OREGON
Department of Aviation

AURORA STATE AIRPORT

DRAFT AIRPORT MASTER PLAN
APPENDIX 11



CENTURY WEST
ENGINEERING

Appendix 11

Public Records

Table of Contents

Public Involvement Summary
- Public Involvement and Communication Plan (2022 & 2025)
- Project Website Overview - Public Meeting Information Summary

PAC Protocols

PAC Meeting & PAC Working Session Meeting Files
- November 16, 2021
- March 1, 2022
- April 5, 2022
- May 3, 2022
- November 15, 2022
- March 12, 2023
- April 30, 2024
- June 11, 2024
- July 30, 2024
- October 15, 2024
- December 10, 2024
- February 11, 2025

Public Open House
- March 1, 2022
- June 13, 2024

Public Surveys
- February and March 2022
- July 2024

Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Correspondence
- Chapter 4 - Draft Airport Facility Requirements with FAA comments and responses (04/16/24)
- Potential for MOS related to runway extensions at UAO (03/26/24)
- UAO Forecast Approval Letter (01/23/24)
- Email transmittal - Memo to acknowledge changes to draft Working Paper #1 and a request for official FAA review of the Aviation Activity Forecasts. (05/19/22)
- Email transmittal - formal request for FAA review of Working Paper #1 including draft Chapter 3, Aviation Activity Forecasts (05/20/22)

FAQs

Public Comments (emails, letters, and comments collected through project website)
- 2021
- 2022
- 2023
- 2024
- 2025


Aurora Airport Master Plan

Public Involvement Summary

Overview

The Aurora State Airport Master Plan, led by the Oregon Department of Aviation (ODAV) and Century West Engineering, was a comprehensive effort with the goal of evaluating and planning for the airport's future over the next 20 years. A large part of this was ensuring the community had a voice in the planning process, which was led by JLA Public Involvement.

This summary gives an overview of the public involvement efforts throughout the four-year process, including Planning Advisory Committee (PAC) meetings, public open houses, surveys, and public comments collected, including emails, website comments, and letters to the project team.



Contents

Planning Advisory Committee (PAC) Meetings 2

Public Open Houses and Surveys 3

Attachments 5

Public Involvement Plan 5

Planning Advisory Committee (PAC) members 6

2021-2025 Public Records 10

Project documents, meeting and open house summaries, and recordings have been posted on the project website throughout the project and will continue to remain available (https://publicproject.net/AuroraAirport).

Planning Advisory Committee (PAC) Meetings

The PAC members included representatives and interested parties from local and state agencies, cities, counties, and neighborhoods, as well as airport businesses and users, and was instrumental in helping guide the Master Plan. PAC members served in an advisory capacity, offering input throughout the planning process, but did not make formal recommendations or decisions. The FAA reviewed and approved certain components of the plan such as aviation activity forecasts, critical aircraft, and the Airport Layout Plan (ALP) to determine eligibility for federal funding. ODAV was the final decision maker.

The project began in 2021 and lasted through 2025. The Aurora Airport Master Plan process began during the Covid-19 pandemic. Because of this, all meetings were held virtually to reduce the transmission of the virus and continue the planning process in a transparent manner; all meetings were open to community members to attend live, as well as accessing recordings of all meetings and meeting materials from the project website. At the conclusion of the pandemic, ODAV decided that meetings would continue to be held virtually to maximize accessibility and participation of the 20+ person PAC. Virtual meetings resulted in increased participation from committee members.

Each meeting included opportunities for public comment, and all materials, including agendas, presentations, and summaries, were made available on the project website. PAC members and the public were notified of the meetings through emails, postcards, meeting notices at the airport, and advertisements in local media. For more detailed information, please see the attachments to this document.

Meeting	Date	Focus
PAC Meeting #1	November 16, 2021	Introduction to the Master Plan process and PAC protocols.
PAC Meeting #2	March 1, 2022	Review of existing conditions and preliminary forecasts
PAC Working Session	April 5, 2022	Continued discussion about existing conditions and preliminary forecasts (Working Paper No. 1).
PAC Meeting #3	May 3, 2022	Review and address PAC comments and questions regarding Working Paper No. 1.
PAC Working Session #2	November 15, 2022	Review of FAA comments on the existing conditions and preliminary forecasts (Working Paper No. 1) and the technical team's responses.

