



**PUBLIC MEETING #2 NOTES**  
**Willow Airport Master Plan**  
**November 18, 2010**

**MEETING LOCATION**

Willow Elementary School

**MEETING AGENDA**

6:30 p.m. – 7:00 p.m. – Open House  
7:00 p.m. – 7:30 p.m. – Presentation  
7:30 p.m. – 8:45 p.m. – Small Group Discussions  
8:45 p.m. – 9:25 p.m. – Regroup/Review Small Group Discussions  
9:25 p.m. – 9:30 p.m. – Fill Out Questionnaire

**PROJECT TEAM IN ATTENDANCE**

*DOWL HKM* – Tom Middendorf, Brian Hanson, Nan Llewellyn, Steve Pavish, Mark Mayo, Dwight Stuller, and Ryan Cooper  
*DOT&PF* – Allen Kemplen, Judy Chapman, Dave Post, and Becky Iles

**ATTENDANCE**

Approximately 35 members of the public signed in.

---

**I. OPEN HOUSE**

Attendees were able to visit stations with display boards on the topics of existing airport and seaplane base issues, the Parks Highway, and summarized public comments from the previous public meeting. There were also graphics displaying the proposed preliminary alternatives and Iditarod Restart Relocation. Project staff members were on hand to talk to the public and answer their questions.

**II. PRESENTATION**

Tom Middendorf, DOWL HKM, explained the project purpose as well as the meeting purpose. Tom stated that the primary purpose of the meeting was to discuss the alternatives and select 1 or 2 to carry forward for further analysis. Tom fielded a brief question and answer period, and then broke the meeting attendees into small groups.

**III. SMALL GROUPS**

The attendees were randomly divided into five small groups to discuss the following alternatives:

- Alternative A: Maintain Existing Willow Airport and Seaplane Base
- Alternative B: Improve Willow Airport and Seaplane Base
- Alternative C1: Close/Relocate Seaplane Base and Improve Airport
- Alternative C2: Close/Relocate Both Airport and Seaplane Base
- Alternative D: Discuss Other Alternatives or Ideas for Airport and Seaplane Base

The small groups discussed each alternative, then decided on two that they'd like to see carried forward for further analysis.

#### **IV. REGROUP/REVIEW SMALL GROUP DISCUSSIONS**

After the small group discussions, Tom Middendorf acted as moderator, having each group present their opinions on the alternatives. Other comments expressed in the review were the desire to understand the effect of the lake being transferred back to the Department of Natural Resources.

The following summary lists the two alternatives chosen by each group, along with key discussion items.

##### **Group 1 Moderators: Dwight Stuller and Ryan Cooper**

##### **Alternatives Selected: D, which was a reduced version of B**

Group 1 voiced several central concerns in the discussion. Primarily, maintain current facilities was desired at the seaplane base. In addition, the group did not want to pave the runway if a gravel strip was not created. Overall, the group decided that Alternative D, a modification of Alternative B, was the best choice; they would like to see the improvements listed in B implemented, minus options 15-18 (all which dealt with the seaplane base). The group expressed strong support for development of lease lots/tie downs on the south end of the airport. Concern also focused on quickly designating separate access for the Senior Center.

##### **Group 2: Moderators: Allen Kemplen and Nan Llewellyn**

##### **Alternatives Selected: C1 and D**

Group 2 decided on C1, improving the airport and "closing" the seaplane base. By "closing", the group meant DNR or another agency would take over management of Willow Lake. The group also decided on Alternative D – improve the airport and maintain the floatplane aviation activity as it is now. Any future increases in floatplane activity would be accommodated by a different seaplane base.

**Group 3 Moderators: Steve Pavish and Mark Mayo**  
**Alternatives Selected: C1 and D**

Group 3 noted the economic benefits the airport and seaplane base provide to the community. They expressed a desire to improve the airport and leave the seaplane base as-is, but maintain and improve an aircraft movement corridor between the airport and lake.

**Group 4 Moderators: Judy Chapman, Dave Post, and Becky Iles**  
**Alternatives Selected: A and D**

Group 4 voiced the concern for financial feasibility, and expressed a preference for Alternative A as an imperfect but practicable alternative. Some suggestions for specific projects included: tree clearing, taxiway improvements, expanding tie down/lease lots, dredging the lake, designating separate access for the Senior Center, developing the frontage road for lake-lease lots, and developing safety improvements for aircraft crossing the highway. The group also proposed damming the lake outlet and raising the water level to its former level to increase aircraft safety.

**Group 5 Moderator: Brian Hanson**  
**Alternatives Selected: C1 and D**

Group 5 centered the discussion on the lake, and winter and summer common community uses. They voiced preference for Alternative D, expressing a desire for a mixture of the elements of alternative A and B, expressing preference to see development of the airstrip and no development of the seaplane base. Concern was voiced on the need for DOT&PF and public to put together a comprehensive Lake Use Plan.

**V. FILL OUT QUESTIONNAIRE**

After the Small Group discussion review, individuals were given questionnaires to fill them out and deposit in the comment box before leaving. The results of the individual questionnaires will be summarized and posted on the web site.