

TACOMA NARROWS AIRPORT ADVISORY COMMISSION
MEETING NOTES
MARCH 6, 2004

Members Present:

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

Others Present:

Deena Turmo, Tacoma Narrows Airport Manager
Mike Kruger, Pierce County Staff
Leslie Rowen, City of Tacoma
Cheryl Carlson, City of Tacoma Attorney
Catharine Hall, City of Tacoma
Jay Derr, Buck & Gordon
Cynthia Stewart, ADR Options Consulting, Inc.
Homer Dodge, Interested Citizen

MEETING NOTES

- The notes of February 12, 2004 were approved with one amendment. Carl Geist was not present at that meeting and his name will be removed.
- The notes of February 26, 2004 were approved as circulated.

MATERIALS BEING PREPARED

- Questions raised at previous meetings are largely addressed in briefings at this meeting. John Howell announced that information from FAA related to how they evaluate fair market value for Airport property is under preparation for a later meeting.
- New questions raised by TNAAC for which responses will be prepared at later meetings include:
 - What types of aircraft are below and above 60,000 lb.?
 - Locations of Johnson and Blanchard parcels for which testimony was received at the public meeting.

BACKGROUND BRIEFINGS

The following background briefings were given in response to TNAAC questions at previous meetings. Each topic included a handout.

- Cynthia Stewart provided information about noise metrics and FAA Part 150 Noise Compatibilities Studies.
- Jay Derr provided information clarifying prior confusion about FAA criteria for consideration of longer runway lengths. He prefaced the presentation by reminding the TNAAC that the City of Tacoma is not proposing a runway extension. TNAAC discussion included the following points:
 - Providing a runway for the largest aircraft to use fully loaded on the hottest day of the year is not something the community accepts. However, it was also noted that FAA criteria for considering runway extensions does not obligate an airport sponsor to extend the runway. Even commercial airports may not proceed with runway extensions even if the criteria may point to a need for a longer runway.
 - The fact that the Airport Master Plan can be amended approximately every five years means that the community remains uncertain about Airport runway plans until each Master Plan update is finalized. However, a current City Council cannot bind later City Councils on decisions that are made at one point in time, and the Master Plan is the method used to define what will happen at the Airport.
- Jay Derr also provided information related to consequences of Airport violation of FAA grant assurances.
- Deena Turmo provided additional details as requested about the Airport expenses and revenues.
- Mike Kruger reviewed a map showing Airport boundaries and topographic contours with lines marking the 20- and 35-foot building height restriction lines. The map portrayed very little area available for development on the west side of the Airport south of Stone Road.

Additional handouts provided at this meeting included copies of recent news articles about the Airport and TNAAC issues; and copies of written testimony received at the public hearing.

INTEREST BASED NEGOTIATIONS REFRESHER

Cynthia Stewart provided a very brief review of the interest based negotiations process with some additional information about ways that TNAAC can respond in conflict to enhance the success of the group in achieving agreement on recommendations.

GROUND RULES

John Howell led a discussion about the previously adopted preliminary ground rules. Some minor changes were made, as follows, and the ground rules were affirmed as amended.

- The ground rule related to no contact with the press was amended to clarify that it includes no letters to the editor. Ex officio members who are government officials will have occasions on which they will need to speak to the press as part of their jobs, and they will limit remarks to conveying that TNAAC is still working on its recommendations and suggesting that the press may attend TNAAC and report whatever they observe. These officials will not comment on possible recommendations until the commission completes its work, and will not make value judgments to the media about how the process is working.
- It is recognized that each TNAAC member represents a constituency with whom they will need to interact regarding TNAAC issues and process. When communicating with constituencies, TNAAC members will strive to communicate in a way that 1) helps build TNAAC trust; and 2) improves communication.

Discussion of other communication needs was deferred to the discussion of communication as an issue that needs to be addressed.

STANDARDS FOR DECISIONS

John Howell led a discussion about the previously adopted preliminary standards for decisionmaking. The following changes were made and the standards were affirmed as amended.

- Added: All participants will support the decision/recommendation.
- Deleted: reference to possible standard addressing land uses.

It was suggested that the TNAAC should begin using the standards and see how well they function. They can be amended at a later date if necessary.

ELECTION OF OFFICERS

Following discussion of issues raised related to the need for officers and the pros and cons of electing them now, TNAAC decided to not elect officers at this time. John Howell will continue to facilitate meetings. If there is a media inquiry, John will suggest the press attend TNAAC meetings and will not respond to substantive questions or make value judgments about the process. The role of spokesperson for TNAAC at the next public hearing and how TNAAC recommendations will be presented to the various

forums will be discussed again at a later date.

ISSUE IDENTIFICATION

TNAAC members identified the following issues and used a “dot voting exercise” to suggest the priority order in which they should be discussed. John Howell asked the members to consider voting for those issues that may be easiest to resolve. It was noted that after the first few issues, TNAAC will review the remaining issues and reevaluate their priority order. All issues will be discussed before TNAAC has completed its work.

