

# Grove Field Environmental Assessment Advisory Committee (EAAC)

## Meeting #2 Summary

December 9, 2008

Meeting: 6:00 – 7:30 p.m.

Port of Camas-Washougal Conference Room

### Attendees:

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

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

**Port of Camas-Washougal Board:** Bill Ward, Alan Hargrave, and Jim Carroll

**WHPacific, Inc:** Rainse Anderson

**Corvid Consulting:** Laura Jackson

**General Public:** Sally Luse and Jared Adams

---

<b>Welcome and Introductions</b>	David Ripp and Rainse Anderson welcomed all EAAC members and the public to the meeting. Attendees introduced themselves and their association with the airport.
<b>October 7, 2008 EAAC Meeting Overview</b>	Rainse Anderson presented a summary of the information and input received at the October 7 <sup>th</sup> EAAC meeting.
<b>Project Alternatives and Affected Environment</b>	<p>Laura Jackson presented the alternatives for runway-taxiway separation, runway length and runway width.</p> <p>Runway-taxiway separation alternatives include: relocate the runway to the north, relocate runway to the south, and no action.</p> <p>Runway length alternatives include keep current length and install additional lighting to allow displaced threshold areas to be used at night, extend runway in current location, relocate runway to the south and extend, and no action.</p> <p>Runway Width alternatives include no action, no action until current runway needs reconstruction and then widen it, and build new relocated and/or extended runway to 60' width.</p> <p>Rainse Anderson presented the County road design standards and the seven alternatives for relocating Delp Road to meet Object Free Area (OFA) requirements and accommodate any runway extension.</p> <p>Alternatives include taking no action, relocating Delp Road in three configurations that would require additional property, one alternative that would be entirely on Port property, one alternative that would be mostly</p>

---

on Port property, a tunnel alternative, and one that would dead-end Delp Road on either side of the runway.

---

## **Open Discussion**

A question was asked why it's taking so long for the Port to close on property being acquired along Delp Road. Scot Walstra answered that the property had potential hazardous material issues and that the Port needed to do a due diligence study.

The group agreed that the runway-taxiway separation alternative that makes sense is the "relocate to the south" alternative and the no build alternative. The "relocate to the north" was dropped on the basis of cost and property impacts.

Runway length alternatives were discussed. The no build and the alternative to relocate the runway to the south and extend were retained. The "extend in present location" alternative was eliminated, as the group felt that if the runway were to be extended, it should also meet separation requirements. The install lighting to allow use of displaced areas was discussed as having some merit, but the pilots in the group explained several shortcomings of this alternative, so it was eliminated.

The group supported building any relocated and/or extended runway to the 60' standard. The no action alternative was retained for the case where the runway is neither located nor extended.

Several comments were made regarding dead-ending Delp Road and the effect on public safety and traffic increases on SR 500.

There was considerable discussion on whether the realignment alternatives with the curves would be less safe than the ones with fewer curves, or whether the straight segments would encourage speeding.

The group agreed to drop the dead-ending alternative (Alternative 7, see attached alternative figures). There was discussion of dropping the tunnel alternative. The group decided to retain this alternative until more information on cost could be developed. Several members believed that the cost of the structure would be off-set by the costs of a new creek crossing, associated mitigation, property acquisition and length of new roadway associated with the other alternatives.

Rainse explained that the alternatives shown as #1 and #2 came from the Master Plan. It appears that the only impacts for alternatives #2 and #4 are property acquisition. Alternative #3 may have less wetland impacts, lower property impacts and lower cost to construct the new roadway.

With regard to concern for speeding on straight-aways, Pete Capell stated that the County does not allow traffic calming on rural roads. Traffic calming is a method of reducing traffic speed by constructing speed ramps, curves, etc. on a road.

Lynn Johnston asked if the standards are "minimum safety standards" or "minimum funding standards." He noted that the current runway length

---

serves 75% of the B-I small fleet, and that the extra length is to allow service to 95% of that fleet. Why do we need to meet the 95% threshold? Dave Luse replied that the FAA wants to relocate the thresholds by an additional 200' at each end, which would make the current runway even less usable than it currently is, and it would be unsafe. Rainse also pointed out that during the ALP development the FAA made it very clear to the Port that the minimum acceptable Runway length would be close to 3,000 feet by 60 feet wide with the separation distance of 150 feet and safety areas that meet the standards.

Jim Ludwig asked about PAPI locations under the extended runway and relocated threshold alternatives. Both PAPIs would be sited using the FAA design Advisory Circulars.

There was a discussion on funding in general, and how the Port came to the decision to prepare a master plan and pursue FAA funding for improvements.

---

**Next Meeting Date and Time**

The group agreed on February 24, 2009, with materials mailed by February 10<sup>th</sup>.

---