



Richland Airport Master Plan Project

Working Paper Number Two: Facility Requirements & Alternatives

Technical Advisory Meeting No. 3 Summary

Oct. 14, 2020, 10 a.m. – noon

Invitees: **Port:** Joe Walker, Diahann Howard, David Billetdeaux, Veronica Serna, Roy Keck
J-U-B: Neal Fraser, Chuck Larson, Christine Roemeling, Lee Unterwegner, Ben Hoppe, Gemma Puddy
FAA: [Scott Eaton](#)
Airport Users:
Devin Alder (Sundance Aviation)
Clif Dyer (Sundance Aviation)
Herb Brayton (Richland Aeronautical Facilities)
[Cannon Hill](#)
[Eric Johnson \(WSDOT Division of Aeronautics\)](#)
Brad Klippert (Local Legislator)
John MacArthur (WSDOT Division of Aeronautics)
[Eric Mendenhall \(West Richland\)](#)
Pete Rogalsky (City of Richland)
Mike Stevens (City of Richland)
George Schaeffer (Schaeffer Industries)
Jeff Schneider (Lamb Weston)
[Robert Wade \(EAA and Friends of Richland Airport\)](#)
Glenn Whitcomb (Friends of Richland Airport)
[Erin Whitney \(Life Flight\)](#)
Please Note: Blue text highlights those who did not attend.

Summary: J-U-B Engineers staff conducted a meeting with the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), made of up of those who have been asked to offer technical input and advice for the update to the Richland Airport Master Plan. They re-introduced the master plan and discussed airport facility requirements, public involvement, the website, and the Alternative Plans for the future. Additionally, they reviewed the role of the TAC and next steps in the project. Below are bulleted notes from comments offered in the meeting. For more information about what was presented, find the presentation PDF file associated with this summary.

Presentation Highlights (please see details in presentation pdf)

1. Introductions:
 1. Joe Walker, Director of Airports, introduced himself and Port Staff.
 2. Gemma Puddy prompted introductions from J-U-B staff and TAC members.
2. Review of TAC and their role.



3. Reviewed public involvement to-date:
 1. Positive feedback, overall, and users enjoy the airport.
 2. Users see opportunities for enhancement and growth in the future.
4. Reviewed project purpose, process, and schedule.
5. Planning is essential to creating the story for the future for the airport; the final product is a multi-chapter report complete with Airport Layout Plans (ALP) for the immediate and long-term future.

CHAPTER FOUR: FACILITY REQUIREMENTS

1. Highlighted both airside and landside recommendations (the primary ones that impact Richland):
 - a. Airside:
 - Runway length and configuration – B-II future design plane, requires at least 5,000 feet or more.
 - Approach capability – current vs. improving ability while protecting airport
 - Airspace Evaluation –
 1. Blowing dust and dirt is a problem; aggressive annual grading program or planting vegetation; concern from sagebrush piling up around hangars.
 2. Hillside toward West Richland – some of the hillside is lighted, yet future protection of the airspace is key to collaborate with the City about.
 - Wind Analysis – wind coverage is very good with the two runways.
 - b. Landside:
 - Aircraft parking - sufficient apron area for the next 20 years. However, creating some larger aircraft spaces and the potential loss of apron along Taxiway A for improved approaches to U.S. Highway 19 will create a need for expansion.
 - Terminal/FBO – sufficient space.
 - Hangar space – there is a wait list for space.
 1. T-Hangars – 99 total, for 119,000 square feet
 2. Box Hangars – 45 total, for 202,000 sf
 3. Available – 13 box hangars and 20 T hangars total, for 79,000 sf
 - Automobile Parking – needed.
 - Security – as deemed appropriate.
2. Future Design Standards
 - a. Current Critical Aircraft – A-II, PC-12
 - b. Future Critical Aircraft – B-II, Citation XLS+ and/or Challenger 300

