

TACOMA NARROWS AIRPORT ADVISORY COMMISSION
MEETING NOTES
MARCH 25, 2004

Members Present:

John Howell, Facilitator	Catherine Mitchell
Larry Bielstein	Hugh Morgan
James DePew, PAC member	Ras Nielsen
Mark Hoppen	Brad Pattison
Terry Lee	Marge Pearson
Paul McCormick	Rob White

Others Present:

Chip Vincent, Pierce County Staff
Cheryl Carlson, City of Tacoma Attorney
Catharine Hall, City of Tacoma
Jay Derr, Buck & Gordon
Cynthia Stewart, ADR Options Consulting, Inc.
Joe Faherty, AOPA
Rob Wood, Gig Harbor Peninsula Resident
Julie A. Gustanski, Gig Harbor Peninsula Resident

MEETING NOTES

- The notes of March 11, 2004 were approved as circulated.

FACILITATOR'S DEBRIEF OF THE MARCH 11 MEETING

John Howell made several observations about the March 11 meeting. He noted that there had been some frustration regarding the pace of the meeting and that the group is following consensus procedures, which are different from the voting procedures established in the TNAAC ordinance. However, he felt the process has started to work and the group was using it in the way it was meant to be used (respectful of others, seeing issues from each others' perspectives, etc.). He further noted, however, that there may be some ways to speed up the process. He will be suggesting that options be grouped together under broader headings; that issues will be prioritized for discussion somewhat differently; and that application of standards will be moved more quickly henceforth.

DEBRIEF OF FLY-OVER

TNAAC members discussed their observations from flights over the Airport and surrounding neighborhoods on Saturday, March 13.

DEBRIEF OF FLY-OVER

- Flying over Wollochet Bay, was able to see the prescribed flight pattern vs the actual pattern taken by some pilots. The prescribed flight path takes planes out over the water, away from houses.
- Saw the extent of development under the airport approaches.
- There is a need for someone to contact the airport (not the tower) when something (e.g., a noise event) does happen and for airport manager to be responsive.
- It was very busy that day.
- Based on conversations with the pilots it seems that a very few aircraft cause most of the noise problems.
- Aircraft go over Paul McCormick’s house at 500 feet when there is an approach from the North and a foul weather maneuver is being used; that is very close to the homes.
- There is a lot going on for the pilots on approach, and I saw why noise is not their top issue at that time.
- Noticed the number of houses near the Airport; the Airport is hemmed in. An aircraft would have to go straight up to avoid all of them.

ISSUE: AIRPORT DEVELOPMENT SOUTH OF STONE ROAD

Definition of the Issue – See the March 11 meeting notes. **Principles were added at this meeting, as follows:**

- **Principle 1: Limit uses on land with access to the runway to uses that need runway access**
- **Principle 2: Determine what the business community would want before developing**

Interests – See the March 11 meeting notes.

Evaluation of Options (Options Regrouped):

Option & Discussion	Evaluation
<p>Option 1: Pursue development options that are aviation or airport-related uses. Examples of this option include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Move the restaurant off the flight line to the south end of the field <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Alternative wording approved by TNAAC (in place of “Move the...”): “Consider relocating the ... “ • Convert the tie down area to hangars • Add a light cargo facility • Add a car rental agency • Additional development may require 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This option is directly out of the Airport Master Plan. • The market place will drive development (e.g., car rental companies declined to start up at the Airport because there was not enough business or the building was too shabby) <p>Pros:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This option makes sense; it is an Airport • Some supporting uses would also fit in this category

