

Grove Field Airport Environmental Assessment

Public Hearing

February 8, 2011

Summary Report

The Port of Camas-Washougal held the public hearing for the Grove Field Airport Environmental Assessment project on Tuesday, February 8, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. at the Port of Camas-Washougal Offices, located at 24 South A Street in Washougal, WA. Forty-four people signed in at the meeting. The purpose of the meeting was to provide the Port Commission with an overview of the Grove Field Airport Environmental Assessment process and hear public testimony regarding the document. Citizens were invited to provide oral testimony or written comments on the draft Environmental Assessment.

Outreach

Citizens were invited to attend the Grove Field Airport Environmental Assessment Public Hearing through a number of outreach campaigns, which included:

- Website announcement on project webpage on the Port of Camas-Washougal website at www.portcw.com
- Legal Notices published 2 weeks before the date of the event in the Columbian and Post-Record Newspapers
- E-mail and regular mail distribution to the Port's interested parties contact list.

Meeting Format

After a welcome by Port Executive Director, David Ripp, Rainse Anderson from WHPacific gave a PowerPoint presentation providing information about the purpose and background of the project and each of the alternatives that were considered. Consultant staff were on hand to answer questions from the Port Commissioners and to collect comments from both the Commission and the public. No decisions were made as part of this meeting.

Presentation summary:

The Environmental Assessment process has been underway for a little over two years and followed the Airport Layout Plan which started back in 2005. Since that time an Environmental Assessment Advisory Committee was established and met six times over the course of the project to help guide the project. The overall project purpose was to conduct an environmental assessment. Since Grove Field is part of the National Plan of Integrated Airport Systems (NPIAS), it is eligible for funding under the Airport Improvement Program (AIP). These funds can be used for both capital projects and maintenance projects that are eligible under the FAA guidelines.

Because Grove Field was not an Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) obligated airport and not taking FAA funds, the Port initiated the process of developing the Airport Layout Plan (ALP) and then continued on with the environmental assessment.

The state of Washington has declared Grove Field as an essential public facility due to its role as a general aviation airport and economic benefit to Clark County. There are nine individuals that do

conduct business at the airport such as mechanics and flight training. There are three individuals that use the airport as part of their business.

The Airport Layout Plan, identified specific design criteria deficiencies for an Airport Reference Code (ARC) B-I (small) Airport. B refers to the approach speed, which is less than 121 knots, and I refers to the wing span of 49. That identifies essentially the type of aircraft that utilize the airport, such as a Cessna 150, 172, 421. It's one of the two smallest categories within the FAA classification.

The identified deficiencies for this type of airport are eligible for funding. Once the Port becomes an obligated airport, it means the Port will agree to the grant assurances that are outlined by the FAA. The EA was undertaken to assess the environmental impact of the proposed improvements needed to correct deficiencies, and those were outlined in the Airport Layout Plan that was completed and signed off in 2007. Grants were accepted from the FAA and WSDOT to prepare the EA; however, it is important to note the FAA understands the Port would not become obligated by taking those funds at that time.

One of the first things that needed to be addressed as part of developing the EA was to establish the purpose and need for the project. The Environmental Assessment Advisory Committee assisted in outlining the project purpose and need and ultimately identified the purpose as being to bring the airport into compliance with FAA design standards for the airport's existing ARC of A-I (small) and future ARC of B-I (small) aircraft; those that are generally using the airport. The design standards for both the A-I and B-I are the same. The project need was identified as the need to maintain the airport as an essential public facility and economic resource to eastern Clark County.

Each alternative reviewed was weighed against this project purpose and need to determine whether or not these actions would meet the purpose and need. The existing conditions were identified, as well as the design standards that the FAA has established for this category of airport. In every case Grove Field is deficient, whether it's runway width of 40 feet versus 60 feet length, including all the other safety areas or object-free areas.

These design standards developed by the FAA are intended to maintain the safety of airports.

The alternatives being considered include:

- Delp Road construction, whether it's a tunnel, relocation, or realignment.
- Relocate the runway to meet the runway/taxiway centerline separation standards
- Widen and extend the runway to 60 feet by 3,070 feet
- Construct a southern taxiway
- Install medium intensity runway lights
- Grading, drainage, and ancillary improvements
- Property acquisitions for Runway 7 runway protection zone
- Runway protection zone clearance
- Wetland mitigation as necessary

As part of drafting the environmental assessment, about 20 different categories within the NEPA guidelines were analyzed as well as several different alternatives for the airport. Eight alternatives were initially considered, but were narrowed to one Preferred Alternative after weighing them against the purpose and need with the assistance of the Environmental Assessment Advisory Committee. This alternative included the minimum runway length, width and alignment, and included tunneling Delp Road. Two additional build alternatives that showed alternate dispositions of Delp Road were also evaluated and a no-build option was included as part of the draft environmental assessment.

The EA looked at the five items that had some type of impact, and some of them were short term during construction and others could be more long term. The biotic resources and noise would be those that would be long term. The air quality, construction and water quality would be short term during construction.

Alternatives for Delp Road include:

- Alternative 5: Realigning Delp Road around the end of the extended runway with a small amount of right-of-way acquisition on the south end and on the north end. Initially, this alignment didn't have a 150-foot curve; the County's minimum standard. This was changed to meet the County requirement while at the same time keeping the road realignment on as much of Airport property and Port property as possible.
- Alternative 6: Delp Road starts out in the south on Port property and then heads up to the north. This alternative requires property acquisition of some residences.
- The Sponsor's Preferred Alternative is the 400' tunnel. This option could present some driveway impacts.
- Relocation involved looking at several items, such as property acquisition, horizontal curves, limitations on future road actions and maintenance costs.

Maintenance costs include:

- 20-year maintenance costs for the no-build, approximately \$900,000. That would be all be Port funded if the Port decides not to become obligated or go after both FAA and WSDOT funds, and so that's over a 20-year period of about \$45,000 per year in maintenance cost.
- \$100,000, \$111,000 and \$91,000, for Airport and roadway maintenance for Alternatives 5, 6 and the Sponsor's Preferred Alternative, respectively.
- Other maintenance needed at the airport; which could be funded through the FAA with their non-primary entitlement money between the three alternatives.
- The Port costs for their share for the three alternatives, \$157,000 for Alternative 5, \$171,000 for 6, and then \$236,000 for the Sponsor's Preferred Alternative.

WSDOT and FAA funds are user tax or user based fees. They're not taxes that come out of property, sales, or income tax. This money is generated when you fly, buy gas, etc.

Public Outreach Overview:

Over the last two and a half years the project team has developed a project website with information, distributed several media releases and mailings, held two open houses and six Environmental Assessment Advisory Committee meetings. Public input gathered at these meetings has helped guide the process. Input has ranged from the Airport serving as an essential public facility; serving for emergencies such as Life Flight and the Forest Service. The Airport is one of the few airports along the Columbia located above the flood plain; so in a national emergency it would be available. All of the input received was factored into the Environmental Assessment document. The public outreach process also included five Port Commission briefings and a public review of the draft Environmental Assessment document. This process will culminate with the public hearing held this evening. The Airport Layout Plan process also included a robust public outreach process. Approximately 27 people took the time to write e-mails, letters so far in response to the draft Environmental Assessment. These, in addition to those collected during the public hearing, will be summarized and will shape the final EA. Comments collected will be sent to the FAA and if there are some significant questions or comments, the FAA may request some changes to the EA before the final document is submitted.

