

# Grove Field Airport Improvements

## Open House

April 21, 2009

### Open House Summary

The Port of Camas-Washougal held the second public open house for the Grove Field Airport Improvements project on April 21, 2009 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. at Camas High School. Forty-three people signed in at the open house. The purpose of the event was to explain the four draft alternatives currently being considered for the Grove Field Airport, and to generate public input and preferences for the alternatives.

Citizens were invited to comment on the proposed Grove Field Airport improvements and their preferred alternatives by filling out a comment form, and by writing comments on flip charts located near the stations displaying information about each alternative.

### Open House Format

The open house was a drop-in style event which included a PowerPoint presentation and various display boards and stations providing information about the purpose and background of the project and each of the four proposed alternatives. Staff from the Port of Camas-Washougal, WHPacific and JLA Public Involvement were on hand to help direct people, answer questions and collect comments.

The stations and informational displays available at the open house included:

- Sign-in Table: Attendees signed in and received a project handout. They were also invited to view the PowerPoint presentation.
- Comments Table: Attendees were invited to fill out a comment form with their feedback on preferred alternatives for the Grove Field Airport.
- Project Background: Display boards included information on the airport layout plan, design standards, and project timeline.
- PowerPoint presentation: The presentation was given twice throughout the evening. It provided a general overview of the project, including a description of all the alternatives currently being considered.
- Alternatives Stations: Display boards provided information about the four alternatives currently being considered. Each station included details on the alternative description, an aerial map, impacts, advantages, disadvantages, and costs. The alternatives include:
  - Alternative 1: No-build
  - Alternative 5: Runway relocation and extension to 3,070' and relocation of Delp Road to Port owned property
  - Alternative 6: Runway relocation and extension to 3,070' and relocation of Delp Road to the North

- Alternative 7: Runway relocation and extension to 3,070' and relocation of Delp Road in tunnel

## **Outreach**

Citizens were invited to attend the Grove Field Airport Improvements open house through a number of outreach campaigns, which included:

- Website announcement on project webpage at [www.grovesfieldalp.org](http://www.grovesfieldalp.org) and on the Port of Camas-Washougal website at [www.portcw.com](http://www.portcw.com)
- Press release 2 weeks before the date of the event
- E-mail distribution to the Port's interested party's distribution list.

## **Flip Chart Comments**

### ***Alternative 1***

- One person commented that the airport should be left as it is, and to widen the runway by 20' on the south side of the runway.

### ***Comments on Alternative 5***

- One person commented that Alternative 5 cuts directly across their existing property at 828 NE Delp Road. They noted that this will affect property values and surroundings.

### ***Comments on Alternative 6***

- One person commented that Alternative 6 turns 252<sup>nd</sup> into a freeway, and noted that people drive too fast already.

### ***Comments on Alternative 7***

- One person commented that this option has the least impact on neighborhoods and environment, while another person noted that Alternative 7 looks to be the best option.

## **Comment Form Responses**

The following is a summary of all the responses collected from the twelve (12) comment forms that were completed, including one emailed open-ended response.

### ***What do you like best about Alternative 1?***

Two people commented that Alternative 1 has the lowest impact to neighborhoods. One person commented that Alternative 1 is the best because it creates no changes. One person prefers a smaller airport, which creates less air noise.

### ***What concerns do you have about Alternative 1?***

Many people commented that Alternative 1 does not meet FAA standards and does not bring the airport into compliance with FAA specifications. Three people commented that Alternative 1 does not address safety issues, and one noted that planes will still have to maneuver around trees to take off, which is a safety concern.

One person commented that doing nothing to the airport will actually have more of an economic cost in the long run.

***What do you like best about Alternative 5?***

Two people commented that Alternative 5 allows the airport to meet FAA standards. Two people commented on the sharp corners and curves involved in Alternative 5; one noted that curves may slow traffic on the road and another commented that the sharp corners impact neighbors on Delp Rd. One participant appreciates that Alternative 5 decreases the runway length. One noted that Alternative 5 does not require much land acquisition, and another suggested that the airport be left as is, only requiring normal maintenance.

*In response to the comment that Alternative 5 decreases the runway length, it is noted that all the build alternatives extend the runway to 3,070'.*

***What concerns do you have about Alternative 5?***

Three people commented on the curvature of Alternative 5, noting that these are dangerous and impact Delp Rd. One respondent expressed concern over the use of valuable real estate for a road. Another commented on the removal of trees and owl habitat.

***What do you like best about Alternative 6?***

Two respondents commented on the importance of bringing the airport up to FAA standards, and one likes that Alternative 6 does not involve impacts to wetlands. One person commented on the decreased runway length and another person noted that Alternative 6 does not require much land use acquisition. One person commented that Alternative 6 is a good choice. Another person supports the minimal curves on Delp Rd that this alternative creates.

*For clarification, Alternative 6 does not decrease the runway length. All build alternatives have a runway length of 3,070'.*

***What concerns do you have about Alternative 6?***

One respondent expressed concerns over the impacts of Alternative 6 on the stream, and one noted that Alternative 6 requires too much right-of-way acquisition. One person did not support closing Delp Rd, and another expressed concerns about the use of valuable real estate for a road.

***What do you like best about Alternative 7?***

Many people commented that Alternative 7 minimally affects neighbors in the area, and has minimal impacts on residents using Delp Rd. One respondent noted that Alternative 7 does not involve the creation of curves on Delp Rd, and does not require a detour. Two people appreciate that this alternative does not require additional land acquisition, and that it impacts the community the least. One person commented that Alternative 7 does not impact the riparian area or creek.

### ***What concerns do you have about Alternative 7?***

Two people commented that they are concerned about the cost involved, and another worried that a tunnel may be more difficult to maintain than estimated due to heavy rains and snow issues.

### ***Which alternative do you most prefer and why?***

- Seven people showed preference for Alternative 7. Many noted that construction of the tunnel would be the least impactful to residents, the community and the environment, and thus worth the additional costs.
- Two people showed preference for Alternative 6 because it brings the airport into FAA standards. Safety for pedestrians and pilots was a main reason for preferring Alternative 6.
- One person showed preference for Alternative 5 because it brings the airport into FAA standards.
- One person showed preference for Alternative 1, noting that the airport should be left as is, and that improvements to the airport would be too costly for taxpayers.
- Some people commented on improvements to Alternative 7 including: closing Delp Road to through traffic and creating cul-de-sacs to provide access for emergency vehicles. One person commented that people impacted should be reminded that the pilots that use the airport are neighbors as well.
- One person commented that in the long run, the project should involve doing everything that can be done to improve conditions for planes and their take-offs so they don't have to make quick ascents over homes.

### ***Other comments***

- One person requested access to the survey or biological assessment that was done on their property at 27015 NE 9<sup>th</sup> Street.
  - Complete field reports will be included in the EA, as appendices.
- One person was thankful for the presentation and noted that the content was informative, and the staff was helpful and knowledgeable. They also suggested having a separate handout available for mobile home owners to alleviate apprehension regarding relocation.
- One person noted that this is a beautiful plan and asked that the trees at both ends of the runways be removed for a safer clearway.
- One person commented that the red and silver double engine plane makes too much noise.
- One person noted that the Port has done "due diligence" on this project, and hopes that it will go forth. This respondent thanked the Commissioners for their proactive stance, and felt that Grove Field is a real plus for Camas-Washougal.
- One person commented that identified safety issues need to be addressed, and that the airport should be a more viable economic entity, as it is not in the local community's best interest to lose the airport. This respondent noted that cost should be considered when looking at the alternatives.