

TACOMA NARROWS AIRPORT ADVISORY COMMISSION  
MEETING NOTES  
April 10, 2004

Members Present:

John Howell, Facilitator	Paul McCormick
Larry Bielstein	Catherine Mitchell
Dennis Cunneen	Hugh Morgan
James DePew, PAC member	Ras Nielsen
Mark Hoppen	Brad Pattison
Terry Lee	Marge Pearson
Andy Markos, PAC member	Ann Whittaker

Others Present:

Cheryl Carlson, City of Tacoma Attorney  
Jay Derr, Buck & Gordon  
Catharine Hall, City of Tacoma  
Mike Kruger, Pierce County Staff  
Leslie Rowen, City of Tacoma

MEETING NOTES

- The notes of April 8, 2004 were circulated to committee members.

REPORT ON CONVERSATIONS WITH FAA  
REGARDING DEVELOPMENT NORTH OF STONE ROAD

Catherine Mitchell and Jay Derr provided the committee with a report on the recent meeting with FAA regarding the proposal to develop airport property north of Stone Road for non-aviation purposes, creating a village retail zone. It was reported that FAA wants to carefully examine all previous grant assurances and amendments related to the purchase of property north of Stone Road. FAA intends to create a map based on that research that will delineate what development is allowable on airport property. City staff are in the process of collecting all documents related to the original grant agreements and conducting their own review.

City staff said it is unlikely that an initial decision will be forthcoming from FAA for at least six weeks. A formal decision could take substantially longer. Based on that time frame, it was agreed that the Committee will not have an indication from FAA about its willingness to accept the village retail concept (approved at the April 8, 2004 meeting) in time for TNAAC's recommendations regarding 2004 Pierce County Comprehensive Plan amendments. Committee recommendations will be completed by the first week in May, 2004.

It was suggested that if FAA ultimately approves the village retail concept north of Stone Road that a Comprehensive Plan amendment could be proposed in the 2005 amendment cycle. In that case, the County would need a TNAAC recommendation by December 2004. It is likely that after 2005 the County will amend their Comprehensive Plan every

CONT. REPORT ON CONVERSATIONS WITH FAA

three years.

There followed a discussion about the options for how TNAAC should proceed with recommendations regarding development north of Stone Road, in light of the City of Tacoma's conversations with FAA. The Committee discussed three options for TNAAC recommendations:

- 1) Proceed with a recommendation to amend the Comprehensive Plan to allow village retail development north of Stone Road.
- 2) Recommend Comprehensive Plan amendments with regard to development south of Stone Road; describe the village retail concept approved at the April 8 meeting but state that the Committee is still conducting research on the issues regarding development north of Stone Road and is not prepared to make recommendations at this time.
- 3) Recommend Comprehensive Plan amendments with regard to development south of Stone Road; state that the Committee is exploring the option of allowing development north of Stone Road, based on several key principles. The development would:
  - A) include non-aviation uses, with a focus on retail and commercial development that would be consistent with the surrounding rural character and the high quality village retail development that is occurring in and around Gig Harbor,
  - B) create substantial buffers around the development that would a visual barrier surrounding the development, and could be used for recreation and non-motorized purposes; and
  - C) meet with the approval of the FAA.

There was considerable discussion about each option. The Committee was not able to reach consensus upon initial review of the options and agreed to move on to other agenda items and return to this discussion at the end of the meeting.

**Conclusion:** At the end of the meeting there was unanimous consensus that TNAAC should proceed with option #3.

ISSUE: USE OF PUD PROCESS FOR  
DEVELOPMENT SOUTH OF STONE ROAD

**Definition of the Issue:**

- Proposed PUD process is not even-handed. It makes requirements on the City of Tacoma that are not required of other land owners.
- The PUD process provides the Gig Harbor Peninsula community with an

**ISSUE: USE OF PUD PROCESS FOR  
DEVELOPMENT SOUTH OF STONE ROAD**

- opportunity for input on airport development plans.
- The PUD process is redundant with the airport Master Plan process.
- The proposed PUD process attempts to control issues that FAA has jurisdiction over.
- The proposed PUD process would allow the County to have input on the City’s development plans at the airport.
- The PUD process would allow for mitigation of off-site impacts
- The proposed PUD process would give people who were not involved in the creation of the airport master plan an opportunity to comment on airport development plans.
- City permitting of development at the airport would be the same whether a PUD process is used or not.

There were several questions about the nature of the essential public facility designation.

- Does the County Comprehensive Plan recognize the airport as an essential public facility?
- What is the difference between “designation” and “recognition” of the airport as an essential public facility?

**Interests:**

- Community trust in the process
- Community feels some control over the process
- The City feels that it has some control over the process
- Environmental impacts on the surrounding communities
- A predictable/definable permitting process is essential for attracting new business to the airport

**Options:**

- Proceed with PUD process for all development south of Stone Road
- Use the Comprehensive Plan amendment process, instead of a PUD process, to review and approve development in specific locations on the east side of the airport. TNAAC will define what is an allowable use within that area. The public review and comment would occur as part of the TNAAC and the County’s Comp Plan amendment process. A PUD review process would be used for any development on the west side of the airport.
- Use the process required to amend the Airport Layout Plan (ALP) as the vehicle for review and comment on airport development plans.