Next Steps:

The next step is what is called the environmental finding phase. After submitting the document to the FAA, the FAA will issue their environmental finding; which is expected to be a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI). A State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) checklist will be prepared and issued. This is anticipated to take two-months.

Next Steps for project development, if the Port so chooses to move forward, would be to meet with the FAA and WSDOT and discuss the preferred alternative, funding and phasing and then moving forward with an application and accepting a grant offer to become an obligated airport. Project completion would likely be done in phases, such as property acquisition, obstruction removal, Delp Road construction and then airport improvements.

Port Commission Discussion

The Port Commission discussed the following questions and concerns amongst themselves and with the WHPacific staff regarding the draft Environmental Assessment document:

Commissioner Ward noted that a majority of the work was already underway when he joined the Commission three years ago. He inquired about the FAA's guidelines on the process, the requirement to assess three factors and as well as the request for public comment on those same three factors: 1) Environmental; 2) the economic impact; and 3) the social impact. Commissioner Ward indicated his concern that it seems like the economic impacts and the social impacts are equally as important to the environmental impacts. He said the draft EA does a superb job of really expounding on the environmental impacts, but seems to ignore the economic and social impacts.

Rainse Anderson replied that the social and economic impacts were not ignored as part of the study process. He explained that the social impacts of a project explore things such as whether or not residents will be displaced or relocated, whether a lot of property will need to be purchased, etc. He went on to describe how very minimal impacts such as this have been identified during the study. In the no-build alternative, there is obviously no change. In Alternative 5 where the road comes closer to two residences, one on each end, and then on Alternative 6 it came close to three residences, so, again, it was not a large social impact considering the FAA's threshold.

Laura Jackson added that pretty much covers the social impacts and said that the FAA's threshold criteria basically don't really take into account whether you're in a really rural, small community like Camas or whether you're in a more metropolitan area. She said that by the FAA's criteria, whether we're affecting one, two or three properties, it's really considered to be insignificant.

Commissioner Ward inquired whether the social implications relate to the number of people.

Laura explained that it's primarily residential relocations or business relocations that are measured; something that would "tear apart the fabric of the community."

Commissioner Ward asked if the economics would be addressed from a standpoint of capital budgeting.

Rainse responded by saying that was addressed a little in the beginning of the presentation, and it relates to the businesses that are onsite and the potential growth in businesses, such as if a Fixed Base Operator (FBO) came into the airport. Rainse explained that this would create a positive impact to the airport and to the financial well-being of the airport and the cash flow for the Port. He

said that with good facilities, a good FBO could generate revenue there and provide all-around services to pilots.

Laura added that is what the FAA is looking for from an economic development standpoint. She also said that in the ALP study it was determined \$1.5 million was the potential for increased revenues from land leases and from businesses relocating at the airport. This is the type of information the FAA is looking for as part of the assessment. And, conversely, if these kinds of improvements don't happen, or if businesses that are already there may leave, a negative impact would be identified.

Commissioner Ward asked if there was data that backed up the \$1.5 million figure.

Rainse replied yes, there was data to back up that figure.

Commissioner Lampton asked what time period did this assessment cover.

Rainse replied that the data was republished in the 2009 study, which was derived from information published by WSDOT in 2002. He added that since the numbers came from 2002, the figure may even be a little on the low side.

Commissioner Lampton inquired if this is intended to be an annual impact.

Rainse replied that yes, it was an annual impact.

Commissioner Ward requested a copy of the economic impact information.

David Ripp said that this information is being updated at this time.

Commissioner Lampton said that there was no hurry to get this information.

Commissioner Ward asked if we are talking about an airport that's suitable for A-I and B-I aircraft. He said some of us can visualize this and he thought that we talked about an airport that might accommodate business class aircraft. He asked what scale of business class aircraft are we referring to.

Rainse explained that a business charter airplane could take four people in a B-I aircraft for example or a B-II aircraft for example, such as a King Air or a Cessna 421. He added that these sort of situations lead into plane ownerships where people start buying fractional ownerships of an aircraft. This is somewhat larger aircraft that are in these categories, small jets and those type of aircraft that are more referred to as business category that fit more like 10 or 12 people in an aircraft. These type of planes would not fly out of Grove Field. These types of planes would be flying out of Troutdale, Portland, or Hillsboro.

Commissioner Ward asked that if at some point it would be conceivable that the Port might decide that is the kind of aircraft that we want at Grove Field, and if so, would there be a need in the future to lengthen the runway even further to accommodate those aircraft?

Rainse replied that the Port is very constrained on this site, and the constraints to the west is that it drops off over 100 feet down to farm land. The runway will already be taken just about as far as we can take it right now going to the west. And then going to the east, the state highway constrains

things as well. The runway will be moved as close to the state highway or as far away from the state highway as possible to make the appropriate buffers and safety.

Commissioner Ward confirmed that the bottom line is that with the improvements that have been designed, the aircraft that can use the field are always going to contain the A-I and the B-I designations?

Rainse confirmed this was correct.

Commissioner Macrae-Smith asked to go back and review the next steps. And asked if a timeline could be identified as part of the process.

Rainse explained that the timeline is really up to the Port and how they choose to proceed. For example, the Port needs to initiate many of the steps, such as scheduling a meeting with the FAA to discuss the alternatives after determining the FONSI. Also, in regards to the funding and the phasing, that would be totally up to the Port. He added that in regards to the first item, obtaining the grant, funds wouldn't be available until early 2012. Rainse explained that the FAA will likely say to continue on with design and with property acquisition in the meantime. He said that because Grove Field is a NPIAS airport, by federal law the FAA is required to have set aside \$150,000 non-primary entitlement money every year that the Port can keep for up to four years. This means there is approximately \$600,000 basically sitting there, waiting to be used, and if you don't use it by a certain period, you lose it. The other thing the Port could choose to do is loan it to another airport.

Commissioner Ward inquired how much interest can we charge?

Rainse replied zero interest can be charged.

Commissioner Ward confirmed June would be the earliest the Port could choose to meet with the FAA.

Rainse replied that would probably be a good time-frame to contact them.

David inquired if this was it would take about two months until their determination?

Rainse said that is correct.

Commissioner Ward inquired about how much administrative time or level of effort was required for future steps, such as grant administration and construction management.

Rainse replied that it depends on how much the actual organization wants to take on themselves, because as a consultant, we do everything from help write the grant applications to administering and keeping track of the grants, putting in the pay requests, basically filling out all the forms and sending them in for the Port's signature. Rainse said there is a lot that the Port could choose to have the consultant do or there's a lot the Port can do. It will depend on how much staff time is available to undertake the grant management.

Commissioner Ward noted that the Port has great staff, but asked if necessary, this work can be offloaded on the consultant and that's part of the capital costs for the project?

