

Grove Field Airport Layout Plan

Public Meeting

Wednesday, September 21, 2005
Camas High School, 26900 SE 15th Street

Meeting Summary

Attendees:

- Jim Carroll, Port Commissioner, The Port of Camas/Washougal
- Rich Gunderson, Port Commissioner, The Port of Camas/Washougal
- Alan Hargrave, Port Commissioner, The Port of Camas/Washougal
- Sheldon Tyler, Executive Director, The Port of Camas/Washougal
- Stan Allison, Manager of Aviation Operations, Washington State Department of Transportation
- Rainse Anderson, PE, Aviation Services Director, W&H Pacific
- Mary Murphy, The Port of Camas/Washougal
- Katy Brooks, The JD White Company, Inc. (JDW)
- Peter Markgraf, JDW

What follows are summary notes from the Port of Camas/Washougal public meeting regarding the Grove Field Airport Layout Plan. Approximately 160 members of the public were in the audience.

PROJECT PRESENTATION

Stan Allison Washington State Department of Transportation Aviation Operations gave a presentation with general background information on the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) and Grove Field. He included an overview of the State of Washington Aviation Operation's policy that refers all airport funding requests to first be sent to the FAA to receive funding before state aviation funds can be released. In order for Grove Field to receive funding from the FAA or the state, it must complete an Airport Layout Plan.

Rainse Anderson of W & H Pacific Consultants gave a presentation on the existing conditions and future plans for Grove Field. A copy of the PowerPoint presentation accompanying his presentation is attached.

PUBLIC COMMENT

At this point, the meeting was opened to public comments. Katy Brooks of the JD White Company, Inc. facilitated the discussion. A bulleted point below represents a summary of each speaker's comments, totaling 35 citizens. For a verbatim recording of the meeting, contact the Port of Camas-Washougal.

- The plan for Grove Field would improve safety and economic opportunity.
- Grove Field serves multiple functions, among them search and rescue, training, and as a base for aircraft.
- Larger aircraft are landing at Grove Field because of improvements is a remote possibility.
- A speaker expressed concerns about noise generated by the airport.
- A speaker stated that Grove Field should continue to act as a local airport and asked where Grove Field fit into the regional plan. The speaker further stated that there are few local pilots and expressed concerns that the best interest of the local citizens could be overlooked. The speaker emphasized that Grove Field is a neighborhood airport and should remain viable by fitting into the community. The

speaker expressed concern that new technology could allow microjets to land in quick succession at the airport even in inclement weather.

- A speaker expressed the belief that pilots should be better neighbors with regards to noise.
- A speaker stated that there is an FAA-designated noise threshold for airplanes, and there must be some way of monitoring noise at Grove Field.
- A speaker stated that the noise generated by aircraft is inconsiderate and expressed concerns over the cost of the project.
- A speaker expressed concerns about his property values if the Airport Layout Plan (ALP) were to be approved.
- A speaker wondered if all the expenses of the ALP had been considered. The speaker further wondered if the concerns of local people had been considered.
- A speaker asserted that the ALP would protect the airport as a community asset.
- A speaker expressed concern about current and future finances of the airport and requested accurate cost data. The speaker further asserted that cost data is necessary for an informed taxpayer decision.
- A speaker expressed concern about noise, potential cost overruns, the opinions of local people, and Port of Camas/Washougal conflicts of interest.
- A speaker expressed the belief that the ALP is about becoming eligible for federal money, not safety or operational demands.
- A speaker stated that the ALP is about safety, and Grove Field has never met safety requirements. The speaker further stated that Grove Field, like other public enterprises, is not a moneymaking enterprise. The speaker expressed the belief that new jets would be quieter because of technological advances.
- A speaker stated that more people will use airports in the future.
- A speaker expressed concern about airport noise early in the morning and the wide geographic area affected.
- A speaker expressed concern about noise increase having an adverse effect on property values and quality of life. The speaker wondered if property tax abatement would be granted to compensate for potential losses in property value.
- A speaker expressed concern about the plane class change from A1 to B1.
- A speaker stated that the ALP would be a bargain for increasing airport capacity when paid for by the FAA.
- A speaker contended that the ALP would increase property values and benefit the community. The speaker further stated that the ALP would increase safety, and the speaker believes that flights will increase with or without the ALP.
- A speaker stated the belief that Grove Field currently cannot meet the needs of some business, that sound abatement is possible, and that the class of aircraft allowed at GF will keep it a community airport under the ALP.
- A speaker expressed concern about noise.
- A speaker wondered about the changes in aircraft allowed under the ALP. The speaker further asserted that the ALP is about money rather than safety, expressed concern about declining property values, and wondered if stakeholders would receive fair market value for their property.