# votes	Issue
9	Existence of the Airport
7	Perceived runway pavement extension
6	Reconciliation of Watland and the Gig Harbor Community Plan.
5	Development on the Airport south of Stone Road and on the west side south of Stone Road
3	Noise
3	Interim development/uses to be permitted prior to implementation of the PUD or an alternative process
2	Annexation of the Airport by a city
2	Communication between the community and the Airport
1	Airport on-site services
1	Airport Area of Influence/Overlay
1	Airport development priorities and order
1	Non-aviation uses at the Airport.
1	Airport development review and approval process
0	Jurisdictional influence over the Airport Area of Influence
0	Development on the Airport north of Stone Road
0	Economic viability of the Airport
0	PUD process
0	Distribution of sales tax generated on the Airport
0	County authority regarding the Airport
0	Buffers between Airport and off-Airport development
0	Airport and off- Airport compatibility
0	Inconsistencies between the Community Plan and the Airport
0	Airport Master Plan
0	Airport permits
0	Public access to/on Airport
0	Airport goals

ISSUE #1: EXISTENCE OF THE AIRPORT

Definition of the Issue:

Should the Airport continue or not? The community may not accept the Airport.

ISSUE #1: EXISTENCE OF THE AIRPORT	
However, FAA mandates that the Airport exist.	
Interests:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FAA compliance • Economic vibrancy for City of Tacoma • Economic vibrancy for the Peninsula • Community emergency services • Aviation facility close to pilot destinations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Residential quality of life • Viability of the regional and national air transportation system • Financial viability for Tacoma • Place for flying • Recreation • Business development
Options :	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tacoma Narrows Airport remains as is • Build a new Airport on the Peninsula • Replace Tacoma Narrows Airport in-kind somewhere else 	
Evaluation of Options :	
Option	Evaluation
Tacoma Narrows Airport remains as is	<p><i>(To be completed when following information is prepared.)</i></p> <p>Information needed that was identified at this meeting included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What criteria and process would FAA require to close and/or relocate Tacoma Narrows Airport? • FAA response to role of Tacoma Narrows Airport in the NPIAS • State and federal regulations related to surplus (selling) property • Consequences of closing the Airport: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ To whom would it be sold? ○ What would happen to existing uses? ○ What future uses would be allowed? ○ Etc.
Build a new Airport on the Peninsula	
Replace Tacoma Narrows Airport in-kind somewhere else	
Preliminary Recommendation:	
<i>(to be completed after information, described above, is presented)</i>	

ISSUE #2: PERCEIVED RUNWAY PAVEMENT EXTENSION

Definition of the Issue:

The City of Tacoma has repeatedly stated that no runway extension is planned at Tacoma Narrows Airport. However, some community members still believe that the safety area project is a precursor to a runway extension. The current City of Tacoma officials do not intend any consideration of a runway extension during the next 20 years but cannot bind future Councils. Although the Airport Master Plan is a 20-year plan, the fact that it is updated every five years or so implies to some in the community that the runway extension question may be revisited in every Plan update. Since the City did not extend the runway at any time during the long period when an extension was part of the previous Airport Master Plan, and that included a time when the City had more money available to it, there is no reason to believe that the City would proceed with a runway extension now that the Master Plan does not call for the runway extension any more, and the City is financially more burdened.

The community's concern about a possible runway extension is that it will allow more and larger aircraft. However, a runway extension per se will not necessarily lead to larger or more aircraft. An extension of the runway in its current form would not increase the load-bearing capacity of the runway, which is in itself a limit on the types of aircraft that can use the Airport.

The community needs information about the Master Plan, and Airport-community distrust needs to be addressed.

Interests:

- | | |
|--|---------------------------------|
| • Community sense of control | • Predictability |
| • City and Peninsula economic vitality | • Move forward from this issue |
| • Trust | • Quality of life for residents |
| | • FAA compliance |

Options:

- Make the Master Plan clear to the community (i.e., no runway extension is planned in the 20-year Plan horizon)
- Community education re: what else would be needed before a runway extension could happen (e.g., extensive public process)
- Make the reasons for the safety area improvement project clear to the public
- Implement the PUD process
- Make it clear to the public the various multiple processes and list all the safeguards to the community that would be required if the City of Tacoma amends the Airport Master Plan

Evaluation of Options: *(to be continued at next meeting)*

Option	Evaluation
--------	------------

ISSUE #2: PERCEIVED RUNWAY PAVEMENT EXTENSION	
---	--

	o
--	---

NEXT MEETING

The next Commission meeting will be held on March 11, 2004, at 7:30 p.m., at the Gig Harbor Civic Center.

EVALUATION	
------------	--

+	D
---	---

- | | |
|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Getting into the issues• The process and sticking to it• Patience• Public concerns are being tackled head on | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Background noise in building• Need to stay focused• Need to follow the process and not focus on solutions prematurely• City bashing |
|---|--|