Rainse confirmed that these costs are eligible for reimbursement.

Commissioner Ward said, Excellent. Good to know.

Commissioner Macrae-Smith said that the next thing he was concerned about is the “Through-the-Fence” thing, because it says the Port will tender into an agreement, with the FAA along with the TSA.

Rainse said that this was correct, the agreement would be with the FAA and the TSA.

Commissioner Macrae-Smith asked how they would sit down with the north side pilots and work out any kind of an agreement. He asked where they would start. He added that it makes no sense to him.

Rainse said that this is a bit of a moving target right now, because the FAA recently came out with some pretty strong language. He said that some people are pushing back and getting congress involved. Now there has been draft rule making and a variety of things have started to come out of it. Rainse said that in his opinion this process is healthy and good, that shouldn't result in a one-size-fits-all regulation. Rainse said that the FAA is asking you to acknowledge that the Port has Through-the-Fence operations and that you're willing to sit down with your neighbors, which the Port has already started doing.

Commissioner Macrae-Smith asked if that really matters when the FAA hasn't issued its final order yet?

Rainse said that it doesn't matter right now. It will matter sometime when they're deciding whether to issue a grant. When they get to that point that they want to see that you've started the discussions on Through-the-Fence. Rainse said that there's no plan out there; there's very few airports that have submitted plans.

Commissioner Macrae-Smith asked what happens to the project if agreement can't be reached.

Rainse replied that the FAA has said that they're not looking for a signed agreement. They're looking for some movement towards getting a Through-the-Fence agreement. And they also know that they have no jurisdiction to say the Port of Camas-Washougal has to go enforce something on a private citizen relating to an agreement that Port has.

Commissioner Macrae-Smith said that somewhere in the Port's files there is a letter from one of those north side property owners that says they don't wish to participate in that agreement. What does that do to the agreement?

Rainse replied that because the Port has a specific agreement with them, the FAA has to honor that, and the Port can say there are four out of five or three out of six or whatever the final number is that agree. Rainse added that it will be very important to discuss the Through the Fence Plan at that first meeting with the FAA in order to get some clarity.

Commissioner Lampton said that he had a couple concerns and one of them was that we haven't really talked about the mobile home park and that's clearly within that runway protection zone.

Rainse replied that he thought he mentioned at the last meeting that as the Airport Layout Plan's

Capital Improvement Program was developed, it was identified as one of the Port Commission's number one priority to look at how to address the mobile home park. The FAA responded that their priority was to fix the airfield first in terms of the minimum standards and then look at the mobile home park.

Commissioner Lampton confirmed that would be done next then.

Rainse said that this project was to develop the environmental assessment, which just dealt with the relocation of the runway, Delp Road and so on. The next major step would definitely be the mobile home park.

Commissioner Lampton said, okay and then referred to the RPZ and in alternatives 5 and 6, which are relocating Delp Road to the west. He asked if those roads actually within the RPZ protection zone? He added that he thought the goal was to not have any type of road within those zones.

Rainse replied that is a goal unless the FAA approves it otherwise.

Commissioner Lampton said, and they've approved otherwise, all right.

Rainse said that it is outside the runway safety area.

Commissioner Lampton asked if it was still within the RPZ?

Rainse replied, that yes, it was and that it's a low-use road.

Commissioner Lampton agreed. And then referred to page 6-27 of the EA, a paragraph that states, "The Port has concluded that without the improvements and without outside funding from the FAA, Washington Department of Transportation Aviation and possibly other sources, the airport would likely lose its ability to generate local economic development and be exposed to liability of an unsafe airport". Commissioner Lampton asked what caused the Port to arrive at the conclusion that the airport is unsafe?

Rainse replied that was a good question, and it goes back to probably right after the ALP was document was completed. The obvious next step was to then start going through the environmental process that we're in now, and there was a lot of discussion that went on with the then commissioners at that time about whether or not to move forward. There were several issues that were discussed. One was the WSDOT decision to change their funding mechanism so there were any funds available, so the Commission determined they would take a look at the FAA funding source. A lot of discussion centered around liability, that since the ALP was done, the deficiencies were brought to light. The Commission decided to move forward with the process of conducting an EA and going through how to mitigate the deficiencies.

Commissioner Lampton said that when we start out with talk about design deficiencies and then as we move into the EA, we get into it's a safety issue. He stated his confusion as to whether these are really design rules or if there is truly a major liability.

Rainse said when this process started, the design deficiencies and design standards were the FAA's based on safety. Then it is a matter of how that is translated into liability. Rainse said he has seen that sort of thing come out of the courts, in the case where there is an accident on an airfield, just like a lot of different circumstances.

Commissioner Lampton stated that we live in a litigious society, we've all agreed on that. But again, he said he was still concerned about how that commission arrived at that conclusion.

Rainse asked if Dave was there.

David said that, no, he wasn't.

Rainse said that it might be something to go back into the records of that meeting to see the discussion that took place. He added that the discussion that took place was regarding a number of different reasons to move forward, and one of those was liability.

Commissioner Macrae-Smith said there was another file of the Port's that should include a letter received from Carol Suomi, the head of the regional FAA office in Seattle. Commissioner Macrae-Smith had asked her specifically if Grove Field in its current configuration is unsafe, and she said, no, that it is not. The letter says that. He added that he didn't know what that would do in court if it gets to a court ruling somehow.

Commissioner Lampton said he thought it bears some discussion with legal counsel.

Rainse said that if there's some language in the draft EA that there is some issue with and would like the consultant team to take a further look at, or modify, that's open for discussion.

Commissioner Macrae-Smith said he felt it should be looked at, because we don't want to lead somebody into thinking we have an unsafe field when the FAA says we do not.

Commissioner Lampton added his agreement.

Commissioner Macrae-Smith asked if it could be looked at further.

Rainse responded that it could.

Commissioner Lampton said thank you and that was all for him.

Vaughn said that it was duly noted in regards to the question about checking with legal counsel to see if that language needs to be edited before submittal to the FAA.

Commissioner Ward also requested the economic study be shared with the Commission once complete.

Public Testimony

Vaughn Brown explained the process for providing public testimony. Each person would have 3 minutes or less to testify as part of the record. He added that were comment forms available for those who would rather provide written comment instead of oral testimony. Vaughn explained that as previously mentioned, approximately 25 comments have been received already as part of the public comment period on the draft EA. All of the comments have equal weight whether they are on paper, if they were sent in already, if they're made here tonight, all of those have equal standing. All of comments will go into the record for the decision on the environmental assessment, so if a comment has already been submitted, it does not need to be stated again at the public hearing. Vaughn requested that groups representing a number of people speak once on behalf of the group.

He also asked for efficiency purposes, if something has been said, to add individual agreement rather than say the same thing again. People wishing to provide oral testimony were called by name as they had signed in on the meeting sign-in sheet. Vaughn said that questions would not necessarily be addressed. However, questions would be noted and addressed later if time allowed, or if not, they would be addressed at a later date and posted on the website as part of the Frequently Asked Questions.