PAC Meeting #4	March 12, 2024	Presentation of Working Paper #1 and updated forecasts and data.
PAC Meeting #5	April 30, 2024	Review of Draft Chapter 4 and discussion of draft facility requirements.
PAC Meeting #6	June 11, 2024	Presentation of preliminary alternatives.
PAC Working Session #3	July 30, 2024	Presentation of refined preliminary alternatives.
PAC Meeting #7	October 15, 2024	Discussion on preferred alternatives and cost estimates.
PAC Meeting #8	December 10, 2024	Review of noise analysis and alternative discussions.
PAC Meeting #9	February 11, 2025	Final review of refined preferred alternative, Airport Layout Plan (ALP), and Capital Improvement Plan (CIP).

PAC Surveys

PAC members were also surveyed at specific points in the planning process to provide feedback for the project team to better understand their thoughts on the draft refined alternatives. This feedback allowed the project team to further refine the draft alternatives and incorporate changes when possible. The results of these surveys are available in the related summaries attached to this document and on the project website.

Public Open Houses and Surveys

Two open houses were held for the PAC and public. These events were opportunities for residents, interested parties, and PAC members to learn about the project's progress and contribute their thoughts, ideas, and concerns. The first open house was held virtually on March 1, 2022, due to the Covid-19 pandemic, and had about forty participants. The second was held in-person on June 13, 2024, at North Marion High School in Aurora, Oregon with about 120 participants. This open house was held in-person to encourage attendance from people with limited internet access living in the project area; however, an online survey with the same questions as the open house comment form was also provided as a way for people to choose the best method for engaging with the project.

The events were advertised through the project website, email announcements to mailing lists and PAC members, newspaper ads and press releases in local media and newspapers, advertisements in the Statesman Journal, postcards to nearby residents and agencies, flyers

posted around the airport, and a press releases. Full summaries are included in the attachments to this document.

Event	Date	Format	Purpose
Open House #1	March 1, 2022	Virtual	Introduce the Master Plan project and gather initial public input.
Open House #2	June 13, 2024	North Marion High School	Present preliminary alternatives and collect community feedback.

Public Surveys

In February and March 2022, ODAV held an online survey to collect community input on the current and future needs of the Aurora Airport. The survey focused on land use, transportation, economic, and environmental impacts, with the purpose of helping the project team understand community priorities and received 467 responses. Relevant project materials were available for public viewing on the website during this time.

ODAV promoted the survey through website updates, email announcements to mailing lists and PAC members, newspaper ads in Pamplin Media and the Statesman Journal, mailed postcards to nearby residents and agencies, flyers posted around the airport, and a press release sent to local media. Two articles also ran in the Canby Herald highlighting the project and public input opportunities.

In July of 2024, the project team also held a public feedback form to ask how people felt about tradeoffs for different elements of the draft alternatives, and the extension of the runway to fulfill safety requirements. There were 75 total responses.

Attachments

Public Involvement Plan

Planning Advisory Committee (PAC) members

Below are the approved committee members by year.

Organization	Name				Alternate
	2021	**2022**	**2023**	**2024/25**	
1000 Friends of Oregon	Roger Kaye	Roger Kaye	Roger Kaye	Roger Kaye	
AABC/TLM Holdings	Ted Millar	Ted Millar	Ted Millar	Ted Millar	Aron Faegre
Atlantic Aviation (formerly Lynx Aviation)	Tristan Dorian (as Lynx Aviation)	Tristan Dorian (as Lynx Aviation) Bob Hala	Bob Hala	Trent Brownlee Jon Bickford	
Aurora Air Traffic Control Tower (ATCT)	Raul Suarez	Raul Suarez	Raul Suarez	Raul Suarez	
Aurora Airport Improvement Association	Bruce Bennett	Bruce Bennett	Bruce Bennett	Tony Helbling	
Aurora Butteville Barlow Community Planning Organization	Ken Ivey	Ken Ivey	Ken Ivey	Ken Ivey	
Aurora CTE, Inc	Bill Graupp	Bill Graupp	Bill Graupp	Bill Graupp	
Charbonneau Country Club	Steve Switzer	Steve Switzer	Steve Switzer	Jeff Baymor Dave Mauk (May 2024)	
City of Aurora	Brian Asher	Brian Asher	Brian Asher	Brian Asher	
City of Canby	Scott Archer	Scott Archer	Scott Archer	Jamie Stickel	Don Hardy

