

Review Goals, Objectives, and Committee Process

A document was handed out at the meeting "Responses to Comments Received to Date from PAC Members and General Public. This would be an on-going document to track questions during this process and the answers from the Port staff and consultants.

An additional PAC meeting has been added to the process. There are now 5 PAC meetings scheduled.

Revised PAC and Port/Consultant Team Roles and Responsibilities documents were distributed. They included the text additions suggested at the last meeting. There were no questions or comments about the new document at this time.

Goal

The PAC was asked to discuss any concerns they may have about the "Master Plan Goals" distributed at the last meeting. The presentation slides were brief summaries of the goal and objectives for the planning process, so members had been asked to look at the entire goal statements on the document. There were no concerns expressed about the overall Master Plan goal statement at this time. However, several PAC members had comments and concerns about the individual objectives. A brief summary of the comments and concerns follow:

Objectives

One PAC member expressed concerns about the first objective "Preserve Public and Private Investment." He felt the word "maintenance" should not be included in an objective because maintenance should be part of the on-going public responsibility of a public organization. Chris Hugunin stated that a program for maintenance was necessary to keep the facility safe and operational. John Newell explained that "maintenance" referred to maintenance of the FAA investments, such as runways and taxiways. The capital improvement plan that is submitted to the FAA for approval includes a maintenance program. There was a comment that as long as the decision has been made to keep the facility in place, there will be a cost for maintenance associated with it.

Referring to the first objective "Preserve Public and Private Investment," one PAC member felt that it was inappropriate to make future investment decisions based on past investments or "sunk" costs. He explained that future investment should be based on future revenues analysis and not just because the original investment (the facility) has always been there. He added that it did not make sense to expand the airport simply because an investment had already been made, but there should be a comparative economic analysis. He clarified that the investment has value, but it is a "sunk" cost and that nothing we do in the future should be dependent on the magnitude of the previous costs. Facilitator Vaughn Brown asked if adding a statement with this idea seemed like an improvement to the PAC. Several PAC members responded that the investment has already been made and that this process is looking at that investment. It was stated that the current investment has a value. Also a statement was made that facility development would be based on projected demand. Vaughn asked if there would be an investment analysis. Chris Hugunin said that the need for any new facilities would

be based on an identified projected demand. He added that an economic analysis, like a business plan, would be done at the time of implementation for any new facility. During the Master Plan process, Chris Hugunin explained that they would be planning and anticipating needs for the future as to not make choices that would preclude future investments. There was also a question on whether the airport currently supports itself in terms of maintenance. Many thought it did, but this was not confirmed. Facilitator Vaughn Brown said the group did not need to make a decision on the objectives at this time.

Regarding the second objective, "Be Reflective of Community Goals and Objectives," one PAC member believed there should be a stronger sense of balance between community and aeronautical users. The group seemed to agree that "balance" should be emphasized, but there was no need to remove any language specifying "aeronautical" users. The later objective "Seek to Balance Disruption" might be better located closer to the beginning of the list of objectives.

The PAC agreed to hold off on the discussion of objectives at this time. Any edits to the draft objectives would be distributed to the committee in advance of the next meeting.

Inventory Chapter Overview

Chris Hugunin gave a PowerPoint presentation on the work that has been done for the first three sections of the Inventory chapter. The complete Inventory chapter will provide a base condition for the rest of the master plan work. The Inventory chapter has three sections: Facility and Community Inventory, Environmental Factors Inventory, and Land Use Inventory. The inventory is a collection of factual information about the current conditions of the airport. Chris Hugunin's presentation gave an overview of how much information was available at this time.

The following are questions that were asked during Chris Hugunin's presentation. Responses are in italics.

- What are biotic communities? Those would be any *plant species (flora, fauna)*.
- Where will noise data be covered? *We will present the noise exposure contours at the next meeting.*
- Can you make the noise impacts from the two airports cumulative? *No, the noise exposure contours will be for Hillsboro Airport only. In the NEPA requirements, we are asked to look at the operations of solely this airport and the types of aircraft that take off and land at this airport.*
- Why is noise in land use and not environmental? *Noise will be a continual factor of what we look at during this study. However, at this time, we haven't been able to define the noise exposure for the airport. We are working with the Port to observe aircraft activity at the airport. When the air traffic control tower makes counts, they put the aircraft into four general categories: air carrier, air taxi, general aviation, and helicopter. That is not*

enough information to complete our noise exposure contour. We need to know what types of airplanes they are and how often they are using the airport. We will be going out to observe the aircraft to develop baseline with the noise exposure contour.