- Dale Lamberton, 12312 Northeast 227th Avenue. That's in Brush Prairie. And I can acknowledge the bad handwriting. I'll be very brief. I'm a pilot and I have a hangar out at Grove Field. I have an airplane in that hangar. And I just want to say that I'm in favor of this project as it's been proposed tonight, I want to let you know that, primarily as a safety feature. So that's been my comments for the night. Thank you.
- Liz Pike, 26300 Northeast 3rd Street, Camas, Washington. Honorable Port Commissioners and the members of the public here tonight, imagine a 12 million dollar improvement project to create economic development at Grove Field with no additional tax dollars from your Port constituents. I live under the traffic pattern right next to Grove Field, and I enthusiastically support the Delp Road tunnel for the following reasons: No resident will have land taken away for this project, and since 2004 there have been many public processes and the community and the Port's own advisory committee have recommended the tunnel as the preferred alternative. As an airport resident, I agree. Many local elected leaders have weighed in on support of this project. You've seen letters from Senator Joe Zarelli, Representative Ed Orcutt twice. All three Clark County commissioners have weighed in on it twice. Select members of the Camas City Council, including Mayor pro tem Scott Higgins, and, also, Council Member Don Chaney just last night submitted letters in support of this project, and I'm going to hand them to whoever is the keeper of the record so that they can be included in the record tonight. I'm a business person with over 30 years of private sector experience, and it's my view that an improved airport will result in several economic benefits to Camas and Washougal. And I know, Bill, you were very concerned about economic development, so I want you to pay special attention. A permanent fixed rate operator and several airport mechanic businesses leasing space from the Port, these are all things that I envision in my 30 years of private sector business experience would happen as a result of you obligating the airport and accepting grant funds to move forward with this project. A retail aviation business that sells headsets, lights, instruments and other aviation related equipment, Grove Field becomes Southwest Washington's leading training facility for new pilots, an ice cream and coffee shop that leases space from the Port at Grove Field, increased visiting pilots foster a vibrant tourism industry for Camas and Washougal, a functional kiosk next to fuel pumps with rack brochures from local restaurants and citing recreational activities, rental cars and lodging facilities, historic airplane fly-ins and home-style pancake breakfast for the entire community to enjoy, a shaded public viewing area in a small portion of the parking lot where local kids eat their ice cream cones and can safely watch airplanes take off and land and become inspired to enter careers in aviation, imagine all the possibilities with a safer airport and a more receptive facility for other pilots that are visitors to land here and leave their money in our community. I'd also like to attach a nexus to all three of your Port district things that you're in charge of: A marina, an industrial park and an airport. Imagine if the U.S. Department of Commerce came in, swooped in and studied Steigerwald Commerce Center for eight years and said, "Gee, we really think Steigerwald has a huge impact to be an economic engine for East Clark County. We realize you need to make infrastructure improvements at Steigerwald. We're going to fund Steigerwald infrastructure permits to the tune of 95 percent." Then they get Washington

State's Department of Commerce to kick in another 2.5 percent. How then would this commission vote to accept 97 1/2 percent funding on a similar type grant operation to include any one of the other Port assets including the Marina or your industrial parks? In this scenario, would you three commissioners say no to a 97 1/2 percent funding at Steigerwald, and if you can't say no to that kind of project, how can you say no to the same kind of infrastructure at Grove Field? And my last point that I want to make is, lots of elected officials in the community and also at the state legislature level have weighed in on this project. Should you turn down this opportunity, what are these same legislators and county commissioners and city officials going to think when you want to partner on other projects that enhance your Port district? Will you have credibility left after refusing this kind of proposal that is such a huge benefit to east Clark County, not only as a community, but as a region in its strategic location for safety, emergency command control, et cetera? Thank you for your time.

- Good evening, gentlemen. Thanks for taking the public comments and having a meeting. My name is Scott Price. I live at 3439 Northwest Sierra Drive in Camas, up on Prune Hill. I'm a former Air Force pilot, currently flying Triple 7s for a large U.S. Airline, mostly international. I have a background in safety, training, operations management and labor relations and politics. Before I get started with my condensed prepared remarks, I want to address two questions that you asked earlier. Mr. Ward, you talked about business aircraft. There are small turbo props, like a Pilatus, that would be able to fly from Grove Field with the improvements that are planned, and they are used for short-range, Seattle, Eugene, maybe down into the Bay Area; that sort of thing. On both safety and liability, those are measured items. I don't think anybody would say that a car without seat belts is necessarily unsafe, but a car with seat belts with shoulder harnesses is a safer car, so take that into consideration when you're talking about safety. Liability is the same thing. I've read the draft EA, and as a professional aviator, I consider these improvements to have minimal impact on the whole area, especially if we do the Delp Road tunnel option and necessary for Grove Field. I've watched over the last five years with interest, stayed relatively quiet, tried to get out of politics after my labor time, and I've notice that the debate has really been a political debate. It's not really a technical debate about whether or not you should or shouldn't do this. And we all know who the players are, and there's probably about 40 or 50 folks on both sides that have an axe to grind one way or the other, a financial incentive potentially, and they've been active in campaigns, and I'm sure there's, shall we say, a little bit of retribution that's desired or a little bit of payoff, possibly, and what I'm asking for each of you to do as commissions is to set that aside. Let's not play the games they play in California with airports. And I think Commissioner Lampton -- I grew up in the Bay Area, so you can appreciate what I'm talking about. It's time to put all that politics aside. You need to move forward with this. You need to be aggressive about it. You need to get the FAA on board with the tunnel option, because it has the least impact on everybody. This is not inconsistent with the development that the Johnson Dairy folks wanted to do in that land out there. In fact, I find it -- it would actually be a benefit, specifically for the Pilatuses that I'm talking about, flying short-range Pilatuses. You have an enormous opportunity. I'd ask that you move forward. And let me make one last statement. Your mission statement says it's the mission of the Port of Camas-Washougal to make strategic investments, develop effective partnerships that enhance the community's quality of life and bring jobs, infrastructure and recreational opportunities to East Clark County. You have a willing partner. It's in the FAA and WSDOT. They're willing to put up a strategic investment upwards of ten million dollars and some money after that for maintenance. Don't turn it away. Don't let that be your legacy. Be open, honest, transparent with your thought process

and do the right thing.

