EIA
we'll move you.
EDMONTON INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

Highway 19 Twinning and Realignment Open House: Edmonton Airports Questions and Answers from March 19, 2013

Q. EIA indicates that part of the need for the new runway is because of increased traffic due to the continued Oil Sands expansion, however it is our understanding that Fort McMurray has its own plans to become an international airport.

A. EIA is aware of Fort McMurray's plans to develop additional capacity in its airport. Forecasts for demand at EIA take this into account and also include anticipated growth in other markets. It is important for us to make sure we have the capacity in the future and the continued opportunity to capture growth.

Q. Is the location of Runway Option 3C as shown to the public on March 19, 2013 the best and only location in the 7000 acres of available airport land? Is there another option that is suitable but might cost more?

A. Runway Option 3C as shown in the open house is the best alignment that balances airport capacity and operations, community impacts, off-site constraints, cost and constructability and environmental features, and aligns with established regulations for off-site land use compatibility constraints.

Q. Is it possible to shift Runway Option 3C a half mile northeast to achieve the same results but with fewer impacts?

A. EIA is currently investigating the possibility of moving the runway to the east. An initial review suggests the runway may not be able to be moved more than 200 m to the east of the current proposed alignment since there are a number of physical constraints such as the proximity to Highway 2.

Q. Where did EIA get the money to finance the land acquisitions that have already taken place for the new airport runway?

A. To date, EIA has not made any land acquisition offers or acquired any lands for the new airport runway. We have provided preliminary information to landowners on the project.

Q. Has EIA investigated other airports with similar needs and constraints? For example, the Las Vegas airport moves 500,000 airplanes a year with a very similar configuration to the current Edmonton airport other than the fact that both runways are twinned.

A. In the airport industry there is a saying – "If you've seen one airport, you've seen one airport." Airports are the products of their unique regional environments and while we all follow basic planning principles and can learn from each other, the ways we develop and operate can be quite different. It would the same as comparing two major cities, and questioning why City A doesn't do things the same as City B.

With respect to the Las Vegas example, LAS does not compare well to EIA, as we have many different needs and constraints, including some fundamental regulatory differences (Canada vs. US) that are non-negotiable with Transport Canada. Aside from regulatory constraints, other examples include:

- LAS has four runways to our two, and extensive airside infrastructure to fully optimize their runway capacity, which is 625 000 movements per year.
- Each airport handles a different mix of aircraft (sizes, small to large), of which smaller aircraft take up more runway capacity than larger aircraft.
- Las Vegas also does not have to address challenges related to de-icing in the winter months like Edmonton.

Q. EIA speaks about productivity as the main deciding factor in where the new runway is going to go, however, the Canada Airports Act mentions community impacts as a consideration. Is EIA thinking only about the bottom line or is it willing to consider the community?

A. EIA is absolutely thinking about the community, which not only includes our immediate neighbors but also the entire region in terms of air service and air traffic growth. That is our mandate and obligation. We understand how important the twinning and alignment of Highway 19 is to the community and appreciate and will continue to consider community input as we move forward.

Through the recent Master Planning process and the Airport Vicinity Protection Area regulation implementation process in 2005-2006, we conducted extensive consultation with the public, and received little opposition to the third runway alignment that was a critical component of both efforts.

Q. It appears that if the Newark airport were flipped it would be a good example of what EIA could do with a parallel set of runways.

A. Current operations at Newark airport is in the range of approximately 400,000 movements with three runways. Their site layout is somewhat different than EIA (terminal location in particular) and includes more operational infrastructure (taxiways), which would positively support movement capacity. EWR does an exceptional job of handling the current traffic levels with their infrastructure. However EWR also has one of the worst on-time performance records of any airport in the US for the last few years, so it is not a model we are interested in pursuing.

Q. If the largest planes in the world can now land and take off at EIA, why is it necessary to build a new runway?

A. EIA is planning to build the new runway to handle *more* airplanes, not *bigger* airplanes. The issue is capacity – quantity versus size of aircraft.

Q. Why is the Airport Authority Board not meeting with the community directly to discuss this issue?

A. The role of the Airport Authority Board is to provide oversight and to approve the master plan, which was completed with public consultation, and it will continue to be involved as the project moves forward. The airport's executive team is directly responsible for the operation and the management of the airport and it is their role to meet on-one-one with the community and to work with Alberta Transportation to determine the best alignment.

Q. What will EIA do with airport land that is non-functional to the airport. Is that going to be given back to the community?

A. The land is owned by Transport Canada, therefore only the Federal Government can determine what happens with the land.

Q. Has EIA been creative in considering all options for a new runway or made decisions knowing that land is cheap and available? Berlin, for example, where additional land was unavailable, was able to construct a functional airport with some novel thinking.

A. EIA is recognized within our industry for being creative and innovative. Throughout our master planning processes (1998 and 2012), our airport design consultants thoroughly evaluated our needs and surrounding constraints to choose a runway alignment that balanced all considerations – winds, weather, off-site features, environmental, communities, and cost. They were asked to not only consider our overall environment, but also be as creative and innovative as possible in their analysis.

Q. **Why is a runway south of the existing (Runway 3A) not being considered as it seems to be a good option?**

A. There are four primary issues with Runway 3A. Firstly, it does not allow for independent operations, which means it does not provide the necessary capacity increase to substantiate the significant investment involved. Secondly, its substantial distance from the Terminal creates extensive aircraft taxi times, which would increase aircraft fuel burn and could cause significant operational delays in poor winter weather conditions. Thirdly, aircraft would have to cross the existing active runway (12/30), which is a practice strongly discouraged within our industry, and especially as a deliberate choice for future development. And finally, it puts virtually all air traffic over the City of Leduc, which would certainly have a significant noise impact to that community.