City of Wilsonville	Chris Neamtzu	Chris Neamtzu Charlotte Lehan	Councilor Dr. Joann Linville	Councilor Dr. Joann Linville Chris Neamtzu	Charlotte Lehan Chris Neamtzu Councilor Anne Shevlin
Clackamas County	Commissioner Tootie Smith	Commissioner Tootie Smith	Commissioner Tootie Smith	Commissioner Tootie Smith	
Columbia Helicopters	Rob Roedts	Rob Roedts	Rob Roedts	Dave Tibbetts Rob Roedts	Bob Buchanan Matt Nash
Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians	Robert Kentta	Robert Kentta	Robert Kentta	Pam Barlow Lind	
Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde Community of Oregon	Cheryl Pouley	Cheryl Pouley	Cheryl Pouley	Cheryl Pouley	
Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon	Christian Nauer	Christian Nauer	Christian Nauer	Christian Nauer	
Deer Creek Estates HOA	Matt Williams	Matt Williams	Matt Williams	Matt Williams	
Friends of French Prairie	Ben Williams	Ben Williams	Ben Williams	Ben Williams	Wayne Richards
Helicopter Transport Service	Robert Fournier	Robert Fournier	Robert Fournier	Robert Fournier	Aron Faegre
Life Flight Network	Ben Clayton	Ben Clayton	Ben Clayton	Ben Clayton	

				Michael Weimer	
Marion County	Commissioner Danielle Bethel	Commissioner Danielle Bethel	Commissioner Danielle Bethel	Commissioner Danielle Bethel Alvin Klausen	Matt Lawyer
Marion County Planning Department		Austin Barnes	Austin Barnes	Austin Barnes	Brandon Reich
Oregon Dept of Aviation	Tony Beach	Tony Beach Betty Stansbury	Tony Beach	Tony Beach	
Oregon Dept of Aviation Board		Cathryn Stephens	Cathryn Stephens	Cathryn Stephens	
Oregon Dept of Transportation	Naomi Zwerling	Naomi Zwerling	Naomi Zwerling	Naomi Zwerdling	
Oregon Dept of Land Conservation and Development	Matt Crall	Matt Crall	Matt Crall	Matt Crall Melissa Ahrens	Nicole Mardell Matt Crall
Oregon Farm Bureau	Mary Anne Cooper	Mary Anne Cooper	Mary Anne Cooper		
Oregon Department of Emergency Management	Bill Martin	Bill Martin Sarah Puls	Sarah Puls	Whitney Stewart	Sarah Puls
Positive Aurora Airport Management	Tony Helbling	Tony Helbling	Tony Helbling	Bruce Bennett	
Regional Solutions	Jody Christiansen	Jody Christiansen	Jody Christiansen	Beth Wytoski	

Vans Aircraft	Rian Johnson	Rian Johnson	Rian Johnson	Rian Johnson	Greg Hughes
Willamette Aviation	David Waggoner	David Waggoner	David Waggoner	David Waggoner	
Wilsonville Chamber of Commerce	Patrick Donaldson	Patrick Donaldson	Patrick Donaldson	Patrick Donaldson	Kevin Ferrasci O'Malley

2021-2025 Public Records

All public records, including emails, letters and comments collected through the project website are included on the website. They are listed by last name, then by date.

AURORA AIRPORT MASTER PLAN

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT AND COMMUNICATION PLAN

Prepared for

Oregon Department of Aviation
3040 25th Street SE
Salem, OR 97320

Prepared by

JLA Public Involvement, Inc.
921 SW Washington St., Suite 570
Portland, OR 97205

Date

February 2022


This Communication and Outreach Plan is a living document and will be updated as the project progresses and more information is available. It will be used to outline the public outreach approach and serve as a reference document for all project team members as they move through the project; for project benefits and messaging, as well to document common stakeholder questions and concerns.

1. UNDERSTAND THE PROJECT

PROJECT TEAM/KEY CONTACTS FOR EACH PHASE	
ODA Project Manager	Heather Peck
ODA	Sarah Lucas
ODA (Airport Manager)	Tony Beach
ODA	Seth Thompson
Century West Project Manager	Matt Rogers
Century West	Samantha Peterson
JLA Public Involvement, Project Manager	Brandy Steffen
JLA Public Involvement, Project Coordinator	Ariella Frishberg

COMMUNICATION PROTOCOLS			
Main Spokesperson	Sarah Lucas	503-378-2211	sarah.lucas@odav.oregon.gov
Media Requests	Media requests or questions from the media should be directed to the Spokesperson listed above. No other staff should speak directly with media, unless approval was provided ahead of time. Spokesperson to consult with Project Manager to develop media replies.		
Social Media	ODA will utilize existing social media accounts to advertise this project, including posting press releases and meeting dates. https://www.facebook.com/ORAviation https://twitter.com/oraviation https://www.instagram.com/oraviation/		
Public comments/ questions	Best practice is for public comments will be collected by the project via a website comment form, the main spokesperson's email, or letters mailed to 3040 25th Street SE, Salem, OR 97302 and stored in a spreadsheet for all staff to review. Questions that come through ODA's social media accounts should be tracked using the existing system but forwarded to the main spokesperson so that it can be tracked specifically for this project. Common responses to comments have been developed and saved as a FAQ and posted to the website.		
Visual identity	Logo and colors will reflect the ODA style guide. Dark blue: #005A9C, 0/90/156 Dark green: #014a1f, 1/74/31		
Quality Control	• JLA will review deliverables internally using our standard QC process • Century West will do an initial review within a week of receiving • ODA will do a final review within a week of receiving; edits will be incorporated and ODA will have one additional review before materials are posted to the project website		