CHAPTER FIVE: ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS

1. Airside Alternatives
 - a. Alternative 1 – Runway 1/19 4,000 ft. (current length)
 - b. Alternative 2 – Runway 1/19 4,600 ft.
 - c. Alternative 3 – Runway 1/19 5,100 ft.
 - d. Alternative 4 – Runway 1/19 5,800 ft.
 - e. Alternative 5 – Runway 8/26 4,000 ft. (current length)



- f. Alternative A – Visual/Non-precision approach
- g. Alternative B – Improved approach capabilities
2. Landside Alternatives
 - a. Landside 1 – Development near existing features
 - b. Landside 2 – Development expansion to new areas
3. General Airside Improvements Runway 1/19
 - a. Obstruction clearing/lighting
 - b. Land acquisition for RPZs and BRLs
 - c. Mark portion of apron as non-movement
 - d. Obstruction light hangars or remove
 - e. Construct run-up areas

Four series of poll questions appeared on the Zoom screen for participants to provide input on; these answers are only representative of the TAC members who chose to participate.

Poll #1 Questions

1. **What is an appropriate ultimate length for primary Runway 1/19?**
 - a. 4,000 ft.
 - b. 4,600 ft.
 - c. 5,100 ft. – 89% of votes
 - d. 5,800 ft.
2. **What type of approach capability is most appropriate for Runway 1 end?**
 - a. >1 mile vm VOR/Circling
 - b. $\frac{3}{4}$ mile vm RNAV – 55% of votes
3. **What type of approach capability is most appropriate for Runway 19 end?**
 - a. $\frac{3}{4}$ mile vm LOC and RNAV – 55% of votes
 - b. $\frac{1}{2}$ mile vm RNAV

Associated Comments:

- Runway 1 approach is low priority. Winds aren't prevailing (Clif, Sundance Aviation/Glenn)
 - Would rather prioritize approach to 8; hills to south will make minimums too high.
 - Runway lengthening and protecting runway 1's airspace from future development is what he sees as the priority. (Clif)
- Also, overflight on the hill above West Richland would be of concern to the public. There are already some complaints, and they want to minimize those complaints.
- What will happen to the golf course? (Devin)
 - Some or all of the golf course may need to go away for an improved approach to runway 8 – potentially incompatible land use.

Poll #2 Questions

1. **What type of approach capability is most appropriate for Runway 8 end?**
 - c. >1 mile vm VOR/Circling
 - d. $\frac{3}{4}$ mile RNAV approach – 86% of votes
2. **What type of approach capability is most appropriate for Runway 26 end?**
 - a. >1 mile vm VOR/Circling



- b. $\frac{3}{4}$ mile RNAV approach – 100% of votes

Associated Comments:

- Keeping Runway 8-26 as an option is important particularly for life flight. (Clif)
- There is also some use by aircraft unable to land at TCA/Pasco due to heavy cross wind. (Glenn)
- West approach to runway 8 by aircraft (Life Flight) uses the ODALS. (Joe, Richland Airport/Clif)
- Suggestion - Consider setting an IAP Fix closer to the airport.
- **ACTION ITEM:** What is happening with development off the end of runway 8? Follow up between the Port and the City is probably warranted to protect the area for aviation. (Question for Richland).

Poll #3 Questions

1. **Given various constraints on both extending Runway 1/19 and improving the approach capability, what should be higher priority for the airport?**
 - a. Absolutely lengthen the runway even if it results in less favorable approach capability.
 - b. Lengthen the runway, but only if it keeps at least the approach capability it has now. – 89% of votes
 - c. Runway length is good enough, but we really need better approach capability.
2. **Extending the runway and improving the approach might both be possible, but probably not at the same time. Which should the airport pursue first?**
 - a. Extend the runway, then seek for better approach capability. – 67% of votes
 - b. Seek for better approach capability, then extend the runway.