**Evaluation of Options**

<b>Options &amp; Discussion</b>	<b>Evaluation</b>
<p><b>Proceed with PUD Process</b> It was suggested that this option has two alternatives: a) proceed with the PUD process as originally proposed, or b) proceed with an amended PUD process that</p>	<p><u>Pros</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Allows community input</li> <li>• Familiar public process. Similar to process used for conditional use permits</li> </ul>

ISSUE: USE OF PUD PROCESS FOR DEVELOPMENT SOUTH OF STONE ROAD	
<p>creates more equity for the City of Tacoma.</p>	<p><u>Cons</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will take more time to accomplish any development</li> <li>• Level of off-site impacts set at “zero” is unattainable</li> <li>• SEPA is based on what might happen rather than on proposed development</li> <li>• Airport PUD requires more specificity than standard PUD</li> <li>• Lack of clarity about specific uses</li> </ul> <p><b>Conclusion: This option did not meet all of the standards for decision making. All parties did not support this option.</b></p>
<p><b>Use the Comprehensive Plan Amendment Process Instead of PUD</b></p> <p>The Committee identified an area or “bubble” on the east side of the airport where development will be allowed without a PUD process. That area includes all of the current airport taxiways, buildings, tie down areas, etc. and the two pieces of vacant land (south of Stone Road) on the north and south end of the airport, marked as “new hanger development area” on the map on page D.22 in the Airport Master Plan.</p> <p>The Committee also discussed allowable uses within that “bubble”. An initial list of uses consistent with the Pierce County Zoning Code (with respect to rural airports) and FAA’s definition of aeronautical activity (in Appendix 5) were discussed. Those uses include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ aircraft sales and rentals</li> <li>➤ hangers</li> <li>➤ aircraft storage (enclosed and open)</li> <li>➤ tie downs</li> <li>➤ aircraft maintenance facilities</li> <li>➤ aviation related manufacturing and fabrication</li> <li>➤ public restrooms</li> <li>➤ fueling facilities</li> </ul>	<p><u>Pros</u> (Note: some Pros are also listed as Cons)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Eliminates the requirement to go through two public processes (i.e. PUD and Comp Plan)</li> <li>• The majority of adjacent residents live on the west side and will support use of PUD process for west side development</li> <li>• Provides more certainty for the City of Tacoma</li> <li>• Any proposal for development beyond the agreed upon use would require a new comp plan amendment</li> <li>• The environmental review for the PUD process and the Comp Plan amendment process are similar</li> <li>• There is a relatively small amount of property where new development would occur</li> <li>• It will reduce the cost to the City as a result of less process</li> <li>• Environmental review process for general proposal would have to assume highest level of impacts</li> </ul> <p><u>Cons</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Could be perceived as having less public scrutiny for the development on the east side than on the west side</li> </ul>

ISSUE: USE OF PUD PROCESS FOR DEVELOPMENT SOUTH OF STONE ROAD	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ restaurants</li> <li>➤ flight schools</li> <li>➤ charter services</li> <li>➤ air couriers</li> </ul> <p>There was discussion of the public review process associated with the Comprehensive Plan amendment process. The public will have several opportunities for review and comment regarding potential development on the east side of the airport, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ TNAAC hearing</li> <li>➤ Pierce County Planning Commission hearings on comp plan amendments</li> <li>➤ City of Tacoma City Council Economic Development Committee meetings</li> <li>➤ Pierce County Council Committee hearings</li> <li>➤ Pierce County Council hearings</li> </ul> <p><b>Principle:</b> Consider the need for more public hearing opportunities and public involvement on the west side of the narrows.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Community may have perception of being excluded from public review process</li> <li>• Any proposal for development beyond the agreed upon use would require a new comp plan amendment</li> <li>• Mitigation requirements may be different for different types of uses</li> <li>• Timing of the environmental review for the Comp Plan review process could be a challenge</li> <li>• Environmental review process for general proposal would have to assume highest level of impacts</li> </ul> <p><b>Conclusion: This option meets all of the standards for decision making</b></p>
<p><b>Use ALP Process</b></p> <p>This could serve as an alternative process for public review and comment. It could also serve to recognize, and incorporate as appropriate, the Tacoma Narrows Airport Master Plan process that has already included public review and comment.</p>	<p><u>Pros</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Could speed up the development process</li> <li>• Would provide the community with another opportunity for comment</li> </ul> <p><u>Cons</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unlikely that FAA will turn over review and approval authority to the City and County</li> <li>• Could put the City of Tacoma between the interests of FAA and Pierce County</li> </ul> <p><b>Conclusion: This option did not meet all of the standards for decision making. All parties did not support this option.</b></p>

**ISSUE: WATLAND PROPOSED COMP PLAN AMENDMENT**

**Definition of the Issue:** See April 8, 2004 meeting notes.

**Interests:** See April 8, 2004 meeting notes.

**Options:** See the April 8, 2004 meeting notes.  
 It was agreed that the Watland property should be included in the proposed village retail development concept currently being explored with FAA. However, until there is approval for that development concept, the Committee agreed to recommend denial of the proposed Comprehensive Plan amendment.

**Evaluation of Options:**  
**Conclusion: This option meets all of the standards for decision making**

**NEXT STEPS**

- TNAAC asked the County and City staff to take the results of this conversation and prepare comp plan amendment text that can be reviewed by the Committee at its next meeting.

**EVALUATION**

+	D
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thanks to Rob and Mark for refining the Village Retail map to reflect discussion at the 4/8 meeting</li> <li>• Remarkable that consensus emerged</li> <li>• The City and County are beginning to talk, and listen, to one another.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would like to have coffee at meetings that begin at 9:00 a.m.</li> </ul>

**NEXT MEETING**

The next meeting is: **April 22, 2004 (Thursday), at 7:30 p.m, at the Bujacich Fire Station (not Dist Headquarters), 10302 Bujacich Drive NW.**