

Hillsboro Airport Compatibility Study Technical Conference
Land Use Technical Advisory Group Meeting #1
June 23, 2005-Hillsboro Civic Center

Attendees:

Group Members:

Wink Brooks	City of Hillsboro
Ken Dyar	HABA
Darlene Green	Citizen chosen by the City of Hillsboro
Henry Oberhelman	Citizen
Ray Valone	Metro
Andrea Vannelli	Washington County

Not in attendance:

Lisa Martin	Citizen chosen by the Port of Portland
Kevin McCullough	Fixed Based Operator at HIO
Don Suhrbier	Greater Hillsboro Chamber of Commerce
Steve Walti	Citizen/Airport User

Non-group Members:

Mark Greenfield	Land Use Planner
-----------------	------------------

Frank Angelo	Angelo Eaton
Katelin Brewer Colie	Angelo Eaton

Duane Decker	Port of Portland
Daren Griffin	Port of Portland
Peggy McNees	Port of Portland
Steve Nagy	Port of Portland
Ryan Parker	Port of Portland
Andy Priebe	Port of Portland
Brooke Satern	Port of Portland
Kama Simonds	Port of Portland
Bob Turner	Port of Portland

Jim Harris	Coffman Associates
Chris Hugunin	Coffman Associates

Introduction

Vaughn welcomed everyone to the meeting and asked everyone to introduce themselves and indicate who they represent. Vaughn explained that the purpose of the meeting was to give the committee a chance to communicate to the Port on issues that they would like the Port to consider while compiling the Hillsboro Airport Compatibility Study.

Chris Hugunin gave an overview of the Compatibility Study and reviewed the mailed material and handouts showing the draft chapters developed to date and how to interpret them. He explained that the purpose of these meetings is to complete chapters 2 and 3 using input from the group. The hope of the Port and the consultants is that the group will provide all the information they have to share today and as a result this committee will only have to meet once. The consultants plan to incorporate today's input and develop draft recommendations for the Port's consideration. The intent is to meet with the Hillsboro Airport Master Plan & Compatibility Study Update Project

Advisory Committee (PAC) to discuss the results of this meeting and to get further public input in late September.

Airport State Rules and Regulations- Mark Greenfield

Mark Greenfield presented to the group some of the rules and regulations that the State of Oregon requires for airports in our region. He explained that the policy of the State is to “encourage and support the continued operation and vitality of Oregon’s airports.” That vitality is a matter of statewide concern due to the impact on the economy. Mark then reviewed the importance of aviation to the local economy and community. He informed the group that Oregon’s 101 airports are responsible for generating \$11.5 billion in revenue and providing 135,000 jobs annually.

Pertinent Oregon statutes were reviewed and explained as they relate to airport planning. Mark explained that one of the statutes requires local governments to adopt Airport Planning Rule (APR) requirements for the Hillsboro Airport relative to airport planning, safety, compatibility, and other miscellaneous uses.

He reviewed the APR with the group and detailed what it requires counties and cities to do. For example, the APR requires local governments to prohibit residential and public assembly uses in Runway Protection Zones, among other requirements. The Port has a requirement to look at a variety of issues relative to safety.

In regard to noise, the Federal Aviation Regulation (FAR) Part 150 establishes federal noise regulations. In Oregon there are no use regulations required when noise levels are below 65 DNL. Mark showed the group maps of base and 2025 65 and 55 DNL noise contours which indicate that there are very few 65 DNL areas off airport property.

The Airport Compatibility Guidebook summarizes safety zone ordinances, divides the runway into zones, and includes a matrix recommending uses and limitations within these areas. This information can be located in Appendix D of the guide book.

Land Use Overview- Frank Angelo

Frank explained to the committee that the Comprehensive Plan map illustrates the intended land uses for Hillsboro as well as Washington County. Currently 12% of the land is vacant within the 7,026-acre study area inside the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB). He displayed maps indicating locations where residential buildable, vacant land and noise-sensitive areas exist. A member of the committee asked what the 12% vacancy represents. Frank responded that this is buildable land inside the UGB which has not to date been developed. There are 1,200 dwelling units currently in the study area – 80% of which are in high-density areas.

The purpose of forecasting residential growth is to determine where future incompatible land uses might occur and where mitigation through land use management techniques may be possible. The total buildable lands within the Hillsboro study area included approximately 488 acres. Of these 488 acres, 10% are designated as residential.

Noise-sensitive uses generally include residences, schools, churches, hospitals and libraries. Frank showed a map that illustrated noise-sensitive use locations within the study area. Federal and state guidelines for compatibility for noise impacts were also explained.

Frank pointed out that according to the Airport Land Use Compatibility Guidebook; there is a general philosophy in regard to land use management, and that is “it is always better to prevent the establishment of incompatible land uses than to correct them after the fact.” This is the basic purpose of the Compatibility Study -- to prevent further incompatible uses from emerging.

All of the proposed land use measurement techniques were then summarized for the group to compare.