Project Schedule



PROJECT DESCRIPTION, GOALS, AND OBJECTIVES	
Project Scope/ Description*	This project will develop a 2021-2041 Airport Master Plan (AMP) for the Aurora State Airport. The AMP is a tool the Oregon Department of Aviation (ODA) will use to address the development needs of the airport for the next 20 years and beyond. Key messages: • The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) requires airports to have an AMP and recommends airports like the Aurora State Airport prepare new plans at least every ten years. • An AMP provides a long-term, mid-range, and short-term development for the ODA-owned portions of the airport. • The goals of the AMP include developing a plan that prioritizes safety, cost-effectively satisfies aviation demand, and considers potential environmental and socioeconomic issues. • This project is fully funded through the FAA Airport and Airway Trust Fund (commonly known as the Aviation Trust Fund). • The ODA is committed to a public involvement process that creates opportunities for engagement from the community, including providing opportunities for education, dialogue and shaping the outcome of the plan through community events and a Planning Advisory Committee (PAC). • The plan will look at what is happening around the airport that could affect the future plans, development and operation of the airport such as land use, transportation, environmental, economic development, etc.
Public Involvement Goals*	Incorporate community and governmental concerns to create an AMP that is built with community support. Develop and administer a fair and balanced public involvement process that leaves all stakeholders feeling heard. Provide the technical team and decision-makers with an accurate representation of the range of community viewpoints to help create a plan that has fully considered the tradeoffs.

Public Involvement Objectives*	Transparent communication throughout the process: • Posting materials before events to the website. • Posting videos and event summaries after the event to the website. • Sharing drafts of plans before a decision is made. Documenting the conflicting and varied viewpoints and concerns heard from the community. Establishing and strengthening community relationships: • Regional stakeholder meetings with state and regional agency stakeholders. • Small group briefings and one-on-one stakeholder interviews with community groups and stakeholders. One-on-one communication through emails and phone calls with the main spokesperson. Educating the community about the process and integrating community feedback at key decision points: • The formation of a Planning Advisory Committee, which will meet throughout the AMP process to provide input on project milestones. • Virtual and in-person (as safety allows) events, where members of the public can learn more about the project and provide their input. • Online questionnaires. • Advertisement for events through newspapers of record, press releases, postcards to nearby residents/businesses, flyers, website updates, emails, social media posts, etc. • Factsheets/newsletters to explain the process and plan at key decision points. • A Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) document that is updated throughout the process to answer questions raised from PAC members and the wider community; posted to the website. • Meeting, event, and questionnaire summaries that explain the comments and concerns collected throughout the process. These will be shared through the project website.

What is the level of public interest in the project?*	High
What is the history of this project in the community?*	The last Airport Master Plan was developed in 2010.
What are the main community concerns about the project?*	Major concerns include noise, increased number of aircraft using the airport, impacts to property values, increased operating hours, and economic impacts of restricting growth. Community members want to feel like their concerns have been heard and considered during the decision-making process.

A stakeholder list will be developed and tracked separately from this document.

3. OUTREACH ACTIVITIES

DECISION-MAKING AND INVOLVEMENT	
Decision making structure*	The wider community will have opportunities to share their thoughts and concerns with the technical team (through outreach approaches listed below). The decision makers and PAC will consider these viewpoints.

	The PAC will make a recommendation to the Oregon Department of Aviation; the summary will include a minority and majority report to represent all opinions. The ODA will make the final decision on what is included in the Airport Master Plan, which must be approved by the FAA.
Levels of Public Involvement*	Inform = provide balanced and objective information Consult = obtain public feedback on drafts, proposals, and/or decisions Involve = public concerns and aspirations influence the decision
Main Questions to Ask the Public*	What does the future look like for the Aurora Airport over the next 20 years?

