

Grove Field Environmental Assessment Advisory Committee (EAAC) Meeting #3

February 24, 2009

Port of Camas-Washougal Conference Room

6:00 – 7:30 p.m.

Attendees:

EAAC Members: Dave Luse, Jim Ludwig, Linda S. Busch Pfeifle, Lynn Johnston, Phil Bourquin and Richard Hamby

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

WHPacific, Inc: Rainse Anderson and Sarah Lucas

Corvid Consulting: Laura Jackson

Public Attendees: Sally Luse, Richard Day and Ron Millard

Welcome and Introductions

David Ripp and Rainse Anderson welcomed all EAAC members and the public to the meeting. Attendees introduced themselves and their association with the airport.

December 9th Meeting Overview

Rainse Anderson gave a brief overview of the EAAC Meeting #2. At that meeting, several project alternatives were presented and discussed. Some of those alternatives were removed from consideration, based on EAAC comments. The resulting alternatives will be presented; along with the engineer's design report at tonight's meeting. The December 9th meeting summary is posted on the project's website.

Project Update

Sarah Lucas gave an update of the work that has been completed for the Environmental Assessment (EA) since the last meeting. WHPacific has drafted the preliminary engineering design report, which includes cost estimates, to assist in selecting the preferred alternative. Additionally, the biological and cultural resource subconsultants conducted supplemental field investigations. The biological investigation was to determine if the Mazama pocket gopher is located on Port property. The cultural resource inventory was revised to include new road relocation study areas.

Discuss Project Alternatives, including preliminary design and results of field investigations

Rainse Anderson, Sarah Lucas and Laura Jackson presented the project alternatives. An alternatives packet was mailed to each EAAC member that consisted of: the alternatives analysis, delineation of wetlands and other waters, cultural resources inventory, biological resources technical report, engineer's preliminary design report, and 30% design drawings.

The wetland delineation found 1.06 acres of wetlands and waters within the study area located in eight areas. At this time, the wetland scientists are

working with the agencies to determine the jurisdiction of these waters.

The initial cultural resources inventory found no archaeological resources and two historic-period aboveground structures that are not eligible for listing in the Nation Register of Historic Places (NRHP). The supplemental study found two archaeological sites (plates); however, at this time they are not deemed significant.

Through an amendment to the Biological Resources Technical Report (BRTR), the biologists have determined the federally-listed Mazama pocket gopher is not present at the project site.

The eight remaining project alternatives were analyzed based on the following criteria:

- Does the alternative meet the project's Purpose and Need?
- Is the alternative feasible?
- Is the alternative compatible with FAA and Clark County design standards?
- What is the alternative's environmental impact?
- What is the overall project cost?

Alternative 1: No Action. This alternative does not change the existing deficiencies in runway/taxiway centerline separation, runway width, runway length, or object free area (OFA) penetration. A cost for 20-year pavement maintenance is included in the analysis. The advantages of this alternative are: there is no property acquisition or environmental impacts. However, the disadvantage is the airport would not meet FAA design standards. The overall project cost is \$887,500.

Alternative 2: Relocate runway with 60' width. This alternative includes relocation of the runway to meet the 150' separation requirement and widening the runway to 60', but the runway would not be extended. Advantages of this alternative include: no property acquisition and all environmental impacts are contained to Port property. Disadvantages are there airport would not meet FAA design standards. The overall project cost was not prepared since the Port and EAAC decided at the last meeting this alternative was not feasible and it would shorten the runway to 1800'.

Alternative 3: Relocate and extend runway to 3,030' with 60' width, relocate Delp Road to the Northwest. This alternative would relocate the runway to meet the 150' separation requirement, extend the runway by 410' and widen the runway to 60'. It would require 1.7 acres of right-of-way acquisition and the removal of one residence. Advantages to this alternative are: no penetration to the runway protection zone (RPZ) or Runway 7 approach surface, runway would meet FAA design standards, and no wetland mitigation. Disadvantages are: runway would not meet runway length requirement (short by 40'), road alignment includes tee intersections at both ends of the realignment and right-of-way acquisition would include one home and relocation of its residents. Total project cost is estimated at \$7,155,208.

Alternative 4: Runway relocation and extension to 3,070' as shown in the Airport Layout Plan (ALP). This alternative would relocate the runway to meet

150' separation standard, extend the runway by 450', and widen to 60'. It would require 2.1 acres of right-of-way acquisition. Advantages include: no penetration to the RPZ or approach surface, minor disruption to roadway traffic during construction, runway would meet all FAA design standards, and no wetland mitigation. Disadvantages are the impacts to a driveway and right-of-way acquisition that includes one structure (a garage). Total project cost is \$7,000,730.

Alternative 5: Runway relocation and extension to 3,070', Delp Road relocated on Port-owned property. This alternative would relocate runway to meet 150' separation standard, extend runway by 450', and widen to 60'. It would require 0.3 acres of right-of-way acquisition. Advantages to this alternative are: no penetration to RPZ or approach surface, would meet all FAA design standards, no new stream crossing, minimal right-of-way acquisition. Disadvantages are: one horizontal curve does not meet County road design standards and three curves may be perceived as a traffic safety hazard. The project cost related to this alternative is estimated at \$6,347,532.

Alternative 6: Runway relocation and extension to 3,070', Delp Road relocated to the North. This alternative would relocate the runway to meet the 150' separation standard, extend runway by 450' and widen it to 60'. It would require 0.6 acres of right-of-way and is similar to Alternative 4; however, it avoids impacts to the driveway and garage. The advantages to the alternative are: no penetration of the RPZ or approach surface, would meet all FAA design standards, and avoids driveway impacts. The principle disadvantage is the right-of-way acquisition. Estimated cost for this alternative is \$6,789,294.