ISSUE: AIRPORT DEVELOPMENT SOUTH OF STONE ROAD	
<p>greater, or more visible, Airport security</p> <p>Alternative language suggested:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maximize Airport/aviation uses • Develop the Airport fully as an Airport 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This should include both sides of the existing runway • Like uses will attract other like uses <p><u>Cons:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Light cargo already is an Airport use (it unloads into trucks); who decides when a facility is needed? • Cannot get heavy aircraft in no matter how long the runway is because of the weight bearing limits of the runway • This would create more noise, traffic • Aviation uses may not optimize the financial return from the property • Hard do achieve this when businesses don't invest there; the Master Plan calls for development financing primarily through the private sector <p>Conclusion: This option meets all of the standards for decision making</p>
<p>Option 2: Buffer the development from surrounding neighbors</p> <p>Examples of this option include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create buffers by laying out Airport buildings specifically to do so • Consider landscaping to help buffer the nearby residential areas • Apply the principles of low impact development <p>Suggested addition to this option:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do not buy more property to create a buffer • Do not develop on land that currently serves as buffer if there is consequently a need to buy land outside of the airport property lines to replace the buffer 	<p><u>Pros:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimizes environmental impacts • Development would look attractive • Low impact development principles would implement the best practices/goals • Could enhance safety (through separation of the Airport from its neighbors) <p>Note: Low impact development = the earth is not disturbed any more than necessary</p> <p><u>Cons:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is not enough information about low impact development to be prescriptive • This could add cost

ISSUE: AIRPORT DEVELOPMENT SOUTH OF STONE ROAD	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Airports have a lot of impervious surface (parking lots, etc.) • Might need additional property to do this and protect adjacent property from incompatible uses <p><u>Decision:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Put suggested alternative, “encourage application of low impact development principles when practical” in Parking Lot <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ This may not be specific enough; we need to say what we mean <p>Conclusion: This option meets all of the standards for decision making</p>
<p><u>Option 3: Create more land for development (original proposed language)</u></p> <p>Examples of this option include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider development east of 26th • Relocate 26th to the east to free up additional area for Airport use • Do not buy more property <p>Alternative language suggested:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Redevelop land closest to land currently used as an Airport • Create more land for development on the East side of the Airport • 	<p><u>Pros:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Keeps development on the Airport centered on the runway area • Uses currently undeveloped land at the Airport • Would create a focus primarily on the East side • The development focus would be in the area where there is least resistance <p><u>Cons:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land on the West side is very limited • The marketplace will drive this; it is easier on the east side; a taxiway would be needed on the West side
<p><u>Option 3 reworded: 3.A. Increase the land available for development on the East side (First amendment)</u></p> <p>Increase the land available for development on the East side and discourage the acquisition of additional property outside of the airport</p>	<p><u>Pros:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Least impact on Airport neighbors; there are fewer neighborhoods on the East side than on the West • The access road is on the East side <p><u>Cons:</u></p>

ISSUE: AIRPORT DEVELOPMENT SOUTH OF STONE ROAD	
<p>boundaries. (Consensus language)</p> <p>Note: There is land needed outside of the current airport property boundaries to fill out the RPZ on the East side; this is not included in the restriction of this Option</p> <p>This option means that if buffers are needed, use existing land within the airport property boundaries for the buffer.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fill would be needed, and it is costly • There is not a lot of land left (except that around 26th) • If additional incompatibility were created by development, buying additional land would be discouraged • If the option said “Do not buy more land”, this would be too restrictive. <p>This option meets all of the standards for decision making</p>
<p><u>Option 3 reworded:</u> 3.B. Increase the land on existing Airport property that is available for development on the West side (First amendment).</p> <p>Increase the land on existing Airport property that is available for development on the West side, but not if the development requires acquisition of additional property outside of current airport boundaries to create additional buffer.</p> <p>Note: There is land needed outside of the current airport property boundaries to fill out the RPZ on the West side; this is not included in the restriction of this Option</p>	<p><u>Pros:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could use the West side for trails and other uses that don’t compete with aviation and don’t create neighborhood impacts <p><u>Cons:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no existing access • Costly to add the fill needed for development • High neighborhood resistance; there are many neighbors • Not much land is available • Fence is needed (infrastructure is needed even for low impact uses) <p>This option meets all of the standards for decision making.</p>
<p><u>Option 4:</u> Create community/public use areas.</p> <p>Examples of this option include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop the south end of the field as a public area • Create community recreation opportunities (e.g., a path around the perimeter of the Airport) • Construct an amphitheater 	<p><u>Pros:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This would create more of a community sense of ownership and support for the Airport. • This would provide a viewing opportunity for the public. • Would be low density use. <p><u>Cons:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The development would have to

