



**Sanderson Field
Airport Master Plan
PROJECT MEETING #4
Preliminary Airport Development Alternatives
Discussion**

MEETING NOTES

DATE: May 13, 2008 – 10:00AM – 12:00 PM

LOCATION: Port of Shelton Commission Chambers

ATTENDEES: See Attached List

MATERIALS PROVIDED: Agenda; Draft Chapter Five– Preliminary Airport Development Alternatives (chapter sent by mail to staff and committee members approximately 2 weeks before the meeting)

MEETING AGENDA:

- **INTRODUCTIONS** – Provide overview of Agenda items.
- **PUBLIC COMMENT** – Public attendees unable to stay for entire meeting may make comments on the planning process. Comments will be limited to two minutes. Public may also make brief comments at the conclusion of PAC member work session.
- **MEETING PURPOSE** – Discussion of the purpose of the meeting and the decision making process to arrive at the Preferred Alternative. Discuss roles of the Advisory Committee, Port Staff, and the Port Commission.
- **INCORPORATING COMMENTS** – Discussion of how comments are incorporated from Advisory Committee meetings and summary of major issues identified and incorporated.
- **DISCUSSION OF AIRPORT DEVELOPMENT ALTERNATIVES CHAPTER & FIGURES**
- **GENERAL COMMENTS/ CORRECTIONS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEE REVIEW** – Process & timeline for review and comment on this material. We would like to provide an additional 10 days for advisory committee review and comments
- **PUBLIC COMMENT** - same guidelines as item 2 for non-repetitive comments.
- **NEXT STEPS**

1. INTRODUCTIONS –

Patti Miller-Crowley with the Port reviewed the Agenda for the meeting and provided an opportunity for all attendees to introduce themselves.



**Sanderson Field
Airport Master Plan
PROJECT MEETING #4
Preliminary Airport Development Alternatives
Discussion**

2. PUBLIC COMMENT –

No public comment was provided at the beginning of the meeting.

3. MEETING PURPOSE

David Miller provided an overview of the purpose of the meeting, which was to discuss the preliminary development alternatives prepared by Century West and to receive input from members of the Sanderson Field Citizen Advisory Committee in the process of defining a preferred development alternative.

4. INCORPORATING COMMENTS

Questions about project coordination were addressed and David Miller provided examples of how comments provided by members of the Sanderson Field Citizen Advisory Committee have been integrated into the master plan. David Miller noted that input has ranged from formal written comments to informal discussion. He also noted that each draft chapter will be revised as necessary to reflect comments, when the draft final master plan report is produced. In addition, items of concern have been considered as the master planning process has unfolded (formulating planning assumptions, addressing facility needs, creating preliminary development alternatives, etc.). Specific examples of input include: the need to address the aircraft parking configuration on the main apron, the need for adding taxiway edge lighting, extending Runway 5/23, preserving the inactive/closed runway for future aviation—related use, improving current instrument approach capabilities, and ensuring that adequate approach clearances are maintained for future instrument approach needs. Patti Miller-Crowley explained the process used by the Port to distribute meeting notes from Sanderson Field Citizen Advisory Committee meetings to members.



5. DISCUSSION OF AIRPORT DEVELOPMENT ALTERNATIVES CHAPTER & FIGURES

David Miller of Century West provided an overview of the preliminary development alternatives contained in Chapter Five.

Considerable discussion occurred surrounding a wide variety of airport issues that were not specifically related to the evaluation of the preliminary alternatives. Topics included using Sanderson Field as an emergency response base for response to natural disasters, terrorism and other potential emergency scenarios; the need to upgrade Highway 101 to 4 lanes in the vicinity of Sanderson Field; and the need to develop an area wide economic development strategy that promotes the airport and other amenities.

Runway /Main Taxiway System Improvement Options (Figure 5-1). The rationale for a 300-foot runway extension at the end of Runway 5 and displacement of the landing threshold for Runway 23 was described. The evaluation of known obstructions (vehicles traveling on Highway 101) and the potential impact of a new residential subdivision east of Shelton Springs Road were discussed. It was noted that the Port previously acquired the property needed to accommodate the recommended runway and parallel taxiway extension; the runway/taxiway extension reserve does require a small amount of property acquisition.