Associated Comments:

- VFR is probably majority right now, not IFR pilots. (Glenn)
 - Yet potential audience needs IFR, and quite a few do use it already at Richland. They are getting more larger aircraft desiring instrument capability as they consider a flight plan both directions and as an alternate to Pasco. (Clif)
- Richland is a convenient airport and would be optimal with a runway of 5,100 feet.
 - Approaches are currently adequate. (George)
- Some of the runway may need a 65,000 lb weight capability based on some of the larger aircraft landing, and FAA requirements changing.

Poll #4 Questions

1. **What is your first preference for aircraft parking/storage options?**
 - a. Tiedowns
 - b. Shade hangar tiedowns
 - c. T-hangars - 38%
 - d. Small box hangar (3,600 sqft. or less) - 50%
 - e. Large box hangars (more than 3,600 sqft.) - 13%
2. **What is your second preference for parking/storage options?**
 - a. Tiedowns
 - b. Shade hangar tiedowns – tie for second
 - c. T-hangars - tie for first
 - d. Small box hangar (3,600 sqft. or less) - tie for first
 - e. Large box hangars (more than 3,600 sqft.) – tie for second



3. What projects overall should be priority for the Richland Airport?

- a. Improve current runway conditions – approaches, obstacle clearances, grading, lighting
- b. Improve primary runway length – 75% of votes
- c. Improve apron, hangar, parking etc.

Additional Comments/Conversation:

- Lamb Weston accesses Saint Street daily. Will need a new reasonable access, not from SR-240. (Jeff)
 - Consider an “access” road, not public within RPZ.
 - Snyder Road will probably be taken out of the RPZ per FAA directives.
 - Security issues and direct access to the Wastewater Operations Plant is needed. Lamb Weston uses Saint Street multiple times a day with heavy equipment and have had issues with security.
 - Consider an access road for private use only within the RPZ. Separate SR-240 access outside of the RPZ for public.
 - **ACTION ITEM:** Port would like to visit with Lamb Weston and City on this topic. (Diahann)
- Regarding Landside Option #1, are the middle ones small or large hangars? (Jeff) *Response: They can be both but are smaller in the exhibit.*
- Current FBO located at the right location (where Sundance is). Need more maintenance facilities. Perhaps where the helicopter operations are shown? (Clif)
- Looking at large hangar area, not FBO for central area of circle area. (Joe)
- Prefer closing Airport Road and plan more hangars toward the apron.
- Zero Gravity hangar - Rumor has them planning non-aviation use and business use only. They are not expecting road access.
- Helicopter operations - current helipads cover most of the need. One or two most of the time. (Devin)
- **ACTION ITEM:** Runway length/weight consideration – possible firefighting aircraft/military use. Need to reach out to them. (Brad, Local Legislator)
 - FBO that provides not just over-wing but pressure fueling. (Clif has pressure fueling.)
 - Restaurant needs. Get more itinerant operations.
 - Aviation Training - Discuss with area schools will be huge need in future.
 - UPS, FedEx, DHL – talk to them about their needs.
 - Presentations to aviation caucus to get in front of the Boeings, etc.
 - Think big!
- Central Washington University closed their aviation training school, so opportunity at the airport. (Joe)
- Helicopter area options other than helipads: (Devin)
 - Large aircraft/military/firefighting.
 - Access difficult due to grade. Would need to lower grade.
- Need for compass relocation in Landside Option 2. Still need the compass for maintenance of aircraft. (Devin)
 - Update FBO building/parking.
 - Provide a common meeting area.
- Business jet customers need a better pilot lounge area, bathrooms, etc. (Clif)



- Don't lose #2019 Butler building to hangars. (Note: this is port property not obligated airport property)(Diahann)
- T hangars expensive to build/invest. (Glenn)
 - Box hangars preferred for investment or for multiple aircraft.
 - 50 x 50 is smallest size hangar. Larger preferred.
- **ACTION ITEM:** Fueling facility relocation. Work with Clif on best location. (Clif)
 - Give Life Flight more room to the east. Coordinate directly with Life Flight.
- Current fueling location ok. (Glenn)
 - Re-route road at gate or new taxi-lane.
 - Concern for wildlife, bird strike management. Need to elevate effort.
- Would like copy of PowerPoint for further discussion with staff/commission. (Diahann)
 - Are there case studies for FBO building charges, management?
 - National Guard/DOD coming in
- Consider helipad area for urban-air mobility platform. (John)