- A speaker expressed the belief that there has been improvement at Grove Field. The speaker further stated his concern about the federal government involvement in the ALP and expressed general concerns about the finances of the ALP. The speaker contended that the approach suggested by the ALP would be less safe for the mobile home park.
- A speaker expressed the belief that new technology could be deployed at small fields which could reduce noise.
- A speaker expressed the belief that safety is only considered when the FAA does a study and is otherwise ignored.
- A speaker asked how the ALP will benefit the community. The speaker also wondered why the Port of Camas/Washougal should take the federal money and what role the Port Commissioners played in the process.
- A speaker contended that the noise generated by the airport was not severe compared to other environmental noise. The speaker further expressed the belief that aircraft are safe and serve many functions.
- A speaker requested data on the safety record of Grove Field. The speaker further expressed concern about noise and believes the Port should close and sell Grove Field.
- A speaker expressed concern about the quality of life in the area if the ALP is fulfilled. The speaker further wondered if aircraft would be louder or more frequent under the ALP.
- A speaker expressed concern about the cost of the ALP and the classification change from A1 to B1.
- A speaker expressed concern about the quality of life in the area if the ALP is approved. The speaker wondered if another location would be better for Grove Field.
- A speaker expressed concern that runway length under the ALP would allow different aircraft to use the airport.
- A speaker expressed concerns about safety and wondered if the ALP could be paid for by increased property tax revenue.

This concluded the public meeting. The Commission will meet to discuss next steps at their October 3, 2005 meeting.

PORT OF CAMAS-WASHOUGAL RESPONSES TO CITIZEN QUESTIONS

Changes in Aircraft Types:

Several citizens asked whether the airport would be accommodating new types of aircraft. The proposed improvements to Grove Field will not change the type of aircraft that currently use the airport. A1 and B1 planes currently fly in and out of Grove Field. The only difference between these two categories is the approach speed, as the wingspan and weight ranges are the same. A1 aircraft have an approach speed of less than 91 knots and B1 aircraft have an approach speed of less than 121 knots. The Design Category, i.e. pavement widths/strengths and separation standards, are the same for the A1 and B1 aircraft. By relocating the Runway 25 threshold and extending the runway 350 feet the airport will be safer for the A1 and B1 aircraft. These improvements meet the FAA standards for proper Runway Safety Areas and Object Free Areas off of each runway end.

Compensation for Property Owners Adjacent to the Airport:

Some attendees expressed concern regarding compensation for their property. The Port of Camas-Washougal will compensate landowners that own property needed to complete airport improvements. If the Port approves the Airport Layout Plan and decides to become an obligated airport by receiving

Federal funding, the Port will purchase the land according to the FAA-approved Airport Layout Plan when funding is available.

Owners of properties that would need to be acquired would be per the requirements of the “Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition for Federal and Federally Assisted Programs” and would be compensated at a minimum the fair market value. Mobile home owners would also be awarded relocation expenses as provided by law the uniform act.

Safety Information:

Citizens asked if FAA reports on safety information/crashes could be provided for Grove field and other similar airports. FAA Safety reports are public information, the FAA and AOPA (Aircraft Owner and Pilot assoc.) web sites have this data available.

Funding:

Several citizens expressed concern about the cost of the proposed improvements and asked how much local citizens would fund the improvements. Several citizens also asked about appreciation in costs over the proposed 20 years of improvements, asking whether the costs provided were adjusted and accurate. The consultants hired by the state to conduct the study and estimate capital improvement costs are asked to prioritize projects and identify funding needs. The summary is included in the W & H Pacific presentation included on this web page.

No increase in taxes is being considered. All development costs would come from the FAA, State Aviation, and Port operating and tax revenues. The funding from the FAA comes from user fees generated from aviation fuel and ticket taxes. State funding comes from aviation fuel and pilot licensing fees. No Federal or State money comes from individual’s income or property taxes.

Port financial statements for 2004 and 2003 are available, and are posted on the Web site. It should be noted that general and administrative expenses that are currently allocated to the airfield would be reduced very little if the airfield were closed, as they include costs that would survive closure. They include, among other things, salaries, commissioner compensation, election expense, costs to operate and maintain the Port office building, mobile equipment, insurance for these items and others.

Zoning:

Some citizens asked if the airport would change surrounding zoning. All Port properties surrounding the airport have been rezoned to Airport, with the exception of the two former Gallas properties in the southeast corner of the airfield. The Clark County commissioners have been asked to reconsider the rezone request of last year on these two parcels. This request is independent of this FAA study

Noise and Flight Impacts:

Several citizens asked if the airport would restrict operations to reduce noise. Measuring noise includes a number of variables such as weather conditions, time of day, propeller pitch, duration and other elements. The FAA’s computer noise model utilizes a Day-Night Level (DNL) of noise that is base on the number of operations of the current and forecasted aircraft. This information is then depicted by a DNL noise contour that generally ranges from 75 DNL on the Runway area to 50/55 DNL in the Runway approach areas. The DNL is an average and can’t be compared to a single noise event (one passing plane) measured in decibels. Lengthening the runway and adding hangars may increase the number of operations at the airport. However, with advanced technologies, newer aircraft are becoming quieter.

Other Regional Airport Studies:

There was a question regarding whether other Regional Studies have or will be conducted. The State Aviation department will be conducting a State wide capacity study starting the end on the year. The study will look at the need for another airport in Clark County.