- Good evening, commissioners, and thanks for the opportunity to talk about this. My name is Bob Martilla. I'm at 6412 Northeast 105th Circle in Vancouver, Washington, and you know me as one of your airport tenants, but my capacity tonight is as President of the Vancouver Chapter of the Experimental Aircraft Association. EAA is the growing international organization of aircraft engineers, designers, antique restorers and amateur aircraft builders. Many of your current airport tenants are EAA members and flying amateur-built aircraft from Grove Field and throughout the United States. We've flown 1,540,000 kids over the last decade and there's been young people's education programs, but the real number tonight for me is 183,000. That's square feet. That's how much a wide, slightly longer runway would be, and that's a 39 percent increase in usable runway surface for safer operations for the local and visiting pilots and students on those not very good days and those really, really dark nights. But, really, we're talking about the future and we're talking about future airport for future Port citizens that allows for more transportation options, recreational opportunities out in the future that only a quality air grown facility can provide. The local community and the greater aviation network, of which Grove is a link, that the FAA state organizations, government dignitaries, aviation groups and business leaders support this project is a sure sign of their confidence of this community and the opportunities that an improved and safer Grove Field would provide. An investment in this type of transportation infrastructure is becoming increasingly rare in the under-served Washington region and will bring critical construction dollars that will trickle down through the local economy and provide needed jobs in an area where the unemployment rate is in the double digits. Will this make Grove into PDX? Not a snowball's chance, but it will make Grove Field into the finest and most user friendly aviation facility, public or private, in Clark County and will be something the community would be proud of. Now, most of the time we rarely recognize opportunities when they present themselves and they only become obvious later, and this idea that I'd like to leave you with a profound saying, but it's as true now as it was when it was first spoken decades ago, and it goes like this: When you've got 3,000 feet of road, you can't go very far, but when you have 3,000 feet of runway, you can fly anywhere. Thank you.
- Good evening. My name is Steve Mezzanatta. I live at 828 Northeast Delp Road. This is my wife Kathy. The tunnel will be coming out at my house. That's how much it's going to affect me. I appreciate -- I'm not a pilot, and this is going to be a personal plea to you guys to not take -- I am against the airport. I probably spend more time in that airport than you guys do. I have friends in it. I walk it almost every day. We've owned the property for over 11 years now, and in that 11 years I've heard that the airport is going to stay the same. That has been the promise from the Port Commission. Well, the people before you went behind the community's back and had this study done. They had in their heads that they're going to develop the airport, while all along they're telling the public they're not going to do anything. Right now Grove Field Airport is a safe and clean airport. It's a fun airport. If they don't like the airport, there's plenty of airports out there that are bigger. Grove Field supports their airport. Right now I understand you have hangars that you can't even rent because of the economy. The government can't afford it. You can't afford it. We can't afford. If you're going to put it in there, it's going to be taxes. You know it's going to be more taxes. It's going to affect the community. It's going to take away from the Camas community as it is. You're not supporting the community with this. You're supporting 79 pilots, and not only that, only 12 of the pilots fly. If you don't believe me, come sit over at my house every day and then watch them come over my house. You say they don't come

over my house. You want to increase the noise. You say the new planes are quiet. Well, you have a jet come over your house and see what you think. Are you going to soundproof my house? I doubt it. Are you going to tear down my trees? Probably. You're going to have a road come out. It's either going to go by my house, behind my house or right in front of my house. You say there's no traffic on there. Come out there and watch the traffic. And you're going to put a tunnel in? It's ridiculous. You're not supporting the community. Take this money that you're going to spend, support it down here in the Port where the community can use it. What do you got, 79 people up here that are going to use it, and 12 of them are flying? Thank you. I apologize.

- Mrs. Mezzanatta said: I'd like to show you where we live. (Pointing at the map) Right here on this corner of the airport, right above, right there. That's our house right at the corner, and I don't think that you should be destroying our neighborhood. I think it's horrible, and I think -- you know what, why don't we stand up. I would like to take my turn. I would like if you live five miles close to the airport stand up, five miles, five miles close to the airport. Three miles. If you're a pilot, sit down. This is not representing our community. This is not our community. We have a lot more people than this that live there, and there's kids that walk in the streets and there's a lot of nice people, and it's absolutely awful if you guys do this to our neighborhood. And our house is right there, I mean, right there. You don't come to us and ask us. You don't say anything. The only thing we get is an e-mail from a neighbor saying about this meeting, so I really think that you guys should really think about if you live and you're flying near us. The place is empty. Who should be living nearest? Who should have children near the airport? Why are you going to have these great big planes? I'm very sorry.
- This seems a little punny. My name is Lincoln Westdal. I live at 30610 Northeast Wylie Road, north of Camas. My concern is training that occurs at Grove Field. I'm the fellow that conducted aviation summer camps for young people over the past several summers at Grove. I was also a pledge student, the oldest for a short period of time, at Grove Field. Flight instruction is an increasingly important activity in Grove Field. About a dozen local individuals have earned their private pilot licenses there in the past three years. Several of them are sitting right back here. Today there are approximately 20 student pilots undergoing training with one of the three flight instructors active at the airport. Of these 30-plus individuals, a few are middle aged and older, primarily interested in becoming recreational pilots. Most, however, are young people looking towards careers in aviation, as pilots but also as air traffic controllers, as aircraft sales and service personnel. In years past most airline pilots received their training in the military. Today, aspiring airline pilots have to pay for their own training, and that training usually begins at small airports like Grove. These young people need and deserve a safe, that is a fully FAA compliant, place to launch their careers. My experience conducting the CWAA Aviation summer camps over the past several years has shown there's a strong interest in aviation among our students at our local schools. Forecast suggests that the outlook for aviation-related jobs in the U.S. is bright, so I think that it's likely that flight instructors at Grove will continue to be busy for some time to come. Thank you.
- Hi. Neil Cahoon, 26300 Northeast 3rd Street. Thank you for your public service and this opportunity to speak with you tonight. I live in Fern Prairie. My property is adjacent to Grove Field Airport on two sides and right underneath the airport traffic pattern. I like the sound of small airplanes. One of the reasons I moved to Fern Prairie is because of the availability of Grove Field. Grove Field is identified by the Federal Aviation Administration

in their National Plan of Integrated Systems, and the Washington State Growth Management Act identifies Grove Field as an essential public facility. By identifying Grove Field in their planning, these agencies suggest that the Port of Camas-Washougal has a responsibility to the airport different from the marina or the industrial park that goes a little bit more beyond their management role. The Port of Camas-Washougal is entrusted with an asset that has regional importance. As such, you have the responsibility to ensure the longevity of Grove Field. The Federal Aviation Administration has identified four items that do not meet their design standards for the type of small aircraft that use Grove Field: They are the runway width, runway length, runway alignment and in particular, obstructions near the airport. The Airport Advisory Committee, a group of local citizen volunteers, considered many different factors of the different build options, including the social impact resulting from adverse land acquisition or the rerouting of road traffic close to existing residences. After much discussion, debate and many public hearings, the committee presented the preferred build option which has Delp Road routed under the extended runway. This option impacts the local residents the least while satisfying the FAA design standards. To help communities pay for the airport improvements, the FAA formed the Aviation Trust Fund. They collect user fees and offer grants to provide funding for small airports just like Grove Field. The only stipulation to accepting the grant monies is that once spent the airport must remain an airport for 20 years or the balance of the grant money returns. Every Port of Camas-Washougal constituent has paid into the Aviation Trust Fund when they were taxed on the purchase of a commercial airline ticket. My fellow aviators and I have further contributed to the fund through taxes collected from the sale of aviation fuel that we put in our small airplanes. The FAA has affirmed that correcting the design deficiencies at Grove Field is an appropriate use of the Aviation Trust Fund monies and is willing to commit funding 95 percent of the budget costs. The Port of Commissioners must decide if they want to apply for this grant from the Aviation Trust Fund, thereby returning our tax dollars to our community. I hope that you do. As I mentioned, I live in Fern Prairie, and in today's economy I would sure like to see our local construction crews and businesses have the opportunity to benefit from this project. Once these infrastructure improvements are complete, Grove Field will provide an environment conducive to business opportunities and be the economic engine that we would all like to see it become. I'm hoping for a finding of no significant impact from the FAA for the preferred build option and the Port commissioners to apply for further grant funding. Thank you very much, gentlemen.