Alternative 7: Runway relocation and extension to 3,170', Delp Road in tunnel. This alternative would relocate runway to meet the 150' separation standard, extend the runway by 550' and widen the runway to 60'. Delp Road would remain in its current configuration, but would be tunneled under the runway and taxiways. Advantages related to this option are: no penetration of the RPZ or approach surface, would meet all FAA design standards, no new stream crossing, and no property acquisition. The disadvantage is the construction impact and detour requirements necessary while installing the tunnel. Overall costs for Alternative 7 are estimated at \$9,385,264.

An option to Alternative 7 is to only extend the runway by 450' to meet the FAA recommended runway length of 3,070'. This would reduce the cost to \$8,724,753.

Alternative 8: Runway relocation and extension to 3,170', Delp Road terminated on both sides of taxiway. This alternative would relocate the runway to meet the 150' separation standard, extend the runway by 550' and widen the runway to 60'. No property acquisition would be required and the environmental impacts would be minimal. However, the closure would result in significant out-of-direction travel for residents and emergency service providers. The Port, EAAC and Clark County determined this alternative was not feasible, so it will be removed from consideration and as a result, no cost estimates were prepared.

Graphical representation of all the alternatives can be found on the project

website in the EAAC #3 presentation document.

**Open Discussion
(EAAC Members)**

Dave Luse- Please cite references in the BRTR for the Mazama pocket gopher. His research does not show a population in Clark County. WHPacific responded that the information came from personal communications with the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife.

Richard Hamby- Feels there are more species, particularly birds, which are in the area but not listed in the BRTR. One species in particular is the pileated woodpecker.

Lynn Johnston- Would the FAA even fund Alternative 2? WHPacific responded the FAA would not fund it and it would have to be self-supported by the Port. In that case, the EAAC members did not feel the option needed to be taken any further since it would decrease safety. Many preferred the No Action Alternative over Alternative 2.

Jim Ludwig- Why are there differences in runway length (*i.e.*, 3,030' vs. 3,070')? WHPacific responded that 3,070' could be achieved in all alternatives and 3,030' was shown as an option.

Pete Capell- Although not in attendance, Mr. Capell spoke with WHPacific prior to the meeting. His comments on Alternative 3 were he didn't like the tee intersections or the relocation of any residence. Since there are other options that do not impact a home, he preferred this alternative to be removed.

Richard Hamby- Alternative 3 has no appeal and Alternative 4 has obvious road advantages.

Pete Capell- Relayed to WHPacific the amount of curves in Alternative 5 could be a safety issue.

Richard Hamby- Can we use the southerly alignment of Alternative 4 with the northerly alignment of Alternative 6? WHPacific: yes.

Richard Hamby- What is the length of the tunnel? WHPacific: it is approximately 500' long. If the northern taxiway were not built, it would reduce the tunnel length by about 150'. It would have footings on either side, with storm drainage, lighting and ventilation.

Jim Ludwig- Where does the stormwater go? WHPacific: catch basins with piping would be used to direct the flow to the creek. However, as the tunnel would sit atop a hill there wouldn't likely be much stormwater to displace.

Richard Hamby- Other than cost, there are many advantages to Alternative 7. Given the Port's 2.5% match, the cost for the Port would be between \$218,000 and \$235,000 depending on runway length.

Jim Ludwig- Noted there would be a significant reduction in road maintenance costs with Alternative 7 because the length of the road is minimized. Even though the cost for maintenance is paid by the County, it should be considered since the taxpayers fund the County.

Dave Luse- Alternative 7 does not have any costs for social impacts, like the other alternatives do. How will the analysis address social costs? WHPacific: it will be addressed in the environmental consequences section of the EA.

Dave Luse- Does the tunnel provide clearance for fire and emergency vehicles?
WHPacific: Yes.

Richard Hamby to Dave Luse- Is there an advantage to having the runway length at 3,170' versus 3,070'? No. It was determined the runway length option of 3,070' was preferred.

Dave Luse- Presented an additional alternative that detours Delp Road further south at a 45 degree angle and takes the road behind homes, along the ridge. Another 45 degree angle would direct the road north, as shown in Alternative 6. WHPacific will do further research on this option.

Phil Bourqin- Prefers Alternatives 6 and 7. He liked that Alternative 7 has less impacts and less impervious surface.

All EAAC members took a vote on which alternatives should be dropped and which should be retained. It was decided Alternatives 2, 3, 4 and 8 would be removed from further consideration. Alternatives 5, 6 and 7 (3,070' runway length option) will be retained.

**Open Discussion
(Public Attendees)**

Richard Day- There are privacy issues for homeowners near the proposed Delp Road relocations. Many people live in the area for its rural character. He reports his yard is well manicured and he believes there are more bird species present than what was reported in the BRTR, especially owls. He disagrees with opinions that Alternative 3 has too many curves, citing there are already many curves on Delp Road. He requested the entire alternatives packet be posted to the project website. Additionally, he asked WHPacific to look at the tunnel to see if there are other construction methods to reduce costs.

Sally Luse- Even though there are differences in alternative costs, \$1 million isn't much these days.

Ron Millard- Alternatives need to consider quality of life for all homeowners. One alternative impacts his property, where he has lived for nearly 50 years. Speed and noise are two issues to address. Wildlife, such as owls, birds and deer are present. He also asked how long it would take fire fighters to travel if Delp Road was dead-ended (Alternative 8). WHPacific: Not only would it impact fire fighters, there would be an impact to medical responders and commuters. This is part of the social consequences they are looking at throughout the EA.

**Future meeting
dates and times**

The next meeting will be a public meeting that presents the refined alternatives. Meeting location and date are yet to be determined. Once decided EAAC members will be notified, in addition to the regular public meeting notification.