- Will the noise exposure contour be looking at noise from helicopters? *Yes, we will be looking at both fixed wing and helicopter. All activity at the airport will be included in the noise exposure contour.*
- What does the paragraph titled "Findings" in the Environmental Factors Inventory Chapter 1-II-2 mean? *This section summarizes the results of the environmental inventory information at this time. It replies to the federal regulations. Chris Hugunin said they could simplify the text. Chris Hugunin agreed that they could add a footnote that defines FAA 5050.4A. He pointed out that the first paragraph of the Environmental Factors Inventory section (1-II-1) defines FAA 5050.4A as the FAA Airport Environmental Handbook. He explained that this handbook is the primary guidance for the environmental work for the Master Plan process. The environmental overview of the Master Plan process is not an Environmental Assessment (EA). An EA, if one is required, would occur at the time of implementation.*
- The "Historical Activity" shown in 1-II, starting on page 5 shows the operations growth from 1990 to 2002. One commenter thought the numbers seemed low. He wondered if the mix of activities had changed significantly seeming like a growth explosion. He also wondered if the data is accurate. *Chris Hugunin responded that the data presented in the chapter is the actual record of operations maintained by the FAA. Chapter Three, Aviation Demand Forecasts, will more closely examine the mix of aircraft operating at the airport.*
- Is the economic impact study for the airport in the reference material a dynamic study? *Chris Hugunin said his firm, Coffman Associates, did not conduct the original economic impact study. They would need to contact the earlier consultant to the Port for any questions regarding that study. Economic impact is usually a snapshot.* The commenter added that the Port should look more closely at counts of users per day. This information should be available. It would be useful to have economic impact information for the Airshow and other uses the airport generates.

Questions/comments from 3x5 cards collected from the audience:

- Why wasn't noise included in the environmental inventory?
- Need to address the increasing helicopter noise. It is constant and annoying even on weekends and holidays.
- Helicopter noise from training.
Noise exposure contours will be covered at the next meeting. The number of helicopters that are operating will help define the noise exposure analysis. At the next meeting, we will have maps detailing where the helicopter training patterns are, how the fixed wing airplanes arrive and take-off and also their training operations at the airport. At this time, we will define, based on aircraft activity observation, how many helicopter operations happen on an annual basis

at the airport. The types of helicopters and how often they operate will be a factor in the noise exposure contour. For fixed wing, we'll look at the types of turbo-jets and other airplanes and types of fixed wing activities. The noise exposure contour will be a detailed analysis and we will present that at the next meeting.

- What are the approaches for helicopter take-offs and landings?
- Question about the flight path taken for ascending aircraft. Can changes to the flight path be considered by the PAC?
- Do runway and training patterns become part of the inventory?

Chris Hugunin briefly described the helicopter patterns. More detailed maps will be provided at the next meeting. Will this be part of the inventory? Yes, the flight pattern maps will eventually become part of the inventory. We didn't want to delay the process that could be started, so they will become part of the inventory as they become complete.

- What are the mechanisms for interfacing with the community?
- Will the Washington County community be surveyed to see what interest there is in commercial use? Would they prefer flying out of Hillsboro vs. PDX?

These meetings will hear public comments. Also, community groups can have a speaker from the Port speak to their group about the project. There is a project website, project mailings, and press releases. The Port accepts public comment from e-mail, mail, and phone. If you have a group that would like a presentation, let us know.

- A simplification point—it is academic and industry custom to present maps and aerial views with north pointed to the ceiling. *We oriented the map this way because of the scale.*
- Regarding the Master Plan Objectives: Objective One—preserving public and private investments. This is in conflict with Objective Two in that the Hillsboro Aviation leases were entered into without community input and it continues to be in conflict with quality of life and community safety.

