-runway conditions, a 5,900-foot runway is long enough and safe, especially in windy conditions. Pilatus aircraft can land on Rwy 20 into the wind.
- Adding at least 300 feet to an existing runway could be a huge improvement.

Attachment C: Public Open House General Comments May 3, 2022

Public Comments/Questions

Note: multiple bullets may be from one commenter; comments are paraphrased based on notetaker's interpretation of comments provided at meeting or collected via written notes from the commentor.

Third Runway

- Is the goal of the project [3rd runway] to increase capacity and meet future demand?
- Costly endeavor for a runway that won't work – don't use tax dollars for this futile effort.
- How much is the feasibility study costing? Too much money is being spent for small benefit of reducing noise.
- Loss of glider port for an unusable third runway is not a good idea
- Has a wind analysis been done for the 3rd runway?
- Will the third runway increase traffic or capacity?
- Why do we need a third runway?
- How will the third runway reduce noise?
- Is a third runway really financially feasible?
- How does a third runway change current arrivals and departures?
- How long will it take?
- What are the environmental requirements?
- Why don't pilots like the third runway?
- Why are we looking at a third runway now?
- Why build 16/34 if it won't be the main runway? 2/20 is still a good idea.
- Will this increase jet traffic?
- People will be landing at the same elevation as 2/20. Dangerous.
- Adding 3rd runway severely complicates airport operations, particularly on the primary runway (Runway 11/29)
- Ponderosa Meadows favors 16/34.
- 3rd runway not aligned with crosswinds
- 3rd runway removes glider port – not good
- It is not clear how a third runway actually reduces annoyance.
- One neighbor cited his 90 acres, 3 kids, goats, chickens, and his concern for new/more aircraft flyovers.
- One long-time local pilot stated he was in favor of the proposed new runway due to the LPV (Localizer Performance with Vertical Guidance) equipment.

- A nearby resident in the “flats,” an agricultural area, and had concerns about aircraft overflights.
- Prosser Lakeview continues to be heavily impacted by flight patterns which ultimately affects the quality of life for its residents. If a new runway would decrease the number of flyovers, I’d say do it. Can we limit 16 LPV to not include nighttime ops?
- The new runway is the most ridiculous proposal this airport has thought of. How about extending and widening 20/2 and saving all of us this time and pain because of 1 accident and poor piloting? This is insanity. And your format to host this discussion was piss-poor!!!
- I question if the new runway will significantly reduce noise & traffic. Pilots must choose the runway that is best for winds, length & width. Runway 29 will continue to be the most used runway. This has the appearance of the board spending money to appear they are solving a problem. – Neil Wangsgard, Pilot, Tahoe City

Displaced Thresholds

- What is purpose of Runway 11 DTH? Support Runway 11 DTH as it would minimize impacts to neighborhood immediately north of Runway 11.
- Get an Arrival 11 displaced threshold climb gradient.
- What is the reasoning for the displace threshold on Runway 11? Not a big impact?
- What is the downside to a displaced threshold?
- Seems like runway 11’s displaced threshold will help decrease noise, at lowest cost. Decrease airport traffic, especially jets.

Noise and Environment

- Jets produce CO2 which is environmentally harmful and therefore, not sustainable or undesirable at TRK
- Small aircraft are noisier and more annoying than jets
- 3rd runway creates environmental impacts and removes public open space
- It’s not fair that Tahoe Donner has little to no impacts while Prosser and other neighborhoods take the brunt of aircraft impacts. If you look at demographic data, you’ll see that the impacted neighborhoods are predominantly low to medium-income neighborhoods.
- Since the tower has been in operation, there has been a considerable decrease over Tahoe Donner which has been great. However, jets that continue to overfly Tahoe Donner remain very disruptive as they “scream” overhead.
- Where are the locations of noise complaints relative to the noise exposure/contour maps? Change of skydiving aircraft flight path? Will the new runway facilitate touch and go ops? How will the new runway help alleviate noise impacts to surrounding communities?
- Are we prioritizing noise over safety?

- How about how this affects wildlife, coyotes, frogs, the glider port, and open space? Who pays for this? DO NOT FURTHER TAX ME!

Flight Procedures

- Appreciate the effort to find new flight paths.
- I like all of them except the paths that go over my house.
- I don't understand how the new runway does anything really different from runway 02/20.
- SIGNA Departure off Runway 29 makes the most sense from a practical standpoint. There was widespread understanding that this procedure was simple, usable, and reduced the duration and miles traveled over our community. People really favored that one.
- Close in neighborhoods such as Ponderosa said almost nothing would change their exposure because of their proximity.
- Many people wanted to know how the new runway would affect the other procedures, would they go away or not be used.

Other

- Believe meeting format is inefficient – prefer forum where public comment is heard by all participants
- Why aren't you consulting pilots/airport tenants?
- It would be helpful to the public (nonpilots) if background information can be provided to provide context for the project. For example:
 - What the airport cannot control
 - What the airport can influence
 - What are the main community/airport issues
 - What programs are in place to address these issues
 - Why this study is being undertaken
- Be sure you host meetings about the other Alternatives.
- Could the airport be shut down?
- Did we do a feasibility study to change the rents?
- Why update the airport master plan?
- What alternatives are you looking at for runway 29?
- How much traffic could you move from 11 to 2 if you extended the runway to 5,000 ft?
- Look at a 29 extension going east.