The purpose of runway extension and taxiway development reserves was described. David Miller noted that the runway extension reserve was consistent with a previous master plan's ultimate runway length associated with transport category aircraft. Based on this consideration, the development reserves and associated setbacks should reflect airplane design group III aircraft (Boeing 737 typical). The potential impact of the increased setback requirements for the redevelopment of the south fairgrounds complex was discussed. It was noted that existing development on the north side of the runway already conforms with the more demanding design standards for items like the runway-parallel taxiway separation for design group III aircraft (these items will be maintained).

Future changes in surface access to the south side of Runway 5/23 from Highway 101 were discussed based on airspace protection needs. An internal operational access road reserve located beyond the east end of the runway is intended to preserve controlled access and on-airport circulation if aviation related development occurs on the south side of the runway.

The addition of taxiway edge lighting was described.



**Sanderson Field
Airport Master Plan
PROJECT MEETING #4
Preliminary Airport Development Alternatives
Discussion**

Landside Options.

The main elements of each preliminary development alternative were presented. The basic advantages and disadvantages of each option were discussed.

The **Terminal Area Option 1 (Figure 5-3)** provides the most compact and economic option, based on the proximity to existing surface access roads, taxiways, and utilities. The specifics of continued development of the existing T-hangar area coupled with infill development in the area. The assumption regarding removal/replacement of three older T-hangars within the twenty year planning period was discussed.

Three apron redevelopment options presented were discussed (**Figure 5-4**). It was noted that it is assumed that some reconfiguration of the main apron will be needed regardless of the preferred landside development option to address specific aircraft parking needs. David Miller noted that development of conventional hangars on or adjacent to the aircraft apron provides several readily developable hangar sites that can be leased in the short term with minimal investment in site preparation.

The **Infield Development Area Option 2 (Figure 5-5)** locates new facilities in the undeveloped areas between the inactive/closed runway and Taxiway Bravo. David Miller noted that this option reflects the recommended landside development alternative that is depicted on the current airport layout plan drawing, approved in 1997, although this option has not been implemented. The most significant impact to an existing use is the parachute drop area, which occupies most of the area.

The **Inactive Runway Area Option 3 (Figure 5-6)** locates new facilities along both sides of the inactive/closed runway, which is converted to an access taxiway. David Miller noted that the lateral development setbacks on either side of the new taxiway preserve the ability to accommodate transport category aircraft taxiway clearances. Larger commercial development areas are identified in the northern section, with business and general aviation development (aircraft hangars, parking apron, etc.) located near the south end of the area, although this could also be reversed based upon need.

It was noted that the **fairgrounds area** is identified in the alternatives evaluation as a long-term aviation use development reserve.



**Sanderson Field
Airport Master Plan
PROJECT MEETING #4
Preliminary Airport Development Alternatives
Discussion**

Comments/Feedback

- The Kapowsin Air representative indicated that the facility development depicted in the infield development option would significantly impact their current parachute drop area. Information from the United States Parachute Association was provided that describes how downwind turbulence is created near ground level on the leeward side of buildings or trees, with a distance equal to 10-20 times the height of the obstacle. Prevailing winds are generally from the west at Sanderson Field. It was also noted that the old ball field on Enterprise Rd, kitty-corner from Techwood might be suitable for an alternative parachute drop area in the future.
- The need for 3-point aircraft tiedowns was clarified and it was confirmed that all new light aircraft tiedowns should be designed with three anchors (two under the wing and one at the tail). The assumption is that tie-down locations depicted will be new tie-downs.
- The location of two proposed helicopter parking pads near the southwest corner of the main apron was questioned over concerns about rotor blades and skydivers. It was suggested that a parking pad(s) could be located adjacent to Taxiway A1 on the west side.
- Providing a small aircraft apron for passenger loading/unloading near Olympic Air on the north side of Taxiway A1 could improve passenger convenience.
- Port Director Bob Robinson commented that the terminal area option appears to make sense for development based on cost, access to existing infrastructure, and ease of implementation. This would also keep vehicular access out of the heart of the airfield. Reserving the infield area for larger tenants also makes sense to protect longer term development options.

No other significant comments in favor or against the preliminary development options were expressed during the meeting. A follow-up comment form has been prepared to assist the Sanderson Field Citizen Advisory Committee with formulating their comments.

6. PUBLIC COMMENT – No additional comments



**Sanderson Field
Airport Master Plan
PROJECT MEETING #4
Preliminary Airport Development Alternatives
Discussion**

7. NEXT STEPS

Sanderson Field Citizen Advisory Committee asked to provide review comments to Port within two weeks (**May 30, 2008**).