Hillsboro Airport's Role Discussion

The next step in the Master Plan update is to define a role for the airport, considering the potential for development of commercial passenger or cargo service in the future. Four potential "airport role" scenarios were presented in a discussion paper provided to the PAC prior to the meeting. The consultant gave a briefing on the four potential scenarios: General/Aviation Reliever Only, General Aviation/Reliever and Commercial Service < 10 seats, Commercial Service/Reliever, and Commercial Air Cargo.

There were some questions from the PAC:

- Why does the scenario of “General Aviation/Reliever and Commercial Service < 10 seats eliminate “turbojet?” Chris Hugunin stated that this is a specification of Federal regulations for commuter aircraft. Chris Hugunin said *the FAA recently changed some of these rules. He thought the reason was to provide a standard level of safety for scheduled flights. FAA has rules for commercial air carriers. Horizon was once considered commuter, but those flights now fit under the category of scheduled commercial service but not in the category of Commercial Service < 10 seats. FAA will soon adopt a rule that airport serving aircraft with 10 or more passengers seats will need to be certificated.*
- What limitations does the existing facility have for different types of aircraft? *We can discuss these in detail later. These can be potential planning options.*
- For commercial service > 10, is there an upper limit of passenger capacity? *As of now, this is not defined.*
- For the third and fourth categories, “Commercial Service/Reliever” and “Commercial Air Cargo”, runway pavement strength is a limiting factor at the Hillsboro Airport. Many of the air cargo planes are too heavy for the current runways. Some commercial planes would be too heavy. Will structural improvements need to be made if these are the uses that are planned for? *If that is the role that is chosen, those improvements would need to be planned for.*
- Does the HIO currently have 10 or more passengers on flights? *You might have, but they are not commercial flights. Intel has aircraft that will hold 19-30, but it’s not commercially operated. They are a Part 91 General Aviation operation. A corporate owner, carrying their own employees, is not considered commercial.*

Small Group Discussion about Future Role

The PAC and Project Team members (staff and consultants) were seated at tables of 5 or 6. They were asked to discuss the four possible scenarios presented for the future role of HIO. Worksheets were provided for their comments and questions. The audience was invited to discuss the same topic informally as well. The following is a record of comments, questions, and concerns as transcribed from the comment forms and any notes from the quick presentation by each of the tables.

Written Comments from Development Options Worksheets

The following comments, questions, and concerns were transcribed from the comment forms.

Generic Question not related to any option: What is the forecast for demographic change in the future?

**Option 1: General Aviation/Reliever Only (Current Role of HIO)
Remaining questions, Key information needs, Critique**

PAC Input:

- Is there a limit on operations of HIO?
- What is the percent of corporate travel that now exists, i.e. of total operations, how many are corporate related? Is there a market to expand this segment? Is there a need to expand this segment?

Public Comments:

- Is it possible to remove reliever status or is that now the minimum possible designation?
- What is there to relieve? PDX has dropped to 1988-89 levels, a 60,000 operation count decrease in the past 5 years.
- OK as is, status quo.
- How many GA aircraft stage from PDX?
- Clarification of "reliever" –HIO is reliever for general aviation not a reliever for commercial/cargo.
- Would like to see projections for general aviation use.

**Option 2: General Aviation/Reliever and
Commercial Service ≤ 10 passengers
Remaining questions, Key information needs, Critique**

PAC Input:

- What is the forecast for this need?
- Are there other employers, such as Intel, that might have a need for shuttle service and what stress would that put on infrastructure (rental cars, shuttle buses, parking, etc.)?
- What's the difference between current capabilities and this option?
- Would operational limits change based on this option?
- What improvements would be needed to facility/runway?
- What impact to local/adjacent properties (if any) would occur?
- What would be the cost?
- What revenue would be necessary to offset these costs?

Public Comments:

- Ok, as is.

<p style="text-align: center;">Option 3: Commercial Service/Reliever FAR Part 139 Certification Remaining questions, Key information needs, Critique</p>
--

PAC Input:

- Is there a forecast demand for this type of service?
- Economic conditions in future and how that relates to each scenario
- Forecasts of demographic change
- % of corporate at HIO
- What would it take to become Part 139 and what is cost?
- What is needed to make airport provide this level of service?
- What would be the impact on aircraft operations, specifically the interaction of uses if this option was chosen?
- Would scheduled service affect current capacity?
- What additional impacts would occur?
- Property value impacts to local communities
- Changes to property values
- What is the revenue to offset cost?
- Can the airport control the size of aircraft if Part 139 maintained?
- Improvements to road
- Consider the trend of airlines to move away from hub and spoke routes and if that impacts this option.
- How does the perceived trend to "Air Taxi" service as opposed to traditional hub and spoke factor into this option?

