

Mat-Su Joint Land Use Study

Technical Committee Meeting #2

Project: Mat-Su Joint Land Use Study

Date/Time: 10/15/08 1:00-2:00 pm

Location: National Guard Armory, Camp Denali,
Fort Richardson

Reporter: Kelly Singh, WHPacific

Participants:

Emerson Krueger, MSB PM

Diana Rigg, WHPacific

Kelly Singh, WHPacific

MAJ Malcolm Brown, AKARNG

Chuck Monie FRA-DPW

Colonel Andrew Mamrol, Alaska Air
National Guard

Valerie Payne, EAFB planner

CPT Samuel Vest, AKARNG-AVN

Meeting Summary: Emerson Krueger, Matanuska Susitna Borough project manager, opened the meeting with a welcome and thanked the participants for their time. He briefly reviewed the agenda. He stated that the MSB had contracted an economic impact study of the military bases on the borough.

Diana Rigg, WHPacific Incorporated, presented the current status of the study. She listed the people she had talked to as research for the study and summarized the results of her interviews.

- **Land Use Compatibility.** The expansion of the port, the future prison, and the railroad extension will all affect the growth of Point Mackenzie. There are concerns that there will be an increase in recreational and residential use of areas used for military training exercises.
- **Noise.** Since the MSB is the fastest growing region of the state, there are concerns that residential development will occur within high noise areas.
- **Airspace Conflicts.** Many civilians in the MSB fly small aircraft, particularly in the Big Lake/Glacier View area. One person had complained that military aircraft did not respond to calls on their radio channel.
- **Changing Military Use.** The transition to F-22 platforms could lead to an increase in noise disturbance.
- **Communication.** The public seems largely unaware of how to file complaints.
- **Nelchina Plateau.** There have been some conflicts with recreational users and low flying aircraft.

She asked the participants if there were any other issues they would like to add. No one volunteered anything else.

She then asked the participants for any ideas on how to resolve the issues. The following is a summary of the discussion.

- **Noise.** There should be a notification on plats or realtor's forms in areas beneath shared military airspace, specifying the possibility of air traffic noise. CPT Vest suggested we determine the actual number of noise complaints over the last five years.

- *Airspace Conflicts.* A public education push might be necessary. Although military flight routes are available through FAA, the public may not know or think it necessary to contact FAA or call the flight service radio station before flying small aircraft. A military-FAA liaison could be the go-to person for flight complaints. COL Mamrol said that although the military is transitioning to F-22 and C-17 aircraft, there were no plans to increase the amount of training exercises.
As for communicating via radio, there is a universal emergency channel that all pilots use, military and civilian. It was noted that [CPT Vest said this?] some training exercises prevent airmen from responding to non-emergency civilian calls on their normal frequency channel.
- *Communication.* CPT Vest said that many issues should go through the public affairs office, not an 800 number. The police should be aware of which issues they should direct to the PAO. The possibility of a borough PAO-military PAO liaison was raised, or at least an annual meeting.

Emerson then led the discussion on the revisions to the first chapter. Following is a summary of the suggested changes and comments.

Section 1.1, paragraph 1, line 6: Change “airman” to Airmen and “soldiers” to Soldiers and insert “and” between.

Section 1.3, bullet 1: Spell out Bryant **Army** Airfield

Section 1.6, Noise Issue: This section needs to be expanded to explain how each of the organizations handles noise complaints or at least amended to indicate whether there is really a problem. Some quantifiable stats would be helpful. The Air Force wants all complaints to go through their Public Affairs Office. The Army sends all complaints to the DARR. (Note: there is another section of the study that explains the procedures used today).

Section 1.6, Airspace Conflicts: The Army took exception to the discussion about private pilots, radios and communication. The discussion was very broad but there were themes:

When in training or otherwise, the Army will not respond to non-military communication unless it is an emergency communication

Most Alaska pilots do not have radios

A lot of Alaska pilots do not check NOTAMs, etc where they can find out whether the military is training and, generally, where – implication is private pilots intrude on airspace that the military has reserved for training - the go through FAA to “reserve” the airspace

Section 1.6, Communication Issue: Confirm with Amanda whether the Wasilla Air Guard base needs to be included in the study.

Section 1.6, Changing Military Use: replace “increases” with “changes”

General comment: Use “training” or “training routes” not “exercises” in the report as “exercises” means something specific to the military.

Valerie Payne wanted the chapter electronically. Diana said it would be Friday or next week.