

# **Hillsboro Airport Master Plan & Compatibility Study Update Project Advisory Committee (PAC)**

**Meeting #6**

**December 2, 2004**

**6:00-9:00 p.m.**

**Red Lion Hotel**

**3500 NE Cornell Road**

## **Meeting Summary**

### **Attendance:**

#### **PAC Members:**

Wink Brooks, City of Hillsboro  
Ken Dyar, Hillsboro Airport Business  
Association  
Perry Gruber, Intel  
Bernadette Hahn, Citizen-at-large  
Thomas Little, Citizen-at-large  
Henry Oberhelman, Washington County  
Residents for Safe and Quiet Skies  
Don Suhrbier, Greater Hillsboro Chamber of  
Commerce  
Ray Valone, Metro  
Bert Zimmerly, HIO Business User

#### **PAC Members not in attendance:**

Gina Anhorn, Washington County  
Consolidated Communications (911)  
Abdellah Choukri, Red Lion Hotel (Airport  
tenant)  
Jim Elam, Citizen-at-large  
Lyle Johnson, HIO Tower Operations  
Charlie Riordan, Oregon Department of  
Aviation  
Keith Thomson, Port of Portland  
Commissioner

Andrea Vannelli, Washington County  
Steve Walti, HIO Recreational User

#### **Port of Portland Staff:**

Bill Allen, Port of Portland  
Ken Anderton, Port of Portland  
Duane Decker, Port of Portland  
Daren Griffin, Port of Portland  
Mary Maxwell, Port of Portland  
Peggy McNeese, Port of Portland  
Steve Mrazek, Port of Portland  
Andy Priebe, Port of Portland  
Kama Simonds, Port of Portland  
Barbara Smolak, Port of Portland  
Bob Turner, Port of Portland

#### **Other Agency Staff:**

Barbara Simon, City of Hillsboro

#### **Consultant Staff:**

Vaughn Brown, Jeanne Lawson Associates  
Chris Hugunin, Coffman Associates, Inc.  
Kristen Kibler, Jeanne Lawson Associates  
Steve Wagner, Coffman Associates, Inc.

### **Welcome and Introductions**

Daren Griffin welcomed everyone to the meeting and introduced Mary Maxwell, new Director of Aviation. Vaughn Brown reviewed the purpose of the meeting and the agenda. The overall purpose of the meeting is for the PAC to understand the alternatives development process and to provide input on the draft alternatives.

The committee was asked if they approved the meeting summary from September 16, 2004. Several revisions were requested before the meeting summary could be approved.

- Page 3—Bert Zimmerly’s comments should read “...Louisiana Pacific has built 2 hangars...” (not 23 hangars.)
- Page 4—Under Annual operations, the second bullet in the second paragraph should read “Air Taxi: ‘For Hire’ charter services” (not For higher).
- Page 7—Chris Hugunin’s response (second paragraph) should say “...the Port could change delay and the airport can continue to operate at its current delay time until around 2008.
- Page 12—Ken Dyar’s comments should read “...Global has very nice facilities. However, the location of fueling facilities at the airport is not very efficient.”

Vaughn Brown let the committee know the displays from the meeting will soon be posted on the website. If anyone has questions or comments, they should contact [smolab@portptld.com](mailto:smolab@portptld.com).

## **Shaping the Master Plan Development Program**

Chris Hugunin gave a quick presentation recapping the process and steps to completing the master plan. The team is in the alternatives development stage. A public open house was held on December 1, 2004 to gather public input on the draft alternatives that were recently developed. During the development of alternatives, the consultant team looked at airfield considerations (a runway for small aircraft, taxiways, runway and taxiway extensions, etc) and landside considerations (compass calibration pad, hangars, tiedowns, apron area, public terminal, buildings, helipad, helicopter hardstands, revenue support, pedestrian and public transportation access needs, etc). This meeting will look at the alternatives that were developed with using these potential considerations. The PAC can choose which elements they prefer and mix and match to create a hybrid alternative that best suits the interests for the future of the Hillsboro Airport. This alternative(s) will be studied further.