- Good evening, commissioners. Thank you for allowing me to speak. I'm not speaking as an aviator or pilot or whatever you want to call them. My name is Gene Cooper. I live at 2323 Northwest Walden Drive in Camas. I've been a resident here for 16 years. I live in Lackamas Shores, so I can see all the activity that goes and comes over Grove Field. I've had the pleasure all my life of living near airports, private, public, Air Force, you name it. I've always known that if you don't like what goes on in an airport, you don't move there. The airports are usually there before you are. In fact, one of the reasons that my late husband and I moved here was proximity of Grove Field and PDX. I'd like to go on record in support of the improvements at Grove Field and moving forward with the ALP. I suggest that the Port commissioners should aggressively pursue the funding from the FAA for these improvements, including the tunnel under Delp Road. I believe the tunnel option provides the least impact on the community, as well as being the safest option in terms of ground and air traffic in and around the airport. Thank you for your consideration.
- Hi. I'm Terry Tucker. My husband and I live at 27015 Northeast 9th Street. We are in proximity to the approach of the Grove Field Airport, and I don't know if we're part of the

RPZ yet or not. I first want to state that we're not against expansion, and I also want to say that I approve of this current Port commission. I do appreciate that you guys have really considered the community, and I appreciate your openness as well. Our concern is that we want to be included in the process and that we have concerns about our property values, and we would like those considerations to be considered. Anyway, my husband's family has lived on this property for 40 years, and our concerns are with regard to any impact on the acre of trees on our property, especially the trees that are in our backyard landscaping. It's just been something that our kids have remembered for years and years, and anybody that comes into our backyard, it's like "Oh, wow, this is like a park," and we really love that, so we'd like to maintain that as much as possible. In fact, our daughter had wedding photos taken in the backyard with the trees in the background. The other issue is concern with the increased traffic noise due to the increased air traffic usage and its impact on future appraisal value of our property. So those are our concerns, and, again, we'd just like to be part of the process and have our considerations seriously thought about and appreciate your willing to be cooperative with us and us with you. Thank you.

- Good evening, my name is Richard Martin. I live at 11218 Northeast 12th Avenue, Vancouver. I think it gets pretty sad when you're 75 and you have to look at a piece of paper to make sure you got the facts right, but anyhow, I've had a long association with both the Federal Communications Commission and the Federal Aviation Administration. I started out in 1955 as a ham radio operator and that has led me into aviation. In fact, I met Mr. Ward up at the airport three years ago, four years ago. We were setting up a tent for the local radio club. I also have gone into the commercial side of licensing with the FCC. As I said, I got my license in '55. I moved to Los Angeles in 1960 where I met another ham who is a pilot. He got me interested again in flying, said go to the airport and talk to Mr. Snyder, so I started flying with Mr. Snyder and had a lot of fun with it. I got my private in the fall of '65, so I've been flying all that time. One thing about Mr. Snyder and the thing I remember most is on final approach he asked me if I was scared. I said no, I enjoyed the flight. His reply was, "Well, I wasn't scared and my ass is in here, too." I use that a lot of times, I'll tell you. So I flew 31 years in the LA basin at the Van Nuys Airport with a club called Eight Balls. By the way, Van Nuys is always in the top ten busiest general aviation airports, so I really like Grove. Moved to Vancouver in '97, flew with Evergreen until it went belly up, and the another ham suggested CWAA, so here I am. I fly Dave's 172 up there and enjoy it. Speaking of 172, a lot of people don't realize that this another type of sedan is purposely designed to get air under the tires. I think there's people in the room that got air under their own tires, but we ain't going there. Obviously I'm in favor of the EA and the ALP. Gentlemen, are any of you -- do any of you have a commercial driver's license? Commissioner Lampton replied, no. Do you know anybody that has a commercial driver's license to drive big rigs or buses so or something that requires anything like that? Commissioner Lampton replied, No. No? Anybody in the audience? Commissioner Lampton replied, no truckers. Darn. Well, if you were going to drive a truck for a living, where would you learn to drive, on that truck or that bus, or would you start out with something smaller? No answers from up there? Commissioner Ward replied, hadn't thought about it. Well, that's the thing: We always start out small, and that's what Grove is, and it needs some help. Well, maybe I'll just quit at that. I have a lot of stuff. I wish we had more time. Well, I think I've said I'm in favor of it. That's what counts. Thank you.

- My name is Kay Currier and my husband and I have lived at -- well, the address is 22633 Northeast 28th Street, and we've been there for 30-plus years, and we both took our flight instruction at Grove Field, so we definitely are in favor of proceeding with this. I wanted to -- I have a letter from another Fern Prairie lady that wasn't able to be here tonight, so I'm just going to read a little excerpt from it and then I'll hand it in to you, Dave. It says, "My name is Cathy Gonzalez and we live in the Camas-Fern Prairie area, about two miles from Grove Air Field. Our youngest son, Michael, has always been fascinated with airplanes since he was old enough to know what an airplane was. Never forgetting his dreams, after he graduated from high school he decided to pursue his dreams of being a pilot. "Michael received a free airplane ride from a local pilot, Doug Anderson, and knew then that he'd chosen the right path. Michael was attending Clark College full-time, working a full-time job and he started taking flying lessons at Grove Air Field under the instruction of Dave Luse. Michael got his private pilot's license at Grove Air Field and was awarded his first aviation scholarship from CWAA toward his career. "After two years at Clark College, Michael transferred to Central Washington University to work on his degree, bachelor of science in flight technology. During Michael's aviation career at CWU, he has obtained his commercial certificate, instrument rating, multi-engine rating, certified flight instructor's certificate and certified flight instructor instrument rating. "The Grove Field pilots are very committed to the future of aviation through the different programs that they offer to encourage students to pursue an aviation career. The Saturday Academy, Summer Camp and Career Day are some of the programs that are offered at Grove Field. They also give scholarships to those that are entering in an aviation career, but without Grove Field, students would be forced to find another airport, compete with other students for scholarship money or just forget about pursuing their dreams. Grove Field is very important to the Camas community. Please help in keeping it and making it safe. Cathy Gonzalez."
- Hi. Good evening. My name is Melissa Smith. My address is 1235 Northwest 7th Avenue, Camas, Washington. I am an elected official for the City of Camas. I'm not speaking on behalf of the City. I'm just speaking for myself as an elected official. I have a niece-in-law that went through Grove and she took training lessons under Dave Luce and Jim Gray, and she was bound and determined to become a pilot but then she met my nephew, got married and had a baby, so kind of changed her plans. I'm in support of it, but I'm looking long term for the next 20 years with the airplane growth boundary that we've got incorporated and the long-term goals and the possibilities of what could be coming with Fisher Basin that's coming, and there's a lot of potential that could happen, and I believe in and talking with my niece, it's a safety improvements that we need to focus on, and I won't insult your intelligence, you know, by saying anything else. You know what needs to be done, and I support everything that you've done so far to research this and be thoughtful about it, so thank you.
- My name is Bob Elliott, and I live at 26111 Northeast 10th Street, Camas, and I'm going to do my best to cut down my five-minute talk to three minutes here. Thank you for the opportunity. I'm going to touch on economic development and economic impact, and if I have a little time, maybe a little about some misconceptions. In order to attract business to Grove Field, it needs to be an airport that modern single engine aircraft owners want to use. Bringing Grove Field up to the FAA's minimum small airport design standards would achieve this. With these upgrades, the Port can start pursuing aviation business, possibly starting with an FBO that we've talked about -- some of the others have talked about tonight for fix based operators. FBOs provide aircraft rentals, maintenance, charters, pilot

