

# Grove Field Environmental Assessment Advisory Committee (EAAC) Meeting #6 Summary

December 14, 2010

Meeting: 6:00 – 7:30 p.m.

## **Attendees:**

*EAAC Members:* Dave Luse, Doug Anderson, Jim Ludwig, Linda S. Busch Pfeifle, Lynn Johnston, Mike Reinhart, Pete Capell, Phil Bourquin, and Richard Hamby

*Port of Camas-Washougal:* David Ripp, Scot Walstra, and Mary Murphy

*WHPacific, Inc:* Rainse Anderson

*Corvid Consulting:* Laura Jackson

*General Public:* See attached sign-in sheet

## **Welcome and Introductions**

David Ripp and Rainse Anderson welcomed all EAAC members and the public to the meeting. The PowerPoint presentation will be posted on the Port website.

## **Project Update**

Rainse and Laura presented a status report, including work on the Environmental Assessment (EA), the ongoing public comment period, next steps in the EA process and next steps in the design process. Laura mentioned that it would take about three to six weeks after the hearing for the FAA to make an environmental finding and the EA to be finalized. The Port would adopt the final EA as the SEPA document, and issue a finding.

Rainse discussed the FAA funding process, including FAA budget and revenue cycles. Projects are funded through budgeted items and airport entitlement (about \$150,000/year). In 2011, the Port could use entitlement money to begin property acquisition and other tasks without a discretionary line item. The FAA has set aside \$1million in discretionary funds for the first year of projects at Grove Field. Rainse clarified the issue regarding 20-year obligation cycles.

## **Discussion**

One member asked if FAA could force the Port to accept a grant to remove the mobile home park. Rainse said that the FAA has decided the on-airport work is higher priority than the mobile home park.

There was some discussion regarding through-the-fence (TTF) planning and FAA's position; FAA Advisory Circulars provide examples of TTF planning.

One member asked if the tunnel alternative would require additional local funding. The FAA asked the Port to look for additional funding from other sources, but did not find any. FAA typically funds 95% of a project, with WSDOT funding 2.5% and the local airport authority funding the remaining 2.5%.

There was some discussion about the differences between B-I and A-I aircraft. Rainse mentioned that the design standards are the same for A and B aircraft. Members of the public presented differing opinions on whether general aviation (GA) is a growing or dying industry. Several Committee members spoke about GA as an industry and mentioned the Port's liability of operating an airport with known deficiencies, if a serious accident were to occur.

There was a discussion between members of the public and the Committee regarding design standards and safety standards. Rainse mentioned that FAAs design standards are based on safety history and aircraft performance and size statistics. One pilot presented his opinion on airport safety, and that it is also part of a pilot's job to determine if an airport is safe based on the conditions at the time, aircraft performance factors, and skill.

One member of the public asked about the grant process, and would an agency like City of Camas or Clark County be resisting so much if they were offered a 95% grant. Pete Capell mentioned that they have not seen grants at such a high percentage in years, but that grants the County accepts must be on their Capital Improvement Plan and have gone through a public process similar to what is going on here.

There was further discussion about the need for GA airports to train future professional pilots, and some statistics about the success of former Grove Field students. Other members of the public commented that they are not against GA, but public spending needs to be prudent, and believes that \$8 million on a GA airport is not prudent. This was countered by a Committee member who mentioned that FAA has designated this part of the National Plan of Integrated Airports System (NPIAS), and that if the FAA believes Grove Field is an important facility, we should believe them.

**Next Meeting**

January 11 will be the public hearing. Note: Due to inclement weather, the meeting was rescheduled to February 8, 2011.