## **Review of Development Alternatives**

Chris Hugunin reviewed alternatives. PAC members asked questions and made comments about each of the alternatives. A summary of the questions and comments follow:

### **Alternative A—Airside:**

**Thomas Little:** Why is there a circle shape in the 55 DNL?

**Chris Hugunin:** This is a result of the modeling of operations and noise exposure in this area.

**Wink Brooks:** Is there an illustration of the current master plan’s noise contours and the actual contours today?

**Chris Hugunin:** The new Charlie pattern was not in the current master plan, so the noise contours would not be accurate in the master plan, given the new facility.

**Wink Brooks:** How does the master plan relate to noise ordinances?

**Chris Hugunin:** When we do the compatibility study, we will look at neighboring land uses and noise abatement techniques.

**Alternative A—Landside:**

**Perry Gruber:** Do we lose parking with this alternative?

**Chris Hugunin:** The parking is about the same as today's current expansion of parking. (Less than some of the other alternatives.)

**Perry Gruber:** What are the lavender triangles on the map?

**Chris Hugunin:** These show fixed base operations. They are parcels, but the buildings could be various sizes on the parcel.

**Alternative B—Airside:**

**Ray Valone:** Was there a projection on needed parking?

**Chris Hugunin:** For the terminal, we just wanted to maximize parking for the built areas.

**Alternative C—Airside:**

**Perry Gruber:** In Alternatives A and B, how do the helicopters operate?

**Chris Hugunin:** As they do now—on the same taxiways (and runways during nighttime operations) that fixed-wing aircraft use.

**Alternative C—Landside:**

**Perry Gruber:** In this alternative (which does not include a Cornell Road relocation) would we get more parking if it included a Cornell relocation but kept the hotel in the same location.

**Chris Hugunin:** The intent is to keep the terminal near Fixed Base Operations.

**Perry Gruber:** What happens to Hillsboro Aviation?

**Chris Hugunin:** They could redevelop near the helipad or stay in the same location. The purpose is to segregate uses over time. The master plan reserves opportunities that could be phased over time.

**Don Suhrbier:** Did you consider a parking structure?

**Chris Hugunin:** No, we didn't consider it at this time. A structure would be more expensive than surface parking.

**Don Suhrbier:** Relocating Cornell Road is expensive, but we get more space. Need to determine the advantages.

**Ken Dyar:** Could we shift the runway south to avoid relocation of Evergreen Road?

**Chris Hugunin:** Yes, that was an element of Alternative B.

**Ken Dyar:** Could we still have new helipad and T-hangars in Alternative C?  
**Chris Hugunin:** Yes, you can mix and match the elements of each alternative to create a hybrid alternative.

**Perry Gruber:** In this alternative, the black hatched area becomes useless. Maybe we could recapture this space and move the lavender Fixed Base Operations.

**Chris Hugunin:** This is possible.

The Committee was asked if there were any other clarifications or ideas to the Alternatives presented.

**Ken Dyar:** Is terminal radar being eliminated? Even though the Port does not authorize terminal radar, we need to promote installing terminal radar for safety. We should encourage it in the master plan.

**Chris Hugunin:** We didn't plan for it in the alternatives, since this is an FAA decision and we don't need to fund it or plan a site for it. However, terminal radar will be included as part of the overall master plan recommendations.

**Wink Brooks:** The City is interested in making an extension from Brookwood to Evergreen. Can this be done in the runway protection area? We're also looking at a connection from Evergreen to Airport Road.

**Chris Hugunin:** We can look at these in the alternatives.

**Wink Brooks:** Will winds affect the Alpha pattern in Alternative C?

**Chris Hugunin:** In C, the Alpha pattern will be further out and lower in altitude.

**Henry Oberhelman:** Do we have estimates for the cost of replacing pavement?

**Chris Hugunin:** There are FAA funding sources for some of this work, maybe up to 75%. There will have to be a mix of funding sources.