and aircraft supplies and flight training. I estimate that the current economic base at the airport would support about \$140,000 revenue for an FBO. That's not quite enough, but the upgrades and some appropriate advertising could lure many modern aircraft owners to the FBO and to the airport. After a few years I believe FBO revenues could easily be \$400,000 a year. This exceeds my estimate of about 260,000 a year to support a FBO. So your support of the FAA upgrade and possibly providing some incentives could make a successful FBO possible. Facilities and services attract users and raise the bar of what you can charge. This is why other airports with more facilities and services can charge more for hangars, ties downs, et cetera. A viable economic environment along with good marketing will encourage other aviation-related businesses to the airport. In the airport's sparse Clark County, truly, if you build it, they will come. In addition to the WashDOT study that Rainse mentioned, which I looked at, I was doing some research and I found another national study on general aviation airports, and in that study they indicated in addition to every dollar spent in a general aviation airport, another \$2.53 comes into the community, so just from that \$400,000 hypothetical FBO, we're talking about a potential 1.4 million into the community, and that's just a start. In fact, just recently the new hangars have opened up and there's new tax revenue for the community and more dollars into the community. And in the short run, how about the economic benefit of the ten million dollar or nine million dollar or eight million dollar project that we're talking about here. Sure, not all of it is going to come to Camas and have local people employed, but some will be. I'll just say that location criteria for many businesses usually include the need for access to local airports. In fact, there's other people like me that live here because of the airport. Thank you.

- Mr. Reinhart: Good evening, commissioners and everybody else. I want to commend WH Pacific for all the work they did. I did work on the advisory committee. I had to miss some of the meetings. I was out of town. Safety issue I don't need to go into. We all know that if we met the FAA standards it would be much safer than it is today. Not that it's completely unsafe. It's better to have real safety. Economically it would be a great asset to move forward. First of all, it's going to save the taxpayers a lot of money for the future. It's a great future growth for all of Clark County, great potential for the Port, all of the community, and with our economic conditions, just think of all jobs it's going to open up. That's very important, and that's probably one of the other reasons why all of the legislatures who have been contacted, county commissioners, are all for it, so I recommend that we support it all the way. Thank you.
- Good evening, Joe Keller, 25813 Northeast Tenth Street. I'm one of the north side property owners. I'm also a retired Navy pilot, and during that time as a Navy pilot one of my collateral duties was aviation safety officer. As an aviation safety officer we were trained in pre-mishap prevention, post-mishap investigation. Anything that is designed below the minimum requirements is a concern. A building designed below minimum requirements could be a concern, a bridge, a road, anything. In this case, yes, the airport is operationally safe most of the time. There's been many mishaps out there. There's been many mishaps that have not been reported. Now, what the minimum safety requirement basically creates is a safety zone for pilots to operate in so when they are losing control of the aircraft. Now, the discussion about litigation or a liability, I think, is a real one, because if there is a mishap out there that could have been prevented with the correct sized runway width or length and/or the required safety zone, then there wouldn't be exposure of liability to the Port, but when the Port knows that the airport does not meet the minimum standards and the Port was responsible for the construction not meeting the minimum standards, as they have been since they put in an airport runway and taxiway that does not have the required

separation. They've also built hangar buildings too close to the existing runway, and they've had opportunity throughout the years of the construction of the airport to correct those deficiencies, and for the last 20-plus years there's been discussion that's been going on with whether or not we should receive money from FAA. That means that the Port does have some exposure to liability if there is a mishap that could have been prevented. So, yes, the airport does operate safely normally. It's when the mishaps occurs when the problem is, and so I think that the Port commissioners need to look at it from that perspective and do the correct thing and not turn this into a political discussion but simply say we need to bring this airport to the minimum standard. Now, if you don't, I think the outcome is going to be eventually that there will be a mishap out there, there will be a lawsuit, and then the Port has to decide if they want to continue to operate the runway as a runway, and then at that time if they elect not to, then most likely the state of Washington and FAA will take over the airport and operate it anyway. That's been stated many times behind the scenes that is the likely outcome, because the State did designate it as an airport that they want to retain, so if we want to keep it as a community airport, make the minimum safety requirements that in are place and make it so it's safe and so you don't have an exposure to liability. The airport has been there since 1945. Anybody who lives near the airport now likely hasn't been there that long. It certainly didn't sneak up on them. I also donated property on the north side for the taxiway and I'd like that investment to continue. Thank you.

- Hi. My name is Devin Sirois. I live at 940 Northwest Fremont Street in Camas. I've been living there for about 90 percent of my life. I began flying out of Camas Grove with David Luse about three years ago, got my private license shortly after and am still flying out there. I have hangar E8 and am currently going to school to be a professional pilot, going to Andrea Riddle for a bachelor of science, professional aeronautics, with a minor in safety. I am also a line service manager at the FBO at the Aurora State Airport, an airport that is very rich with general aviation, and I do manage fuel pricing, hangar rent, and I can say for a fact that a runway that is more enticing to general aviation pilots does bring in increased revenue. Our hangars are currently going for 450 to \$500 per month. Our av gas is rated at \$5 a gallon, so seeing numbers like that and having the experiences of speaking with different general aviation pilots and telling them I fly out Camas Grove and seeing them shriek kind of brings testament to the fact that with improved safety measures, we could bring that sort of revenue into Camas. A few months ago I brought in a friend, similar pilot, about 250 hours into Camas Grove and landing Runway 7 with an east wind. He said that was the last time he was going into Camas. And, you know, I wish my prospective employer had flown into Camas because if they know how many times I've landed Runway 7 with an east wind, I think I would be a shoo-in. I think at 21 years of age I have a fewer more gray hairs than I should, and I support the safety standard improvements.
- Good evening. My name is Jim Margason. 520 Northeast 319th Avenue, and that's three miles from the airport. I am kind of a gopher for the airport. I have been here in the area since '96, and that's not 18. That's 1996. I do have a letter from one of our pilots who's busy right now. He's out of town. He's more or less repeated everything that's been said that an airport should be built like or should have a good runway, but his opinion in Option 7 -- which I don't remember an Option 7 at this time, but anyway, it had to do with -- they had 50 percent increase of usable runway and a sufficiency and increase in operational safety. This man has had an excess of 20 years. I started flying in 1944 when I was a young lad. I'm 79. I've spent 47 years of my life working to see safety and also to be part of the safety program with the railroad for 47 years and sometime in there the work done with the military, and in all cases when you speak of safety, what's this? This is a good chance for

you to -- so he stated that they have an awful lot of talk going on that this airport is not safe. It is safe. As just explained by the young fellow that was here, he got his license here, so I guess it's about as safe as you can get it, but we're going to have to go along and look forward and put this plan to work. Mr. Ludwig retired from the fire department. He's the pilot which letter I have here. He says that you people will do right, and I'm sure that from my experience you will do right, and I'll keep going for it until hell freezes over. Thank you very much.