Chris Hugunin explained the purpose of land use management techniques and the difference between the different types of techniques. Regulatory techniques include the different types of zoning required with regard to compatible land use, airport safety and overlay zoning, as well as airport use zones. He explained to the group that the UGB and the development application review guidelines fall within the policy technique section. A member of the committee asked if the Port and their consultants were planning on presenting this information to Metro. The team responded that at this time there has been nothing scheduled but it is flagged to do so when there is enough information. Metro also informed the group that the review of the boundary for possible incompatibilities could put conditions on the property. One committee member suggested that something should be put into Metro's policy that recognizes the work that is being done now rather than putting the Port in the position of having to petition Metro later. The representative from Metro informed the group that Metro does not do zoning. It is up to individual cities to do their own zoning. It might be best to wait until the analysis section of the study is complete before presenting to Metro.

The airport use zone is a separate district for the airport that applies to the airport site. The airport safety compatibility zone looks at the model ordinance overlay zone which looks at safety issues such as noise and outdoor lighting. The compatible land use zone projects the 55 DNL contour through 2025.

City of Hillsboro building code amendments require sound insulation usually starting at the 65 DNL contour. In some situations the City has added certain restrictions outside the building code. According to the regulatory techniques height restrictions are critical for compatibility and safety because they protect the airspace. The purpose of the transfer of development rights is to maintain open space for agriculture and natural resources. The noise disclosure regulations say that the City requires the airport to produce noise disclosure statements. They are intended to make sure that property owners are aware of the noise issues that affect their property.

A member of the committee pointed out that oftentimes you will hear noise complaints from people beyond the 55 DNL contour. The response was what individuals in the public hear and/or what noise impacts of individual noise events cause are not all resolved by the DNL regulations.

Expenditure techniques deal with property acquisition. Currently, the Port of Portland owns all the land within the 65 DNL so there are currently no regulatory issues.

The Noise and Avigation Easement says that property may be purchased by the Port in order to fly over property or gain access to property.

Purchase assurances are intended to make sure that property owners can sell their property. The property would be acquired if the owner was unable to sell due to noise issues.

Sales assistance is similar to a purchase assurance program except in this case the title is not taken.

Development rights acquisition restricts all future development on a property through an easement.

The committee asked how an avigation easement would be structured. The response was that typically easements are needed for acquisition to remove trees or the right to over fly the property in question. What the property owner gets out of the acquisition depends on what the scope of the easement that was negotiated is. The committee also asked if anyone has put measure 37

constraints against what is going on here. There have been a couple of claims outside the UGB west of Jackson School Road.

The group wanted to know when the next UGB review is scheduled. The Metro representative responded that it will be soon because the report is due at the end of 2007. There will be a big analysis that will begin in about six months or so. A member of the committee asked who is responsible for setting the land inventory, and the answer is Metro.

Measure Discussion

Vaughn asked the committee to look at the measures that are on the handouts as well as displayed on the wall and determine whether or not anything that is written needs to be clarified.

Expenditure Measures

A member of the group wanted to know what the airport review guidelines are. Airport input goes into review on an informal basis due to there not being tall buildings in the city of Hillsboro. Ninety percent of Port responses are about noise-related issues and not about structures. There have been some times that comment has been made but in very specific situations.

An inquiry was made as to the extent of the Port's review area. The Port must review all complaints within 10,000 feet (roughly 2 miles) of the airport. This is the case for all agencies involved (e.g.; Washington County, Vancouver, Troutdale).

The Port, not private parties, is responsible for development expenditures with the exception of redevelopment. Most infill is currently taken, and development timing will depend on how the market values large lots. Discussion about how to predict future development pressure suggested that owners seem to be giving up large lots for condominiums and town homes. If the boundary stays tight, one could see tear-downs or residential areas could turn into industrial areas. As residential property becomes scarcer, developers will figure out how to keep building and dividing lots into many smaller lots. Keeping abreast of City zoning and ensuring redevelopment has the same review process as new development does is an important Port function.

If a zone change is required, the City of Hillsboro and the Port will need to get together to discuss disclosure requirements. The Port needs to be aware that an up-zone is occurring. A member of the group wanted to know if there was any other redevelopment that would be important other than residential. The fairground property as well as some downtown locations were discussed.

The committee wanted to clarify that the concern was not with conversion but instead going from low density residential to higher density residential over time. It is possible to create a policy discouraging that development or have a disclosure statement about it.

During the discussion of model ordinances, it was pointed out that they don't just encompass ground zoning. Model ordinances are very broad. There could be regulations about residential property. Model ordinances give local governments some flexibility.

The airport use zone applies to everything that occurs on Port property, overlay goes beyond that. Communities have taken this overlay approach for redevelopment in the past.

Criteria Screening Measures- Vaughn Brown

Vaughn asked the group to write down their ideas about things that are expected to happen, what results the group would like to see, what features should be included and what outcome they would like.

Those ideas were grouped into categories and labeled to provide overall group input on Criteria Screening Measures (see attachment).