Planning Tasks

PHASE SPECIFIC OUTREACH APPROACHES	TIMING	TEAM MEMBER	PURPOSE AND GOALS
Project email/mailing list with comment/response documentation	Throughout the project	Maintained by JLA	record all comments and responses, coordinate responding to comments
Project website with comment form	Throughout the project	JLA	Share information, encourage people to attend events, provide opportunity for comment
Planning Advisory Committee Meetings	Nine meetings over the course of the project	Facilitated by JLA, agenda and presentations developed in collaboration with ODA and CWE	Make recommendations to decision makers
Regional Stakeholder Meetings	Four meetings with state and regional agency stakeholders over the course of the project	Led by JLA, topics and questions developed in collaboration with ODA and CWE	Share information, solicit stakeholder input
Small group briefings, one-on-one briefings, and stakeholder interviews	Up to 20 community groups, neighborhood associations or selected stakeholders	Led by JLA, topics and questions developed in collaboration with ODA and CWE	Share information, solicit community input
Public Open House Meetings *At least two will be virtual*	Up to four, two-hour public open house meetings	Facilitated by JLA, agenda and presentations developed in collaboration with ODA and CWE	Share information, solicit community input

Project Questionnaires	Up to two project questionnaires	Developed by CWE, reviewed by JLA. Summary provided by JLA.	Solicit community input on specific aspects of project, including process of community engagement
Online Open House	Two online open houses	Content developed by ODA and CWE. Implementation by JLA.	Share information, solicit community input
Project Video	One video to accompany online open house	Script written by JLA, based on content from ODA and CWE. Video produced by JLA.	Share information about the project
Public meeting notices and press releases	Throughout the project, up to 13 public meeting notices and press releases	JLA develops notices, ODA responsible for sending	Share information, encourage people to attend events, or provide input another way
Project mailers and fact sheets *One project fact sheet and two mailers*	Throughout the project	JLA develops content and layout and up to two updates, ODA responsible for distribution	Share information, encourage people to attend events, or provide input another way
Email broadcasts	10 emails throughout the project	JLA will draft content in collaboration with ODA and CWE, ODA responsible for wider distribution; JLA will send PAC only emails	Share information, encourage people to attend events, or provide input another way

4. DEMOGRAPHIC TABLES

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION		
NORTH MARION PRIMARY SCHOOL, 2020-21	*Report cards can be found for each school or district in Oregon: https://www.ode.state.or.us/data/reportcard/ReportList.aspx*	
American Indian/Alaska Native	*<1% of students*	*vs. 1.2% Oregon average*
Asian American	*1% of students*	*vs. 4.1% Oregon average*
Black/African American	*0% of students*	*vs. 2.3% Oregon average*


Hispanic/Latino	*54% of students*	*vs. 24.4% Oregon average*
Multiracial	*6% of students*	*vs. 6.9% Oregon average*
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	*0% of students*	*vs. 0.8% Oregon average*
White	*39% of students*	*vs. 60.4% Oregon average*
Ever English Learners	*38% of students*	*vs. 9.3% Oregon average*
Languages Spoken	*4*	*vs. >25*
Students with Disabilities	*13% of students*	*vs. 14.2% Oregon average*
Free/Reduced Price Lunch***	*>95% of students*	*vs. all students for 2020-21*

CENSUS DATA	***American Community Survey (ACS)/2019***	
City of Aurora compared to larger area with Aurora, Canby, and Wilsonville (Figure 1)		
	City of Aurora	*Area with Aurora, Canby, and Wilsonville*
Per Capita Income	*$ 36,056*	*vs. $40,782*
Total Hispanic Population	*75/7.2% of population*	*vs. 6,844/14% of population*
Non-Hispanic - White Alone	*953/91.2% of population*	*vs. 36,887/77% of population*
Non-Hispanic - Black Alone	*2/.2% of population*	*vs. 317/1% of population*
Non-Hispanic – American Indian Alone	*4/.4% of population*	*vs. 426/1% of population*
Non-Hispanic – Asian Alone	*11/1.1% of population*	*vs. 1,451/3% of population*
Non-Hispanic – Pacific Islander Alone	*0/0% of population*	*vs. 344/1% of population*
Non-Hispanic – Other Race Alone	*0/0% of population*	*vs. 25/0% of population*
Non-Hispanic – Two or More Races Alone	*0/0% of population*	*vs. 1,469/3% of population*
Age 0-17	*191/18.2% of population*	*vs. 11,088/23% of population*
Age 65+	*146/14% of population*	*vs. 7,581/16% of population*
Less than 9th Grade - Educational Attainment (over 25 years old)	*16/2.2%of population*	*vs. 1,220/4% of population*
No high school diploma - Educational Attainment (over 25 years old)	*8/1.1%of population*	*vs. 1,414/4% of population*
Bachelor's Degree or more - Educational Attainment (over 25 years old)	*305/42.7% of population*	*vs. 11,892/36% of population*
Linguistically Isolated Households** – Speak Spanish	*18/5% of population*	*vs. 318*
Linguistically Isolated Households** – Speak Other Indo-European Languages	*17/4.6% of population*	*vs. 17*
Linguistically Isolated Households** – Speak Asian-Pacific Island Languages	*2/0.6% of population*	*vs. 17*
Linguistically Isolated Households** – Speak Other Languages	*0/0% of population*	*vs. 43*
Households by Household Income <$15,000 (extremely low-income)	*1.4% of population*	*vs. 1,240/7% of population*
Households by Household Income $15,000-$25,000 (low-income/working poor)	*4.2% of population*	*vs. 1,341/7% of population*
Households by Household Income $25,000-$50,000	*16.1% of population*	*vs. 3,415/19% of population*
Households by Household Income $50,000-$75,000	*18.9% of population*	*vs. 3,939/21% of population*
Households by Household Income $75,000+	*47.2% of population*	*vs. 8,477/46% of population*
Population by language spoken at home (over age 5)	*Spanish*	