- Richard Hamby, 37015 Southeast Gibson Road, Washougal. I wasn't really sure whether I was going to say anything here, but according to the meeting purpose, this was about comment about the environmental assessment, and I would have to say a lot of the testimony I heard really didn't directly address that document. I was on the advisory committee for the environmental assessment. I think that it was a pretty thorough document, certainly at it related to issues revolving around the natural environment. Commissioner Ward asked about issues involving economic development and about social impacts. I think as a committee we looked at social impacts to a fair degree, primarily revolving around how Delp Road would be resolved. It really wasn't the purview of our committee to decide whether any of these impacts ultimately were acceptable or not, because our committee wasn't charged with deciding whether this project was something to go forward with or not. We were primarily reviewing the details of the environmental assessment as it was formed, but most of our work revolved around Delp Road. So I see this as all information gathering, that this process was put in place before most of you sitting in front of me were involved in this board before I was paying attention to it, quite frankly. So in the next few months I'm assuming that there will be more open discussion and trying to put all the pieces together. I'd have to say that I've had a hard time coming to a really solid conclusion on how I feel about the project because every time I learn something I am faced with a new question that needs to be answered, so I think that you as commissioners maybe have some of those same questions, and I'm sure that you'll try and get final answers to everything that is appropriate before you make a decision. Thank you.
- Hi. Keri Gramm. I live at 35006 Northeast 1st Street, Washougal. I'm a taxpayer. I don't mind paying my taxes if I get what I'm supposed to get. I appreciate good value, and I think this would really add to our community. We had the opportunity last year to fly into Oshkosh and we landed in a lot of little airports to fuel, and it's really nice to be able to go in and check your flight plan on a computer, and I'd like to see our airport expand and be able to do that kind of thing, too. It's really nice. I hope you go forward with it. To me it's a no-brainer. When you get 95 percent funding, go for it.
- Martha Martin, same address as Richard. As most of us do, we procrastinate until the meeting is going to happen and then we start to do some research, which is what I did today because I'm, of course, never busy. But today I decided I'd look up something, and one of the things I did was go to the AOPA website, and if you know that what that is, it's the Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association, and just looked up the current trends for a general aviation, because I keep hearing that and I didn't know. I didn't know what that was. So the executive summary for the second quarter in 2010 is what they have that's the latest that they have, so, of course, it's not right now. It says that there are mixed results in terms of flight activity, pilot certification, aircraft shipments and aviation safety. One of the things that stood out for me was pilot certification. The trends are 2009 and 2010 comparisons, students are down 6 percent, privates are down 51 percent, commercial is down 47 percent, ATP is down 34, CFI is down 13 and instrument rating is down 50. Okay, that's what it says.

I'm not making any conclusions. I just wanted to know because I hear that. What is true? What isn't true? So you look for the facts, and I did some research. It just made more questions for me. I didn't get any answers from that. I also looked at what they said about air aviation safety, that the Air Safety Institute reports fewer general aviation accidents in 2010 than in the same period last year. Accidents year to date 2010 showed a decline of 4 percent compared to 2009, so people are being pretty careful, pilots are being pretty safe. I think that's the issues that I'm hearing, is, safety is an issue and is this going to be something that pencils out economically, and I don't have the answers for that. I'm still doing my research. I want to know the answers to those questions. This is a small airport. It's not big, and there are small planes that go in and out of this airport, not large ones. I like the airport. I think it's a fantastic facility just the way it is right now. Does it need improvement? Probably. It's old. It needs some tender loving care. Does it need ten million dollars worth of tender loving care? I don't know the answer to that. I can think of some other places to put ten million dollars right now, but maybe the airport should be considered for that. I don't know. But it's just something to think about. There so many questions that still need to be answered. And I know people are assertive about their responses and they want to know if you're going to go ahead with this, but I think there's so much more you need to ask before you do. Thank you.

- Good evening, commissioners. My name is Mark Price. I live at 3439 Northwest Sierra Drive up on Prune Hill. I am currently what you would call a pilot in training. I've been taking lessons with Dave Luce for the past couple summers. I've been around airports. I've lived around airports. I've never had an issue with noise or anything else. As stated earlier, if you have a car -- or put it in a little story. If you have a car and it's got a broken taillight, you can drive that car with a broken taillight, but if somebody said, "I'll fix that taillight for \$100 and all you have to do is put in \$2.50," why wouldn't you? Why wouldn't you want to do it and improve your vehicle so that somebody doesn't come in later and say, "Oh, look, you have a broken taillight"? That's going to cost you later down the road, whereas this is not going to cost you nearly the amount that it could. I'm in favor of the tunnel under Delp Road. I believe it is the safest way for both air traffic and ground traffic to coexist with the runway improvements. This is an easy decision, guys. I would encourage you to actively pursue the FAA grants to the fullest extent of your powers. Thank you.

Meeting Wrap up and Next Steps

Vaughn thanked everyone for participating at the meeting. He said that we've heard comments from both the Commissioners and the public. We've previously reviewed what the potential next steps might be.

David also thanked everyone for coming to the meeting and providing input. He added that as people may have observed over the last year and a half, staff and the Commissioners, have been very transparent in wanting to take public input and accepting public input, whether it be positive or negative. He said he felt the information received tonight, will be very helpful in the decision process as the Port continues to move forward. David said that as Rainse mentioned the comments will be included in the revised draft EA and probably two months after it's submitted to the FAA, they will provide their determination. He said that the Port will keep reporting on the status of the project as it continues to move forward.

Commissioner Lampton confirmed that after the FONSI is issued, it is up to the Port to decide whether or not to move forward. And if they do decide to move forward, the Port still hasn't determined what exactly will be done with Delp Road, correct?

Rainse said the decision process after the FONSI would be:

1. move forward,
2. go talk to the FAA in Seattle and get some clarification.

Commissioner Lampton asked if the Port needed to make any sort of commitment.

Rainse said, no, the Port does not have to make a commitment until the FAA offers a grant. The Port will receive a letter from the FAA stating their finding. Then the Port can meet with the FAA and begin talking about the alternatives, funding and phasing and the Through-the-Fence issues.

Commissioner Lampton added that they need to also talk about the timing of purchasing properties and other significant issues.

The meeting concluded at approximately 8:14 p.m.