Q. Would parallel runways allow for the necessary capacity within the current confines of the airport?

A. Parallel runways spaced to have independent operations cannot be constructed in the predominant wind directions (NW) without significant changes to existing infrastructure, like moving airport road and the QE II interchange, or moving the Air Terminal Building.

Q. The EIA's current land mass is the largest of any airport in any country, why can it not come up with a solution that uses the existing land?

A. While EIA does have a sizeable land mass, its overall configuration still cannot quite accommodate our future infrastructure needs to support long term regional air service growth. What is proposed is the most sustainable option, when all factors are considered, although the third runway does extend off the existing property.

Q. If EIA is planning for a fourth runway in the future that would be built on existing airport land, why can't the third runway be placed in that location?

A. The only runway being proposed at this time is Runway 3C. This runway would provide the required capacity well beyond EIA's master plan of 2035.

Q. What is the capacity of the airport that EIA is trying to achieve?

A. Airport capacity is always planned for growth, as passenger and operational activities are expected to increase over time. From the current Master Plan (2010 to 2035), the specifications for the runway and supporting airside facilities needed to support growth until 2035 are:

- A third runway, parallel to Runway 12-30, with a length of 3530 metres, separated from 12-30 by 1525 metres, to allow independent parallel operations referred to as Runway 11-29
- Supporting taxiway system including Rapid Exit Taxiways and navigational facilities
- Expanded apron with centralized de-icing bays
- Extension of the existing Runway 12-30 to 4030 metres

Based on the capacity range of 270,000 and 317,000 airport users per year for the two runway system, the Master Plan contemplated a third runway would be required at EIA in the 2026 to 2033 time period. Under more recent forecasting, we now plan for a third runway to be required by 2025.

Q. Why is the third runway required?

A. Ensuring that an airport has operational capacity for long term growth is a fundamental component of airport planning, just like cities plan long term for residential growth to meet the needs of their residents. A third runway has been a critical component of our long-term growth plan for the last 15 years. It's been highlighted in our 1998 Master Plan, supported by the revision of the EIA Airport Vicinity Protection Area (AVPA) Regulation in 2006, and maintained in the 2012 Master Plan. Failure to plan for increasing the operational capacity of an airport can have significant impact on the availability of air service in the region which will have hurtful impacts on the regional economy.

During both Master Planning processes and the AVPA implementation, significant public consultation occurred with regard to plans, to ensure they were aligned with regional expectations.

The follow up question to "why" the runway is needed is "when" it is needed. Running out of capacity for an extended period (until a new runway can be constructed) can seriously impede the growth of air service. Establishing the trigger point for initiating development of another runway is extremely important to the overall process.

With our current and projected mix of aircraft, our practical annual capacity with the runway system is approximately 87 movements per hour, or 270,000 annual movements. Based on our current growth projections we would reach that practical annual capacity by 2025-2026. Since we must start building the runway before it is needed, construction could start as early as 2020.

Q. Why does the third runway need to be located where it is shown by EIA?

A. There are various planning aspects impacting the decision on the currently proposed runway alignment as outlined in our Master Plan:

- Operational Considerations:
  - The prevailing winds (to determine the orientation of the runway)
  - The need for simultaneous independent aircraft operations on the parallel runways
  - Aircraft ground movement patterns, to enable safe and efficient flow of aircraft on the airport
  - Aircraft not required to cross active runways
  - Suitable locations for aircraft de-icing, to address safety and environmental concerns
- Noise and Environmental Impacts:
  - Potential for significant impact to existing surrounding communities, such as residential property owners already in place, and existing and future transportation corridors (particularly significant overpasses)

    - Sensitive environmental features, such as watercourses and wildlife habitat
- Off-site Impacts:
    - Safety-related constraints, such as rail lines, highways, power lines and substations, landfills, communication towers, water bodies, and objects of significant height (both temporary and permanent)
    - Siting of landing and navigation aids, which can be constrained by off-airport features
    - Existing legislation already in place to prevent incompatible development on off-airport lands. The EIA Federal Zoning Regulation and the EIA Airport Vicinity Protection Area Regulation have already established land use constraints on both the current runways and the runway proposed in the current and previous Master Plans.
- On-airport Impacts:
    - Constructability of the runway, to enable ongoing airport operations during construction
    - Cost-effective infrastructure investment, to ensure airport financial sustainability

Other proposed runway locations were originally identified in the 1998 Master Plan, from which the current alignment was chosen based on the balance of all these factors.

Q. How does the Airport Authority purpose to:

(a) to manage and operate the airports for which it is responsible in a safe, secure and efficient manner, and

(b) to advance economic and community development by means that include promoting and encouraging improved airline and transportation service and an expanded aviation industry for the general benefit of the public in its region.

A. There are some legacy developments on airport property that can be considered interim uses (such as the gun club and race track) until the land is needed for aviation development, as designated in the Transport Canada approved EIA Land Use Plan under “Airport Reserve Protection”. Other development areas designated in the Land Use Plan (“Development”) support the long term strategic goal by providing opportunities for non-aeronautical revenue, with complementary developments (such as the golf course) enhancing the overall land use context of an international airport in a metropolitan setting.