NEXT STEPS:

1. Gather broader stakeholder / public feedback.
2. Use TAC feedback and airport input to select preferred alternative.
3. Working Paper No. 2 to FAA for review and preferred approval.
4. Develop short- and long-term development plan/draft airport layout plan.
5. Working Paper No. 3 presentation.

Overall Themes for Aspects of a Preferred Alternative (established from feedback of this meeting):

- Primary runway should be between 5,000 and 5,100 ft.
- ¼ mile approach capability is sufficient.
- Need better approach to Runway 8.
- Maybe approach to Runway 1, but not necessarily.
- Absolutely keep the approach to Runway 26.
- Plan for the ODALS being turned off.
- Reconfigure landside to allow for more T hangars, possibly.
- Close airport road back further east.
- Revenue generators maintained.
- Hangars no smaller than 50 ft.
- Show improved FBO and corporate services facilities.
- Consider air-mobility and electric powered craft.
- Expanding the current helicopter space is not essential; the extra space could be better used for something else.

MEETING ACTION ITEMS:

1. Explore options for Electric/Hybrid Aircraft, Urban Air Mobility, and electric vehicles.
2. What is happening with development off the end of Runway 8? (Question for Richland).
3. Meeting with Port, City of Richland and Lamb Weston about airport access roads.



4. Reach out to firefighting aircraft/military use to discuss runway length and weight consideration.
5. Talk to Life Flight about their needs and preferences for a preferred alternative.
6. Gemma to work with TAC members to reach broader audience for alternatives feedback.

Zoom Chat Questions & Comments

1. **Would vegetation help keep the dust/dirt down?** (Glenn, Friends of Richland Airport)
 - a. *Response: Concern for FOD from sagebrush, etc. Piles up around hangars.*
2. **Has there been consideration for emerging aviation technology, alternate propulsions (electric aircraft) and Urban Air Mobility or Advanced Air Mobility?** (John, WSDOT)
 - a. **ACTION ITEM:** *Response: Facilities to accommodate charging/landing area will be explored.*
3. **Would the Port consider building T-hangars?** (John)
 - a. *Response: Yes the Port would absolutely consider building T-hangars, as with any project that is not grant eligible, funding will be the challenge.*
4. **On hangars, the demand is high for box hangers but is not using space efficiently. Most 60x60 hangars on the field only have 1-to-2 aircraft stored inside. T hangars are hard to build on the investment side from my understanding from some stakeholders on the field. Would the Port consider building some T-hangar buildings? I do believe most spaces would be filled quickly.** (Devin, Sundance Aviation)
 - a. *Response: Yes, the Port believes there is ample opportunity for the Port to build hangar space. Funding will be the main challenge.*
5. **In pushing the runway north, what do access roads look like for accessing the property west of the runway? Lamb Weston does not want to have to enter SR-240 to get to the treatment facility.** (Jeff, Lamb Weston)
 - a. *Response: Port would like to visit with Lamb Weston and City on this topic.*
6. **By extending 500 ft south of approach end of Rwy 1, what will happen with the golf course area?** (Devin)
 - a. *Response: Some or all of the golf course may need to go away for an improved approach to Runway 8 – the golf course could be considered potentially incompatible land use.*
7. **I do have concerns about asking aviation questions from non-aviators and most here are not IFR rated. Actually you have two on the call that are. This could be a different result with aviators.** (Glenn)
 - a. *Response: Our next steps will be to reach out to a broader audience for feedback. Glenn and Gemma will coordinate to reach the fellow airport users who Glenn knows.*
8. **Comment: For future use - the helicopter pads could be used for Urban Air Mobility platforms.** (John)