** Households in which no one 14 or over speaks English “very well” or speaks English only.

*** Students qualify for free or reduced-price lunches if their caregivers household’s income is within the limits on the Federal Income Eligibility Guidelines: https://www.ode.state.or.us/apps/FRLApp/Default/Apply

Figure 1- Area with Aurora, Canby, and Wilsonville



AURORA AIRPORT MASTER PLAN

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT AND COMMUNICATION PLAN

Prepared for

Oregon Department of Aviation
3040 25th Street SE
Salem, OR 97320

Prepared by

JLA Public Involvement, Inc.
123 NE 3rd Avenue, Suite 210
Portland, OR 97232

Date

June 2025


This Communication and Outreach Plan is a living document and was updated as the project progressed. It was used to outline the public outreach approach and serve as a reference document for all project team members as they moved through the project; for project benefits and messaging, as well to document common stakeholder questions and concerns.

UNDERSTAND THE PROJECT

PROJECT TEAM/KEY CONTACTS FOR EACH PHASE	
ODAVV, Director	Kenji Sugahara
ODAVV, Project Manager	Tony Beach
Century West, Project Manager	Matt Rogers
Century West	Samantha Peterson
JLA Public Involvement, Project Manager	Brandy Steffen
JLA Public Involvement	Jen Winslow Ashley Balsom

COMMUNICATION PROTOCOLS			
Main Spokesperson	Tony Beach	503-378-2523	Anthony.BEACH@ODAVv.oregon.gov
Media Requests	Media requests or questions from the media should be directed to the Spokesperson listed above. No other staff should speak directly with media, unless approval was provided ahead of time. Spokesperson to consult with Project Manager to develop media replies.		
Social Media	ODAV will utilize existing social media accounts to advertise this project, including posting press releases and meeting dates. https://www.facebook.com/ORAviation https://twitter.com/oraviation https://www.instagram.com/oraviation/		
Public comments/ questions	Best practice is for public comments will be collected by the project via a website comment form, the main spokesperson's email, or letters mailed to 3040 25th Street SE, Salem, OR 97302 and stored in a spreadsheet for all staff to review. Questions that come through ODAV's social media accounts should be tracked using the existing system but forwarded to the main spokesperson so that it can be tracked specifically for this project. Common responses to comments have been developed and saved as a FAQ and posted to the website.		
Visual identity	Logo and colors will reflect the ODAV style guide. Dark blue: #005A9C, 0/90/156 Dark green: #014a1f, 1/74/31		
Quality Control	• JLA will review deliverables internally using our standard QC process • Century West will do an initial review within a week of receiving • ODAVV will do a final review within a week of receiving; edits will be incorporated and ODAVV will have one additional review before materials are posted to the project website		

Project Schedule



PROJECT DESCRIPTION, GOALS, AND OBJECTIVES	
Project Scope/ Description*	This project will develop a 2021-2041 Airport Master Plan (AMP) for the Aurora State Airport. The AMP is a tool the Oregon Department of Aviation (ODAV) will use to address the development needs of the airport for the next 20 years and beyond. Key messages: • The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) requires airports to have an AMP and recommends airports like the Aurora State Airport prepare new plans at least every ten years. • An AMP provides a long-term, mid-range, and short-term development for the ODAV-owned portions of the airport. • The goals of the AMP include developing a plan that prioritizes safety, cost-effectively satisfies aviation demand, and considers potential environmental and socioeconomic issues. • This project is fully funded through the FAA Airport and Airway Trust Fund (commonly known as the Aviation Trust Fund). • The ODAV is committed to a public involvement process that creates opportunities for engagement from the community, including providing opportunities for education, dialogue and shaping the outcome of the plan through community events and a Planning Advisory Committee (PAC). • The plan will look at what is happening around the airport that could affect the future plans, development and operation of the airport such as land use, transportation, environmental, economic development, etc.
Public Involvement Goals*	Incorporate community and governmental concerns to create an AMP that is built with community support. Develop and administer a fair and balanced public involvement process that leaves all stakeholders feeling heard. Provide the technical team and decision-makers with an accurate representation of the range of community viewpoints to help create a plan that has fully considered the tradeoffs.

