

**Town of Eatonville  
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING  
MONDAY 6:00 PM, FEBRUARY 5, 2007  
COMMUNITY CENTER  
305 CENTER STREET WEST**

**Study Session** – Eatonville School District Presentation

Presentation by the Town Administration, Gary Armstrong on up coming town projects. Major projects include: Eatonville High School construction project. Reconstruction of Carter Street. Curbs, sidewalks and gutters on Rainier Street. Water projects to include water main project at center to top of hill to Larsen. Liner replacement in lagoon and new electric and new aerators.

**Chairman Lind** called the meeting to order at 7:00PM .

**Commissioners Present:** Lind, Beach, Valentine, Schaub, Frink, Harris.

**Town Staff Present:** Mayor Smallwood, Nick Bond, Mart Kask and Karen Bennett.

**Approval of agenda:** Beach moved to approve agenda. Schaub second. Unanimous vote to approve agenda.

**Approval of minutes:** Schaub moved to approve minutes for January 29, 2007. Harris second. Unanimous vote to accept minutes w/corrections.

**Communications and Announcements:**

**From Commissioners, Town Officials, other government bodies:**

**Lind** Extract of overall 2007 budget handed out to commissioners and copies available to the public.

**From the Public:** There was none.

**Public Hearings:** Comprehensive Plan Amendments – Eatonville Airport

**Lind** asked for name, title, credentials and qualifications.

**Mart Kask**, Consulting Town Planner

In the airport area I was commissioned by the Pierce County Council and the Parks Department to do a master plan and airport layout plan for the Thun Field Airport. That was done, completed that included an environmental impact statement that was adopted by the county council and subsequently an application was made to the Federal Aviation Administration and the grant was made to the Pierce County that re-aligned the runway.

Following that Clark County retained me to do an environmental impact statement on a brand new proposed Clark County Airport in the Richfield area. I did the environmental impact statement and the NEPA documents. Then while I was at the Puget Sound Regional Council I participated in the tail end of the relocation of the SeaTac Airport by looking at various sites throughout the four county Puget Sound area. Then the Port of Seattle repeatedly retained the Puget Sound Regional Council under my direction to prepare passenger and airplane operations forecast for the SeaTac Airport operations. Pierce County came back and retained me to do an seaplane base on American Lake. They had some noise problems and the landing patterns were causing noise problems to the residents in the area. Re-use study of the Martha Lake Airport to which then was taken out of use and put into a development, both residential and commercial. These are my qualifications in the airport planning area. In addition I am a Certified Planner by the American Planning Association. I have about 21 years of experience in a consulting practice of planning. Most recently my area of involvement has been the Growth Management Act and meeting those requirements prior to that I have worked heavily for the law firm doing special research on various aspects of litigation that they were involved in and also worked for a number of private developers preparing environmental documents for various project proposals. I have been a consultant for the Town of Eatonville since 1991 having done the 1993 Comprehensive Plan and the most recent amendments.

**Kask** review how to increase airport safety without severely reducing property rights. Over view of Airport Committee proposed goals and policies. Review of amendments to the Eatonville Comprehensive Plan. Make note the Kerri Woehler's letter was entered into the record.

**Public Comment:**

**Steve VanCleve**, 206 Orchard Avenue South, Eatonville, WA

I am Airline transfer pilot. I am currently a Captain flying for an airline all around the U.S. and Mexico. I also hold a flight instructor certificate for all three of the flight instructor certificate for single, multi-engine and instrument as well as a instrument ground instructor. I am also a former Chairman of the Planning Commission. I spent five years on the Planning Commission worked extensively with Mr. Kask on the 1993 airport development regulations. That should pretty much cover what my qualification wise. I think we are on the right track here. I think we are just about to the point where this will resolve itself and take out this issue. Most of what I am going to say are to put somethings in some layman terms and so it is really easy to understand. I have just a couple of minor questions. So I will start with the first question I had for Mr. Kask. When we had our meeting the other day in our original code we had the provisions for the potential of an instrument approach. Now for those of you that are not familiar with that. A instrument approach is when you fly in the clouds and you can descend down to a minimum altitude to when then you can see the airport and continue to land and you have a minimum height you can descend to. Eatonville will never have what they call an instrument landing system which is used for precision landing right down to the runway. The best we could ever hope for would be possibly a GPS approach. Which you use a GPS system to get you reasonably close at a lower altitude. Which will still be several hundred feet above the ground even at the best case. In our original Comprehensive Plan we did say that we would leave the potential for an instrument landing system, especially now with the new GPS technologies