**Henry Oberhelman:** For the fixed base operations in Alternative B, will there be engine maintenance and run ups?

**Chris Hugunin:** The existing berm facility will still be used for noise operations.

**Henry Oberhelman:** Would the relocated helicopter area be lit and used at night? (Henry Oberhelman has asked for time with Port staff or consultant outside of the meeting for further explanations of the aircraft noise model and INM. This can be scheduled after the meeting for another day.)

**Chris Hugunin:** If we assume the area is moved to the east, there is no lit area.

**Bert Zimmerly:** What is the criterion for a runway visibility zone?

**Chris Hugunin:** There are considerations midway between each runway. The runway visibility zone is especially important when the tower is not staffed with air traffic controllers.

**Bert Zimmerly:** The turns from Runway 30 are assumed at 400 feet, but nobody familiar with the airport follows the standard instrument departure as it puts pilots above town. Most familiar with the airport turn at 1000 AGL rather than 400 AGL to reduce noise to the southeast and center of town. We might want to change this to be standard.

**Chris Hugunin:** These types of changes/mitigation elements can be looked at during the compatibility study update.

The PAC took a break before beginning the next section of the meeting.

## **Environmental Screening Analysis**

Steve Mrazek, the Air Quality Manager at the Port of Portland, presented the preliminary environmental screening analysis, which was conducted at a very broad and high level to look for relative impacts of the individual alternatives. Port environmental staff flagged areas of more significant impact, where there would be mitigation, or where there are differences between the alternatives. This exhibit was part of the PAC handouts. The PAC did not have questions about the environmental screening analysis at this time.

## **PAC Questions and Comments about components of alternatives:**

The PAC was asked to consider the various alternatives and discuss, comment, and ask questions about the individual components of the alternatives that they liked or disliked. The following is a summary, when known the PAC member making comments/asking questions, has been identified:

**Thomas Little:** Who would pay for any road relocation?

**Chris Hugunin:** It is unknown at this time. There are a number of funding sources: city, county, state, and other traditional sources.

**PAC Member:** How do we calculate a return on investment if we mix and match components of the alternatives?

**Chris Hugunin:** The process we are undertaking helps to identify the best way to facilitate logical growth to meet demand at the airport. We are not making any financial decisions at this time. Those decisions will be made during the implementation phase.

**PAC Member:** What is the trigger that prompts things to be implemented?

**Chris Hugunin:** We will look at planning horizon activity levels and will keep a “pulse” on market conditions insofar as what needs to happen at the airport in the next five years.

**Ray Valone:** When will the land use compatibility study be available?

**Chris Hugunin:** First we will need to know what we want the airport to be. We need to mix and match elements to create a preferred alignment. This effort will start in late winter 2005 and is anticipated to be complete in summer 2005.