Public Comments:

- Need to know key components of this certification and expenses/responsibilities of obtaining designation.
- Bad idea. No real need. Plenty of air capacity available at PDX.
- Max Red Line train takes 50 minutes to shuttle passengers to PDX from Hillsboro – millions were spent to make this possible. Why commercial [flights] at Hillsboro?
- How can you do Part 139 with limitation on the number of seats?
- Appears difficult to control over long term size of aircraft once airport receives Part 139 certification.
- Would like to see generalized cost of facilities and infrastructures to certify HIO under Part 139.

<p style="text-align: center;">Option 4: Commercial Air Cargo Remaining questions, Key information needs, Critique</p>
--

PAC Input:

- Economic feasibility based on limited types of aircraft currently viable for HIO usage?
- What factors would trigger the need to plan this?
- What is the economic viability of the type of existing aircraft that could operate within the pavement strength limits of Hillsboro Airport?
- Are cargo jets significantly louder?
- What service hours, environmental impacts are necessary to consider for this option (i.e. older aircraft, operating at night....)?
- What are the operating hours of such operations (night, early morning flights)?
- What are the property value impacts for adjacent neighborhoods?
- What additional infrastructure would be necessary—both airport and surrounding areas (warehouses, transportation, trucking, access roads)?
- Air cargo examples

Public Comments:

- Air cargo historically noisy and disruptive. Business schedules seldom consider livability or quality of life concerns.
- No—not appropriate airport for general air cargo, improve freeway access to PDX.
- Address smaller cargo operations, documents, etc. Less than 7500 pounds.
- Eliminate the larger aircraft cargo operations.

Public Comment

Mark Ahrend

He has lived in the Bravo Pattern for about 10 years. He says the helicopter noise has increased in the last 2 years. He says that much of the time the planes are at 500-600 feet elevation. He added that the City of Hillsboro and Port of Portland are oblivious to what is going on at airport. He has collected 150 signatures (see petition) about the helicopter noise. He is annoyed with the helicopter training not upset with the airport. He has called the Port of Portland Noise Abatement line and walked outside with the phone. The Port staff on the phone cannot even hear him over the sound of the helicopters. He has counted 29 helicopters in 45 minutes. He also presented a local "home for sale" realtor flyer—the price of the house had decreased by about \$15,000 in the last few months.

Unidentified Citizen

The first two objectives are in conflict with each other. Some of the existing uses/assets are already a direct adverse impact to the community.

Unidentified Citizen

He has recently put his house up for sale. He feels that corporate service doesn't need to be accommodated at HIO. Much investment went into MAX to serve the area to PDX. People should be encouraged to use it. He doesn't like what he sees happening in Hillsboro. The community has been greatly affected by helicopters. He says the fixtures in his house vibrate.

Miki Barnes

The flight training is a problem because it is constant for hours. It is presumptuous of the Port and FAA to give our skies over to training without any community input. She doesn't understand the use as a "reliever" because PDX is at low levels. She went to a Conditional Use permit hearing for PDX. The Port was told to do something about air cargo affecting residents in NE Portland. She warns the Port not to dump the problem on Washington County. She also commented that residents around HIO do not even have a Citizen Noise Advisory Committee.

David Ellis

He says it would be valuable to know the types of operations—how much is fixed wing, how much is helicopter? He lives near the Alpha pattern area. He says flight patterns seem erratic and security rules don't allow information about where pilots are "supposed" to fly. There needs to be some dissemination of information so neighbors can ascertain if the pilots are following the rules.

Next Steps and Adjournment

The information from this meeting would be compiled and distributed to the PAC. The next meeting will be held in a few months. An email would be sent out to members regarding the meeting. The PAC was asked to reserve 3 hours for the meeting. Committee and audience were thanked for their attendance and participation.