Public Involvement Objectives*	Transparent communication throughout the process: • Posting materials before events to the website. • Posting videos and event summaries after the event to the website. • Sharing drafts of plans before a decision is made, when possible. • Documenting the conflicting and varied viewpoints and concerns heard from the community. Establishing and strengthening community relationships: • Regional stakeholder meetings with state and regional agency stakeholders. One-on-one communication through emails and phone calls with the main spokesperson. Educating the community about the process and integrating community feedback at key decision points: • The formation of a Planning Advisory Committee, which will meet throughout the AMP process to provide input on project milestones. • Virtual and in-person (as safety allows) events, where members of the public can learn more about the project and provide their input. • Online questionnaires. • Advertisement for events through newspapers of record, press releases, postcards to nearby residents/businesses, flyers, website updates, emails, social media posts, etc. • Factsheets/newsletters to explain the process and plan at key decision points. • A Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) document that is updated throughout the process to answer questions raised from PAC members and the wider community; posted to the website. • Meeting, event, and questionnaire summaries that explain the comments and concerns collected throughout the process. These will be shared through the project website.

What is the level of public interest in the project?*	High
What is the history of this project in the community?*	The last Airport Master Plan was developed in 2010.
What are the main community concerns about the project?*	Major concerns include noise, increased number of aircraft using the airport, impacts to property values, increased operating hours, and economic impacts of restricting growth. Community members want to feel like their concerns have been heard and considered during the decision-making process.

OUTREACH ACTIVITIES

DECISION-MAKING AND INVOLVEMENT	
Decision making structure*	The wider community will have opportunities to share their thoughts and concerns with the technical team (through outreach approaches listed below). The decision makers and PAC will consider these viewpoints. The PAC will make a recommendation to the Oregon Department of Aviation; the summary will represent all opinions.

	The ODAV will make the final decision on what is included in the Airport Master Plan, which must be approved by the FAA.
Levels of Public Involvement*	Inform = provide balanced and objective information Consult = obtain public feedback on drafts, proposals, and/or decisions Involve = public concerns and aspirations influence the decision
Main Questions to Ask the Public*	What does the future look like for the Aurora Airport over the next 20 years?

Planning Tasks

PHASE SPECIFIC OUTREACH APPROACHES	TIMING	TEAM MEMBER	PURPOSE AND GOALS
Project email/mailing list with comment/response documentation	Throughout the project	Maintained by JLA, CWE, ODAV	record all comments and responses, coordinate responding to comments
Project website with comment form	Throughout the project	JLA	Share information, encourage people to attend events, provide opportunity for comment
Planning Advisory Committee Meetings	Nine meetings over the course of the project	Facilitated by JLA, agenda and presentations developed in collaboration with ODAV and CWE	Make recommendations to decision makers
Public Open House Meetings *At least two will be virtual*	Up to four, two-hour public open house meetings	Facilitated by JLA, agenda and presentations developed in collaboration with ODAV and CWE	Share information, solicit community input
Project Questionnaires	Up to two project questionnaires	Developed by CWE, reviewed by JLA. Summary provided by JLA.	Solicit community input on specific aspects of project, including process of community engagement
Online Open House	Two online open houses	Content developed by ODAV and CWE. Implementation by JLA.	Share information, solicit community input

Public meeting notices and press releases	Throughout the project, up to 13 public meeting notices and press releases	JLA develops notices, ODAV responsible for sending	Share information, encourage people to attend events, or provide input another way
Project mailers and fact sheets *One project fact sheet and two mailers*	Throughout the project	JLA develops content and layout and up to two updates, ODAV responsible for distribution	Share information, encourage people to attend events, or provide input another way
Email broadcasts	10 emails throughout the project	JLA will draft content in collaboration with ODAV and CWE, ODAV responsible for wider distribution; JLA will send PAC only emails	Share information, encourage people to attend events, or provide input another way