- PAC Member:** What are the implications of moving roads and/or runway safety areas?  
**Chris Hugunin:** We will look at those elements when opportunities arise over time.
- PAC Member:** What is the trade-off if we take Alternative B or C, in terms of bumping out Evergreen?  
**Chris Hugunin:** Those will be costs of implementation. We can look at those next time.
- Key Dyar:** I could agree to a third runway as long as it doesn't move Evergreen Road.
- Thomas Little:** What is the consequence if we don't move Evergreen?  
**Chris Hugunin:** There would be some obstruction clearance at the end of each runway, but we can work with that.
- Ken Dyar:** What should we do about Cornell Road? Do we want to move it? We might want to co-locate small aircraft around the third runway. What do we do about the terminal area if we want parking for 700 automobiles?
- Bert Zimmerly:** I was against third runway for years, but am now for it. The price of fuel is driving this decision. Planes idling on the runway cost money. How will the training facilities survive if it is too expensive for students to pay for fuel because of excessive idling?
- Chris Hugunin:** If we place certain uses in certain areas in the master plan, they will move over time as opportunities arise.
- Ken Dyar:** Hangar 53's lease expires in 7 years. The Port needs direction on what to do when the lease expires.
- Bert Zimmerly:** In 1978, we had to do our own ground preparation and fill a swamp to develop on the airport property.
- PAC Member:** If we're going to renovate the frontage on Cornell Road, we need a new terminal building and new/more parking.
- Ray Valone:** If we move Cornell Road, what do we get besides a new building and additional parking?  
**Wink Brooks:** Moving Cornell Road would be a safety improvement because we'd be removing a hazardous curve. There may be potential benefits to the fair complex. We may even choose to remove the additional curve in Cornell.
- Ken Dyar:** Has there been any discussion with the fair complex?  
**Chris Hugunin:** Yes, the Port has been talking with them regarding a Cornell Road relocation.
- Thomas Little:** Could Alternative C2 not include a relocation of Cornell Road? Could you try to reserve as much parking as possible? Could we add more parking?  
**Chris Hugunin:** We could look at that.

**Don Suhrbrier:** It seems like it would be better to move Cornell Road (which is a County road). But this would need to be added to both the City and County transportation plans.

**Wink Brooks:** This is a 4-6 month process.

**Henry Oberhelman:** What is the timeframe to make this kind of decision about moving a road?

**Wink Brooks:** Can't we commit to Alternative C2 then update the master plan again in five years?

**Chris Hugunin:** These elements are good to have in the plan, to make assumptions for when development occurs between master plan updates. To include moving Cornell Road in the plan, we will need agreement from the County and the fair complex.

**Ken Dyar:** We need to decide if T-hangars are in the plan to allow space for their construction.

**Wink Brooks:** How important is a parallel runway? The City has concerns about using land that has been zoned industrial for the airport because this land is limited.

**Chris Hugunin:** We can look at not using all this land, but finding compatible uses.

**Bert Zimmerly:** Would the taxiway on the northside of the parallel runway be used for helicopters?

**Chris Hugunin:** This is something that could probably happen incrementally.

**Ray Valone:** Is there a way we can toggle between Alternative C1 and C2 when studying in case we don't agree to move Cornell? If you don't move Cornell in Alternative C2, do you have to move Evergreen?

**Chris Hugunin:** We can look at both C1 and C2. We do not have to move Evergreen.

The committee agreed they were most interested in the landside Alternatives C1 and C2 with no relocation of Evergreen Road

**Perry Gruber:** Can we look at maximizing parking for both C1 and C2?

**Chris Hugunin:** Yes.

**Henry Oberhelman:** To make a good decision, we should compare analysis of each of the alternatives.

**Bert Zimmerly:** Does Alternative B include corporate hangars?

**Discussion:** The PAC discussed corporate hangars and whether they should be included. Daren Griffin stated that the Port needed a framework to guide the placement of hangars if a company came to them and wanted to build one. He asked the PAC if segregation of these uses should start occurring. He added that they need to plan for infrastructure.

**Wink Brooks:** Can we avoid relocating the tower? Can we avoid alternatives that affect connecting Airport Road to Evergreen Road?

**Chris Hugunin:** We can look at alternatives that address those issues.

**Bert Zimmerly:** I like the Alternative C Airside configuration because of the connection to the T-hangars.

**PAC Discussion:** The PAC discussed runway crossings and safety issues.

**Ray Valone:** Can a helipad be included in any alternative?

**Chris Hugunin:** We can take a look at that.

During the discussion, the PAC agreed on several elements that were recorded on a flipchart. These elements follow:

- Push parallel runway north without having to relocate Evergreen Road
- Consolidate user types together for efficiency
- Carry Cornell Road relocation along—provide impact comparison of not moving it. Include parking comparison of moving/not moving it.
- Try not to move the air traffic control tower.

