-Meeting Summary-

Attendees:

Oregon Department of Aviation: Matt Maass, Jeff Caines, and John Wilson
WHPacific, Inc: Dave Nafie and Mark Steele
Planning Advisory Committee Members: See sign in sheet
Public Attendees: See sign in sheet

Welcome and Recap

Meeting opened at 6:00 pm, with a brief discussion of the agenda for the evening, a recap of the PAC roles and responsibilities, the master plan elements, and a project schedule update.

Summary of Aviation Forecasts

The discussion of forecasts began with a recap of the national trends data presented at PAC Meeting #1 and how that information, along with state and local data, was utilized to develop several ranges of potential growth that could occur at the Independence State Airport in the next 20 years.

The summary of the aviation forecasts was presented and discussed, followed by a summary of the scenario planning exercise from the prior meeting. Attendees concurred that general feeling of the PAC membership, although not unanimous, was that when external conditions such as the state of the economy and local demographics are positive, the airport should still be conservative and retain its small aircraft focus. Thus no significant changes to increase the runway capabilities or dimensions and no instrument approach.

Introduction of Three Alternative Concepts

The three concepts presented had these characteristics:

Alternative 1

• Shift runway north to maintain runway length of 3,142' • Relocate connectors to meet criteria • Prepare alternate landing area • Relocate lighted windcone/segmented circle • Remove PAPI system • Acquire land to the west for future airport development (33 acres) • Acquire land to the south for RPZ and approach protection (6 acres) • Construct full length parallel taxiway on west side including taxiway lighting and drainage improvements • Construct apron and taxilanes for west side
hangar development • Construct access road north from Hoffman Road • Install fencing for security and wildlife control • Depict future airpark uses only to west within UGB, no development to north.

Alternative 2

• Shift runway north and extend to future runway length of 3,436’ • Relocate connectors to meet criteria • Acquire land to the west for future airport development (34 acres) • Acquire land to the south for RPZ and approach protection (6 acres) • Construct full length parallel taxiway on west side including taxiway lighting and drainage improvements • Construct apron and taxilanes for west side hangar development • Construct access road north from Hoffman Road • Install fencing for security and wildlife control • Depict future airpark uses and UGB expansion only to north, airport development to west.

Alternative 3

• Relocate Runway 34 threshold for a future runway length of 3,001’ • Relocate connectors to meet criteria • Acquire land to the west for future airport development (64 acres) • Acquire land to the south for RPZ and approach protection (6 acres) • Construct full length parallel taxiway on west side including taxiway lighting, drainage improvements, and environmental mitigation • Construct turf runway at a future length of 1,700’ including environmental mitigation • Construct apron and taxilanes for west side hangar development • Construct access road north from Hoffman Road • Install fencing for security and wildlife control • Do not depict any future airpark development

Dave Nafie from WHPacific described each concept and gathered initial feedback through Q&A.

Breakout Exercise

Three tables were set up with large format maps of the concepts and markers. The entire PAC and audience together gathered around the tables and worked with ODA and WHPacific facilitators to gather discussion and feedback. The exercise lasted approximately 40 minutes after which people were invited to share what they discussed and heard. The following questions guided the discussion:

1. What are key advantages or drawbacks to each alternative?
2. Do you believe any facilities are missing or underrepresented?
3. Do you believe any facilities that FAA would not financially support would be worth local investment?
4. Which alternative best represents your vision for the airport?

Alternative 1:
Alternative 1 was generally well received. Most of those in attendance felt that a turf landing area is desirable and several were ok with relocating or eliminating the PAPIs in order to make room. Opinions were split on how much, if at all, the runway should be extended. Several commenters do not see a problem with the aligned taxiway at RW 34. They would rather spend resources other places on the airport. The west side configuration was generally well received. Several recommended shifting that development farther west to allow both turf landing area and PAPIs to exist in their current configuration.
Alternative 2:  
Alternative 2 was also well received because of the added runway length. However, several attendees wanted to see a turf strip on the plan. Alternative 2 had many of the same comments as Alt 1: Leave 34 end alone and shift west development to the south to allow turf.

Alternative 3:  
Alternative 3 was not well received and was dismissed outright by most participants. Most saw issues with the turf runway including visibility issues between the converging runways since hangars would block being able to see the other runway’s departure end. Access to the turf runway is problematic and the overall cost of acquiring enough land to accommodate the turf runway made the cost of the alternative far exceed the benefits.

General Comments:
- Public Restrooms for the hangar areas are especially important for female pilots and should be included in the plan.
- Turf strip is desired by flight instructors – Soft surface landings is a required training element for student pilots.
- Is it possible to use the RPZ land to create a wetland drainage swale?
  - This was discussed briefly and dismissed due to wildlife (bird) concerns and RPZ land use issues.
- It was noted that a longer runway could attract larger and louder aircraft to the airport.
- (FAA Airports Planner) Valerie Thorsen noted that any runway extension would only be grant eligible with a demonstrated need. “This isn’t a build it and they will come” situation.
- Wayne Nutsch advocated for a longer runway, an instrument approach, automated weather observation system (AWOS), and a radio communications outlet (RCO) to bring in more business traffic. He noted that while most of the people voicing opinions in the room paid dues for airfield access, his investment is significantly larger. His business would benefit from enlarging facilities and inviting more aircraft that are used for the growing business GA segment.
- Several people want to see an AWOS installed on site.
  - Matt Maass stated that ODA can’t put an AWOS on each state-owned airport – too expensive to maintain and calibrate ($4000/year per AWOS).
  - Others noted that Independence is one of three profitable airports in their system and at least those three should have an AWOS.

Public Comments

Members of the public had, in general, views that were aligned with the PAC. There was a strong desire to keep the Airport and its culture unchanged. Suggested improvements to the Airport were focused on enhancing facilities that serve the current based aircraft, and not changes that would draw in larger turbo prop or jet aircraft. Most members of the public wished to see a grass runway and an improved/expanded FBO with public restrooms.

Next meeting date in June will be determined soon and sent to PAC members well in advance. The meeting was adjourned at 8:00 p.m.