The group then compared their criteria list with the Port's initial criteria list. The group felt there was a large degree of overlap and recommended that the Port and consultant team consolidate their input with the already existing suggestions into a final list.

Port of Portland Criteria Screening Measures

- 1) Airspace impacts (operational and technology focused)
- 2) Airfield Capacity Impacts (operational and technology focused)
- 3) Safety (Balance)
- 4) Cost (Balance)
- 5) User/Operator Acceptability (Process)
- 6) Community Acceptability ((Process)
- 7) Legality-feasibility

Committee Preference or Value on Measures- Vaughn Brown

Vaughn asked the committee to look at the different measures and place value or preference on the measures that were most important to them. He emphasized that the Port would not be removing any of the measures regardless if they did not receive any priority votes. The exercise is intended to give the Port direction as to which measures are considered the most important.

The committee thought that airport use zoning was important because it is on airport land. Compatible use zoning is critical except where helicopter noise is concerned.

A citizen committee member suggested formalizing the recommendation that the Port ensure that the Compatibility Study findings get to the appropriate people at Metro and that a coordination agreement be developed. The committee thinks it is reasonable that Metro's decisions be airport compatible. The committee asked if, when taking the information to Metro, it be taken more seriously if there was a plan in place. Metro responded that if there were policies and a plan, the information would carry more weight.

Currently there are no adopted regulations for Hillsboro. The state requires the City to put ordinances and the overlay zoning in place which has not been done yet. There is some information in the comprehensive plan leading to applying zoning ordinances and writing new policy.

A committee member wanted to make sure that the Port of Portland and the FAA were added to the coordination agreement. Another attendee added that it is important to make sure we are incorporating and not creating new issues when it comes to environmental zoning.

In regard to noise disclosure, the committee agreed that information readily available to property owners who live by the airport and easements are completely different. It is unclear what responsibility the city has to aviation easements.

The committee placed dots on their most preferred measures. The attachment includes a ranked list of measures.

Closing

Port staff thanked everyone for attending the meeting and providing such valuable information and stated that the input will be very valuable guidance as the Compatibility Study is completed.

Attachment: Hillsboro Airport MP Compatibility Study-Land Use Meeting Screening Criteria Input

Financing/Value

- Timeliness- timing of benefit
- Cost effective - intensity of impact
- Financing

Regulatory Feasibility

- Political Feasibility
- Legal Feasibility
- Need for change in Federal regulation

Technology

- Technology improvements
- Technological advances in the aviation industry

Implementation Process

- Cooperative and open
- Planned-open discussion of policies and implementation
- Trust building
- Clear/Easily understood

Government Consistency & Coordination

- Access- transportation modes coordinated
- Outcome- provide a framework and context for city/county to apply to APR
- Sequencing- between the impact of measure and other “environmental events”
- Non-duplicative- don’t duplicate what already is working
- Combined impacts- of HIO, PDX and other airports in Washington County
- Coordination of plan process
- Clearly defined roles
- Consistency
- Who has the lead responsibility
- Government consistency

Balance

- Balance- needs
- Balance- airport and community
- Maintain- value of airport
- Protection of public- safety, land values, noise
- What frame of reference

Proactive

- Proactive- UGB expansion N. of Evergreen to industrial
- Outcome- minimize future increase of compatible uses
- Consideration- greater certainty regarding future UGB expansions
- Preventative approach- to address 2025 extent of 65 DNL

Measure Ranking

Measures are listed in the order of their preference per dot voting.

Note: Committee emphasized that even though they may not have voted for all the measures, they would still like to see everything included in the study.

Regulatory Measures

- Airport Compatibility Overlay Zoning (8 dots)
- Compatible Use Zoning (4 dots)
- Airport-related Environmental Zoning (2 dots)
- Airport Use Zoning (1 dot)
- Airport-related Subdivision Regulations (0 dots)
- Building Codes-noise insulation (0 dots)
- Height restrictions (0 Dots)
- Transfer of Development Rights (0 dots)
- Fair [Noise] Disclosure Regulations (0 dots)

Expenditure Measures

- Property Acquisition (3 dots)
- Purchase Assurance (1 dot)
- Sales Assurance (1 dot)
- Development Rights Acquisition (1 dot)
- Redevelopment (1 dot)
- Sound Insulation (0 dots)
- Noise and Avigation Hazard Easement Purchase (0 dots)

Policy Measures

- Coordination Agreements-formalize need for better coordination between agencies (7 dots)
- Comprehensive Planning-APR (6 dots)
- Urban Growth Boundaries (5 dots)
- Airport-related Project Review Guidelines (1 dot)
- Metro "official" recognition of MP and the compatibility in the UGB expansion decisions (added by group/goes with Coordination Agreements) (1 dot)

Port Measure Criteria

- Airspace Impacts-operational (balance/technology)
- Airfield Capacity Impacts-operational (balance/technology)
- Safety (balance)
- Cost (financial)
- User/Operator Acceptability (balance/process)
- Community Acceptability (balance/process)
- Legality (feasibility)