Vaughn Brown stopped the PAC discussion to make sure there was time for public comment.

## **Public Comment**

### **David Lowry, Pilot and Airport User**

There are a lot of expenses in moving Cornell Road. If you're leaning toward smaller hangars, who is going to pay for/build the road to the hangars? This is critical to the first hangar that is built. Chris Hugunin responded that sometimes airport access roads are eligible for FAA money. Ken Dyar asked who would pay for an Airport Road connection. This will be examined in the next chapter of the master plan update.

### **Randall Henderson, Tenant at Hillsboro Airport**

He is building a hangar at another airport and is now dealing with the issues of infrastructure: road, sewer, fire hydrants, and utilities. The first hangar builder has to do everything. The FAA may fund pavement but not water lines. Chris Hugunin responded by saying there may be other federal programs that can be used. The FAA will only fund if there is a master plan in place.

### **Henry Oberhelman, Resident and PAC member**

(Henry read a statement, which follows:)

“I have a story to tell you. My story is about my little \$50 radio shack noise meter. The story really starts back in the first part of this year when we were writing the section about noise in this book we call the Hillsboro Master Plan. Typical of many groups such as this, once that chapter is written, we dust off our hands and move on to the next big thing. This chapter will be different and will be with us once all the consultants are gone and the community is left with the results.

Anyway back to my noise meter. This is a pretty good little gadget. It measures dba, what you hear from the next-door leaf blower noise that you hear on a quiet Saturday morning. It also measures dbc, the construction equipment vibrations that you may feel through the floors in your home. It doesn't measure impulse noise, the string of firecrackers that startle you when the neighborhood kids set them off on July 3<sup>rd</sup>. On the other hand, it is available, more than can be said for the Port's much more sophisticated equipment.

Naturally I use this gadget to measure helicopter overflight noise. Like your little dog, it jumps up in response to a helicopter overflight. If it likes dba then it jumps to about 70. If it says dbc then it jumps a little higher to 73 dbc.

Well, you ask, so what?

Well, one of the so whats is November 20<sup>th</sup>. That day happened to be a Saturday apparently a good flying day for Hillsboro Aviation. On that day, between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. we received 77 helicopter overflights. Between the hours of 10:00 and 1:00 p.m. there were 33 overflights. Each of those overflights interrupts conversation, penetrates our home with the low frequency noise and startles our nervous system. THIS IS INSANITY! And it will get worse. How much worse I can't guess because the Port is only willing to put more noise over us. Next there will be three helicopters, there will be different sizes of helicopters, then there will be additional training companies and of course all of this will go on 24/7. This is insanity.

As my little story concludes, I ask each of you to keep these questions in mind:

1. How would you like that leaf blower 77 times a day?
2. How would you like that construction roller 77 times a day?
3. How would you like that string of firecrackers 77 times a day?

Finally, unlike Houston Hickenbottom of Hillsboro Aviation who can choose to not advertise Hillsboro Aviation in Afghanistan because there is insufficient return, we cannot evade our community responsibility in all of its aspects. Then I ask: to the Port, to the FAA, to the City of Hillsboro, to the aviation community and to the State Aviation Board: My God, what are you doing to our community as you write this book?"

End of public comments.

## **Public Information Workshop Report**

Chris Hugunin explained that an open house occurred on December 1 (evening before PAC meeting). There were 71 attendees. The public received a summary of the process to date and the next steps.

## **Next Steps and Adjournment**

Vaughn Brown asked that any comments be returned to the team by December 17<sup>th</sup> at [smolab@portptld.com](mailto:smolab@portptld.com). The final master plan should be complete by May. The next open house is tentatively scheduled for March 23, 2005, and the next PAC meeting is scheduled for March, 24, 2005.

There was an announcement that the Port has a new commissioner, Ken Allen. He is from the area.

## **Meeting Adjourned**