

TACOMA NARROWS AIRPORT ADVISORY COMMISSION
MEETING NOTES
MARCH 11, 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 (by telephone)	Brad Pattison
Mark Hoppen	Marge Pearson
Terry Lee, ex-officio	Rob White, ex-officio
Andy Markos	Ann Whittaker

Others Present:

Mike Kruger, Pierce County Staff
Cheryl Carlson, City of Tacoma Attorney
Catharine Hall, City of Tacoma
Leslie Rowen, City of Tacoma
Jay Derr, Buck & Gordon
Cynthia Stewart, ADR Options Consulting, Inc.

MEETING NOTES
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was suggested that the March 6, 2004 meeting notes should be amended to indicate that the commission's vote to determine the priority order in which issues would be discussed was, in part, a reflection of John Howell's encouragement to choose issues that could be resolved relatively easily. The notes of March 6, 2004 were approved as amended.

ISSUE #1: EXISTENCE OF THE AIRPORT
Further consideration of this issue was deferred, pending the additional information requested at the March 6 meeting.

ISSUE #2: PERCEIVED RUNWAY PAVEMENT EXTENSION	
<i>(continued from March 6 meeting)</i>	
Evaluation of Options :	
Option & Discussion	Evaluation
<p>Make the Master Plan clear to the community (i.e., no runway extension is planned in the 20-year Plan horizon). It was clear from the public hearing that a great deal of work is needed, particularly in the Saratoga, Pt. Fosdick and Quail Run neighborhoods adjacent to the Airport. The Master Plan</p>	This option addresses the interests and meets all of the standards.

ISSUE #2: PERCEIVED RUNWAY PAVEMENT EXTENSION	
<p>and its implications are not well understood by the public. This option would initially include meetings by the Airport staff with the community to explain the Plan, focusing the discussion on the reasons for the safety area project and how much public involvement would be required to proceed with a runway extension, should the City decide to proceed with one in the future.</p> <p>It was suggested that the City hire a professional PR person to review the materials and presentation for these meetings to be sure they will be clear to the public and successfully relay the necessary information.</p> <p>It was further suggested that meetings such as these be held regularly, several times a year, on an ongoing basis.</p> <p>In addition to the initial meetings conducted by the Airport, described above, TNAAC will consider outreach and communications strategies when its recommendations are ready.</p> <p>It was suggested that for the next public hearing sponsored by TNAAC, a flyer should be mailed to every household in the vicinity of the airport. The mailing could be used to make sure that TNAAC's recommendations and issues are clear to the community before they comment.</p> <p>It was also suggested that a TNAAC presentation (slide show or power point) should precede the public testimony at the next hearing.</p>	
<p>Community education re: what else would be needed before a runway extension could happen (e.g., extensive public process)</p>	<p>This is the same as Option #1</p>
<p>Make the reasons for the safety area improvement project clear to the public</p>	<p>This is the same as Option #1</p>
<p>Implement the PUD process. It was noted that the safety area project is being constructed under a CUP, not a PUD, at the advice of Pierce County because of the delay that would occur in establishing a PUD. The PUD would provide predictability to the community.</p>	<p>This option is not relevant in this issue except to the extent it should be explained during the public meetings as part of the public process required for future airport development.</p>

ISSUE #2: PERCEIVED RUNWAY PAVEMENT EXTENSION	
Make clear to the public the various and multiple processes and list all the safeguards to the community that would be required if the City of Tacoma amends the Airport Master Plan	This is the same as Option #1
RECOMMENDATION	
<p>The options above will be combined. The Airport will sponsor community meetings during April to explain the Master Plan and safety area project, including the details discussed under Option #1. TNAAC will consider additional outreach and communication strategies when its recommendations are prepared.</p>	

ISSUE: AIRPORT DEVELOPMENT SOUTH OF STONE ROAD
<p><u>Definition of the Issue:</u></p> <p>The types of new uses and locations of those uses need to be defined for the Airport area south of Stone Road. There has been an assumption that the area south of Stone Road would be developed before any area north of Stone Road could be considered, and that there is sufficient developable land available south of Stone Road to meet development needs. However, it has become clear that due to challenging topography and the height and location constraints for buildings adjacent to a runway, that development opportunities are limited on both the east side and the west side of the airport property south of Stone Road.</p> <p>There may be some uses on the west side that haven't been previously contemplated.</p> <p>It is not clear what the Master Plan's designations of "aviation use" and "aviation reserve" mean.</p>
<p><u>Interests:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protect nearby residential areas from development impacts • Optimize the return on the public's investment at the Airport • Highest and best use on each parcel • Cost-effective, affordable development on the Airport property • Airport viability • Safety • Airport security • Compatibility of Airport with the character of other nearby parcels
<p><u>Options:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Move the restaurant off the flight line to the south end of the field • Develop the south end of the field as public area • Convert the tiedown area to hangars

ISSUE: AIRPORT DEVELOPMENT SOUTH OF STONE ROAD	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do not buy more property • Determine what the business community would want before developing • Limit uses on land with access to the runway to uses that need runway access • Add a light cargo facility • Add greater, or more visible, Airport security • Add a car rental agency • Create buffers by laying out Airport buildings specifically to do so • Consider development east of 26th • Consider landscaping to help buffer the nearby residential areas • Relocate 26th to the east to free up additional area for Airport use • Apply the principles of low impact development • Create community recreation opportunities (e.g., a path around the perimeter of the Airport) • Construct an amphitheater 	
Evaluation of Options :	
Option & Discussion	Evaluation
<p>Move the restaurant off the flight line to the southeast end of the field. By moving the restaurant, aviation space could be put to a higher (aviation) use. At the southeast end of the Airport, some of the public could walk to a restaurant, and the restaurant could take advantage of a spectacular view. This could be done by a public-private partnership, even on non-Airport land. The marketplace should establish the demand for this type of use.</p>	<p><u>Pros:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A restaurant would not require a big footprint • There could be a lot of private sector interest in this option <p><u>Cons:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The option is limited by needing to place the facility outside the RPZ and building restriction lines. • This may not be enough of a destination to attract an investor's interest • Not sure this is feasible at the south end of the field because of site development constraints (steep slopes) • Not clear what FAA's reaction would be <p><u>Questions:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact on sales tax distribution could be an issue • Compatibility with the surrounding neighborhood • May require a zoning code amendment. •

ISSUE: AIRPORT DEVELOPMENT SOUTH OF STONE ROAD	
	<p><u>Standards:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May not be safe/secure • Not sure of legality of this option.
<p>New Option: Move restaurant to the west side of the Airport</p>	<p><u>Cons:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could create more incompatibility/ conflicts with the community than the previous option
<p>Convert tiedowns to hangars. May require a zoning code amendment. This is already provided in the Master Plan.</p>	
<p>Move 26th Avenue. The portion of 26th Avenue near Stone Road and at the intersection with Stone Road could be moved as suggested by the Master Plan – or more than already contemplated by the Master Plan – to free up more developable land for the Airport.</p>	
<p><i>(to be continued at next meeting)</i></p>	

NEXT MEETING
<p>The next Commission meeting will be held on Thursday, March 25, 2004, at 7:30 p.m., at the Gig Harbor Civic Center.</p>

EVALUATION	
+	D
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Beverages • Moving through the process • Learning the process 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to go faster • Issues we have no control over • Need a better speaker phone