available. At the meeting we had at the Committee Meeting there was no objection to that but I didn't see it in the final copy. That might simply be an oversight. I would just hate to see the opportunity for us to have an instrument a GPS approach someday. And that is heavily regulated by a document that the FAA calls TURPS which set out a very specific criteria. We many never ever qualify for a GPS approach but we would certainly not want our Comprehensive Plan to prohibit that possibility if it would ever come about. And as the technology so rapidly changing now regarding the navigation that we would want that ability because it would increase the usefulness of our airport. The second issue that I had is why this is better and it is really better. Our old Comprehensive Plan said we will prohibit the penetration of FAR77 airspace. The ironic thing and Mr. Kask talked about this a little bit. The FAA doesn't prohibit that. The FAA says you are goint to file a form tell us what you are going to do. We are going to look at the height. We're going to come back with what that call a determination of hazard. They are going to say hey what your doing is a hazard it's right in the way of the runway and people are going to run into it with airplanes. Or they are going to say, well it penetrates our guidelines but it's not a big hazard and they will allow for mitigation and say hey put lights on, paint it red and white. Do various levels of mitigation and allow it. For instance, at Thun Field there is a set of hangars that are right at the end of the runway landing to the north. And those hangars do not comply with the FAR77 guidelines. They do penetrate by three or four feet. What the FAA said if you guys put red lights on those things all the way down. Clearly mark them to pilots we don't see a hazard in that. What our old plan failed to do was allow this mitigation. Allow the FAA to say hey it's o.k. but you mitigate it this way. Our original Comprehensive Plans says we are going to prohibit it. So we really have something in place that is more restrictive than even the FAA wants. I think that it's foolish to limit ourselves to a height restriction that the FAA may again allow. And so I think that this is the right approach because we are taking, abopting the FAR77 and we are going to let those Fed's mitigate that. And the FAA can make those determinations. And then they can come back to you with those determinations as a Board of Adjustments and say this is what we recommend and Nick in the Planning Department can deal with those. I think that is a far better way to deal with this. Also there is one thing that is really good about that is I think that if we adopt FAR77 as a base line and as the Federal Government will allow or FAA will allow we allow that penetration and that's really good because we are following the Federal Guidelines and that is good for liability issues for ourselves in the long run because we are clearly in sink with the Federal Guidelines. The Federal Aviation Administration is the primary body that governs aviation. Anything once it is off the surface is their thing. The state, ironically, does not have any regulations to regulate what happens once you get off the airport. That is a Federal issue. Now the document that Mr. Kask was correctly referring to where the airport compatibility quidelines that you have. But this is a airport compatibility guideline it is not regulatory. Therefore we are completely empowered to set our own regulations. Granted we should consider this but there is nothing that says we have to do what the state says. So you are under no obligation to adopt this verbatim. You certainly have the ability to look at this, adjust this, make revisions to this. I think looking at it and respecting it is appropriate but there are certain areas that this document has some problems and one of the areas that the state has problems with this is that they don't recognize types of airports. They only look at runway lengths. They do not look at is it a Utility Airport, is it used for passenger transport carrying such as a bigger airport. Like SeaTac is. Or where are you in between. We're not even where Thun Field would be. We are substantially smaller than that. And this does not recognize those FAA and that is part of FAR77 those different levels of airports. So I think