ISSUE: AIRPORT DEVELOPMENT SOUTH OF STONE ROAD	
<p>Note: The amphitheater example was withdrawn during discussion.</p>	<p>be compatible with the airport (e.g., not exceed height restrictions)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would create additional traffic, noise • Additional liability for the City • Concentration of people • High costs for fill • Difficulty to park • Access problems • Maintenance costs • Not clear what implications are for FAA grant assurances • Not clear of implications for safety <p>Conclusion: This option is not sufficiently clear to understand all of the implications. It should be put into the Parking Lot for consideration later.</p>

ISSUE: AIRPORT DEVELOPMENT NORTH OF STONE ROAD
<p><u>Definition of the Issue :</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What should Airport development be, if any? • The Gig Harbor Peninsula Community Plan prohibits development north of Stone Road except for runway safety projects. • The Airport owns 200+ acres there; no other land owner would be told they can't develop their property. This is unfair. • The area within the RPZ vs the area outside the RPZ may be different. • The East and West sides have different levels of development on adjacent property. • Should the future of the golf course parcel be included in the discussion of this topic? • It was noted that the inclusion of the adjacent Watland property in the Urban Growth Area is still undecided (i.e., it is currently not included and no decisions to include it in the UGA have yet been made).
<p><u>Interests:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimize impacts on the community • Financial viability of the Airport to support Airport operations

ISSUE: AIRPORT DEVELOPMENT NORTH OF STONE ROAD

- Compatibility with adjoining uses
- Predictability for the community and Airport users/owner
- Sense of control
- Consistent treatment of the Airport and similar adjacent properties
- Fairness

Options:

- Differentiate between property under the flight path and property that is not under the flight path
- R-10 uses
- No residences
- Light industrial
- Additional aircraft parking (in recognition of the likely conversion of aircraft parking south of Stone Road being converted to hangar space)
- Same as any other property in the same zone
- Consistent with current Comprehensive Plan policy
- Business park/light retail
- Storage facilities
- If more specific than R-10 and less compatible with nearby residences, then differentiate among different parts of the 200+ acres
- R-10, except not those types of uses that are incompatible with the Airport (i.e., no schools)
- R-10 plus Airport-dependent uses
- Medical offices
- Phased development , per PUD process (note: it was stated that this needs development)
- No Airport services until the area south of Stone Road is full
- Note: The R-10 zone is intended to support rural development; it is not intended to be more intense development
- Postal services
- Market driven
- List by exception (i.e., identify what is not allowed)

PARKING LOT

- Timing / sequencing
- Weight bearing capacity of the runway pavement
- Language around low-impact development
- Community uses – look at potential north of Stone Road and south of Stone Road
- Suggested alternative, “encourage application of low impact development principles when practical”

- Create community/public use areas.

NEXT MEETING

Representatives from the City of Tacoma and the City of Gig Harbor offered to present additional options for uses North of Stone Road at the next meeting.

In addition to the next scheduled Commission meeting on April 8, two additional meetings will be held:

- Wednesday, March 31, at 7:30 p.m., at the Gig Harbor Civic Center (possibly earlier, as determined by the facilitator)
- Saturday, April 10, exact time to be determined by the facilitator based on progress at the April 8 meeting.

EVALUATION

+	D
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Speed of the process • Acceleration of the process by grouping the options • Got to the heart of the issues • Very reasonable discussion 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>None were mentioned.</i>