Renton Airport Advisory Committee Meeting

Tuesday, October 16, 2018

5:30pm  Meeting called to order by Marleen Mandt, RAAC Chair.

5:32pm  Approval of August 28, 2018 minutes, unanimously approved.

5:35pm  Neighborhood communications
-  None reported in lieu of providing additional time to discuss Master Plan

5:40pm  Old Business
-  Airport Minimum Standards and Rules and Regulations
  ▪  Subcommittee will meet again in two weeks

5:47pm  New Business
-  None reported in lieu of providing additional time to discuss Master Plan

6:00pm  Master Plan Process Update, presented by Ryan Hayes, Mead & Hunt; Ryan Orth, EnvirosIssues
  -  Open House – Wednesday, October 17, 2018, 5:30pm – 7:30pm, at Kennydale Memorial Hall
     o  RAAC members are strongly encouraged to attend and provide perspective to the public
     o  Jeanne DeMund commented that meeting date conflicts with the Planning Commission meeting for shoreline planning that waterfront neighborhoods will be attending
  -  Review of Alternatives 4, 5 and 6
     o  Alternative 4 – shifts runway to south and deploys declared distances with EMAS at each end of runway, relocate Airport Way to Tobin Street
     o  Question/Answer Session
        1.  Bob Ingersoll – what is the timing of construction?
           o  Ryan Hayes – best case construction start in 2026
2. Diane Paholke – what is the location of existing taxiway and drive lanes on Alternatives maps?
   - Ryan Hayes – pointed out that taxiways will not be moved, instead, operational mitigation will be used that involves the ATCT restricting simultaneous operations by Group III aircraft. Also, the drive lanes or vehicle service roads will remain in their current location and an FAA modifications to standards will be applied for.
   - Some hangars may be within the required 800 feet setback from runway centerline. Harry stated that hangars will not be modified until the expiration of the lease term.

3. Diane Paholke and Shane Carlson – what is the timing on relocating seaplane base dock and logistics to ensure least impact on seaplane operations?
   - Harry Barrett – impact to businesses will be taken into consideration during construction phasing and scheduling
   - Ryan Hayes – improvement and rehabilitation projects that do not contradict the approved Alternative can be completed during the Environmental Impact Statement phase. So improvements to the seaplane dock and ramp could be made during the EIS.

4. Diane Paholke – where is the North Boeing bridge located?
   - Ryan Hayes – All three preferred alternatives require replacement of the bridge and rechanneling of the Cedar River to meet lateral RSA standards.

5. Marleen Mandt – will the Compass Rose be relocated, and to where?
   - Ryan Hayes – Yes, all three preferred alternatives relocate the compass rose because aircraft positioned on the compass rose would penetrate the ROFA. Consequently, it will need to move slightly to the southeast of its current location

6. Shane Carlson – how much of the existing dock space will be lost after relocation?
   - Ryan Hayes – the goal is to replace on a one-for-one basis and to not reduce space in the dock area. This can be
accomplished by utilizing the vacant parking lot and small park adjacent to the seaplane base

7. Matthew Devine – will Airport Way be moved to Tobin Street?
   o Ryan Hayes – confirmed, in two of the three preferred alternatives

8. Diane Paholke – will Aerodyne’s building be removed?
   o Ryan Hayes – the building doesn’t penetrate the ROFA and doesn’t have to be moved for that reason. However, given the age and location of the building, the master plan landside alternatives may consider relocation of the Aerodyne building.

9. Diane Paholke – will Leven’s buildings on the southwest corner need to be removed or modified?
   o Harry Barrett – buildings may have to be modified to remain outside the object free area and that won’t happen until the expiration of the leases

10. Shane Carlson – is there a list of buildings that are affected and how much of the buildings are needing to be removed?
    o Ryan Hayes – the westerly River hangar building will need to be removed, and the 850 building, 540 building, and 250 building will need modifications because they are too close to the runway (they penetrate the ROFA line).
    o Alternative 5 – shifts runway to north by installing concrete platform or fill material in the lake, Airport Way does not move

Question/Answer Session

1. Jonathan Blubaugh – what if an Alternative is chosen and found unfeasible during the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)?
   o Ryan Hayes – it is a possibility, and the goal is to examine all reasonable and prudent alternatives and determine an economically feasible alternative

2. James Young – will the category be restricted if the standards cannot be met?
   o Randy Corman – Council desires to get input from the Airport Advisory Committee and will work with the FAA to determine the best way to meet FAA standards. The best alternative may also be some combination of Alternatives 4,
5 and 6, or a hybrid alternative that includes components of all three.

- Jason Anderson – modification of hangar buildings will not occur until the end of the lease term.
- Ryan Hayes - expansion of runway safety area to the south will require acquisition in accordance with the federal Uniform Act which requires appraisals, and review appraisals and fair and open negotiations with property owners.

- Alternative 6 – hybrid of Alternatives 4 and 5, with EMAS off north end and traditional runway safety area to the south.

**Question/Answer Session**

1. Marleen Mandt – how much fill material is required in the lake?
   - Ryan Hayes – fill material is less than required for Alternative 5 because it doesn’t extend as far into the lake.

**Financial Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Alternative 4</th>
<th>Alternative 5</th>
<th>Alternative 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$114 million</td>
<td>$87 million</td>
<td>$108 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Question/Answer Session**

1. Diane Paholke – will southeast corner property be acquisitioned by the Airport and be used for vehicle parking?
   - Ryan Hayes – yes, the parcel is proposed as part of the property acquisition.
   - Randy Corman – there has been public discussion of moving Airport Way and the impact on residents and businesses located between Airport Way and Tobin Street and the effect on the high school.

2. Jeanne DeMund – which agencies have to give approval of impacts to the lake?
   - Ryan Hayes - multiple agencies must be coordinated with in the EIS. FAA will work with the city to develop the agency coordination list.

3. Donald Woo – is the cost of acquiring property or filling the lake included in Alternatives 5 and 6? How can those be quantified?
• Randy Corman – the City’s goal is to continue working with the FAA to meet standards and continue operations
• Jennifer Kandel – the FAA is willing to work with the City to complete projects and make sure the preferred Alternative is viable
• Jennifer Kandel – Airport has the ability to use operational mitigation; use the Airport Traffic Control Tower to provide operational mitigation. This allows both Taxiways A and B to stay in their current location.

4. Bob Ingersoll – how much additional land will be acquired?
• Ryan Hayes – most of the newly acquired land would be safety area and can’t be developed. In Alternatives 4 and 6 there is a small increase in developable property for aeronautical purposes.

• Pros of Alternatives 4, 5, and 6
  i. Shane Carlson – Alternative 6 has environmental and community challenges by being extended both to the north and south, and that Alternative 4 or 5 should be selected because the challenge would only be to the north or to the south
  ii. Jennifer Kandel – there are many in the NEPA process and any of them could uncover significant impacts

6:53pm  Call for soft vote of preferred Alternative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative 4</th>
<th>Alternative 5</th>
<th>Alternative 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6:58pm  Vote on Preferred Master Plan Alternative *(quorum requirement was not met)*

- Nine voting members present of 178 voting positions; 7 Primary, 2 Alternate
- Seven members cast votes and two members abstained
- Voting Results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative 4</th>
<th>Alternative 5</th>
<th>Alternative 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7:06pm  Meeting Process Check –
2019 meeting dates: January 8, March 11, May 13, June 11 (special meeting), August 12, and November 12

7:08pm Meeting adjourned