this is useful document to give us a baseline but I fully agree with Mr. Kask that we cannot follow this nor are we obligated to follow this verbatim. That is the one point I wanted to make sure and I wanted to support Mr. Kask comments on that because that is really true. On related issues, I am getting close to the end here, Pierce County is doing a lot of airport planning right now. Our north end of our airport is part of Pierce County it's not in the town. There is a current meeting going on this week with the Shady Acres Airport people which is a publicly used, privately owned, publicly use airport that's located close to Bethel High School if you are not familiar with the area would be the best place to describe it. And the planning for that area has not been done yet by Pierce County. That planning endeavor is going to go on. In fact Pierce County now is going to be in the business in this next planning cycle of doing the planning for the other airports which will include the north end of our airport. I am primarily just giving you that because I am in close contact with the AOPA airport support network volunteer as I am for Eatonville for Shady Acres. And he advised me today that that meeting is going underway. I know we are going to have a little bit of challenge to coordinate with Pierce County and that is just a heads up for you guys. Regarding the Zone Three Mr. Kask brought up the Zone Three issues and if you look over here at the map you can see those triangle sides that come out of there. The one unique thing about Eatonville is we do not follow the standard pattern, I don't know if I can speak and talk into this at the same time, but we use what they call right hand pattern. Aircraft enter here they come down here to land to the north they turn and go in and land. But when we land to this way and that is based on the wind we come down this way turn and go like this. There are hills here and hills here. That has set up Eatonville since it's inception in 1952 when the airport opened that we use what they call right turns to land to the south. So possibly we should consider that maybe this zone here this outer triangle may not necessarily need to setup to the restrictions that would be done on the other side and that would leave some more flexibility out there for those people. We are really regulating an area around the airport that maybe unnecessarily regulated because we don't over fly it anyway. We should take a look at that and see if that add a little more flexibility to people that would want to develop on that side. Or maybe cut a chunk of that. Cut it in half might be a real good compromise because we do not occupy that side. And granted you might stray a little bit left of the runway or right of the runway in that case and so that might make a good reason to slice that in half and give then give those folks who live or have properties over there a tad bit more flexibility or maybe get them out of that conditional use process that been proposed. So in general we are on the right track I am interested in what Mr. Kask finds out about instrument approach procedures but we may be able to do couple little things to improve it. I think there is no reason it can't go forward tonight and get this done.

**Lind** then Mr. VanCleve do I hear you that you are in agreement with the document that Mr. Kask has written here, Airport Area Land Use 10.7.5 and would support that?

**Steve VanCleve** I was also a participant in the committee so I was there and had a chance to put my input in and that has gone very smoothly.

**Lind** so you are in support.

**Steve VanCleve** I am in support. The couple of things that I just talked about revising the zone and dealing with the fact that we don't want to exclude the possibility of an instrument

approach someday would be the only two issues that I would have and consider amendments.

**Beach** moves to adopt Mr. Kask memorandum dated 31, January 2007 with the Hudson addition of 10.7.5

**Valentine** second.

**Schaub** question?

**Lind** all those in favor say "T". Unanimous vote. Opposed, none. Motion is passed.

**New Business:** Downtown Revitalization Report presentation – Arai Jackson

**Lind** set public hearing for Rezone on February 20, 2007.

**Valentine** moves to set public hearing for Rezone on February 20, 2007.

**Schaub** second.

**Lind** all in favor say "T". Unanimous vote. Opposed, none. Motion is carried.

**Mark Spitzer**, Arai Jackson Ellison Murakami, 2300 Seventh Ave., Seattle, WA

Reported on the Downtown Revitalization Study. Looking for an approval of a motion on the 20<sup>th</sup> to go forward so that the town can adopt the essential parts of the plan and permit subsequent application for follow on funding.

**Old Business:** None

**Public Comments:** No comments.

**Commissioner Comments:** None

**Next Meeting:** Tuesday, February 20, 2007

**Beach** moved to adjourn meeting.

**Valentine** second.

**Lind** all in favor say "T". Unanimous vote. Opposed, none.

**MSC to Adjourn at 8:40 PM**

---

PC Chairman, Steve Lind

---

PC Recorder, Karen T. Bennett

PC Secretary, Larry Frink