4. DEMOGRAPHIC TABLES

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION		
NORTH MARION PRIMARY SCHOOL, 2020-21	*Report cards can be found for each school or district in Oregon: https://www.ode.state.or.us/data/reportcard/ReportList.aspx*	
American Indian/Alaska Native	*<1% of students*	*vs. 1.2% Oregon average*
Asian American	*1% of students*	*vs. 4.1% Oregon average*
Black/African American	*0% of students*	*vs. 2.3% Oregon average*
Hispanic/Latino	*54% of students*	*vs. 24.4% Oregon average*
Multiracial	*6% of students*	*vs. 6.9% Oregon average*
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	*0% of students*	*vs. 0.8% Oregon average*
White	*39% of students*	*vs. 60.4% Oregon average*
Ever English Learners	*38% of students*	*vs. 9.3% Oregon average*
Languages Spoken	*4*	*vs. >25*
Students with Disabilities	*13% of students*	*vs. 14.2% Oregon average*
Free/Reduced Price Lunch***	*>95% of students*	*vs. all students for 2020-21*


CENSUS DATA	***American Community Survey (ACS)/2019***	
City of Aurora compared to larger area with Aurora, Canby, and Wilsonville (Figure 1)		
	City of Aurora	*Area with Aurora, Canby, and Wilsonville*
Per Capita Income	*$ 36,056*	*vs. $40,782*
Total Hispanic Population	*75/7.2% of population*	*vs. 6,844/14% of population*
Non-Hispanic - White Alone	*953/91.2% of population*	*vs. 36,887/77% of population*
Non-Hispanic - Black Alone	*2/.2% of population*	*vs. 317/1% of population*

Non-Hispanic – American Indian Alone	*4/.4% of population*	*vs. 426/1% of population*
Non-Hispanic – Asian Alone	*11/1.1% of population*	*vs. 1,451/3% of population*
Non-Hispanic – Pacific Islander Alone	*0/0% of population*	*vs. 344/1% of population*
Non-Hispanic – Other Race Alone	*0/0% of population*	*vs. 25/0% of population*
Non-Hispanic – Two or More Races Alone	*0/0% of population*	*vs. 1,469/3% of population*
Age 0-17	*191/18.2% of population*	*vs. 11,088/23% of population*
Age 65+	*146/14% of population*	*vs. 7,581/16% of population*
Less than 9th Grade - Educational Attainment (over 25 years old)	*16/2.2%of population*	*vs. 1,220/4% of population*
No high school diploma - Educational Attainment (over 25 years old)	*8/1.1%of population*	*vs. 1,414/4% of population*
Bachelor's Degree or more - Educational Attainment (over 25 years old)	*305/42.7% of population*	*vs. 11,892/36% of population*
Linguistically Isolated Households** – Speak Spanish	*18/5% of population*	*vs. 318*
Linguistically Isolated Households** – Speak Other Indo-European Languages	*17/4.6% of population*	*vs. 17*
Linguistically Isolated Households** – Speak Asian-Pacific Island Languages	*2/0.6% of population*	*vs. 17*
Linguistically Isolated Households** – Speak Other Languages	*0/0% of population*	*vs. 43*
Households by Household Income <$15,000 (extremely low-income)	*1.4% of population*	*vs. 1,240/7% of population*
Households by Household Income $15,000-$25,000 (low-income/working poor)	*4.2% of population*	*vs. 1,341/7% of population*
Households by Household Income $25,000-$50,000	*16.1% of population*	*vs. 3,415/19% of population*
Households by Household Income $50,000-$75,000	*18.9% of population*	*vs. 3,939/21% of population*
Households by Household Income $75,000+	*47.2% of population*	*vs. 8,477/46% of population*
Population by language spoken at home (over age 5)	*Spanish*	

** Households in which no one 14 or over speaks English "very well" or speaks English only.

*** Students qualify for free or reduced-price lunches if their caregivers household's income is within the limits on the Federal Income Eligibility Guidelines: https://www.ode.state.or.us/apps/FRLApp/Default/Apply

Figure 1- Area with Aurora, Canby, and Wilsonville


Nat'l Wildlife Ref
Tualatin
West Linn
Sherwood
Oregon City
Wilsonville
Canby
Champoeg State Heritage Area
Aurora
Mulino
Hubbard
Ninety-One
West Woodburn
Woodburn
Molalla
0
6 km

PUBLIC MEETING INFORMATION

The project will hold meetings online, rather than in-person. Meeting materials, as well as summaries and recordings will be added to this page.

Planning Advisory Committee (PAC) Meetings

PAC Meeting #1

Tuesday, November 16, 2021
3:00-5:00pm, virtual meeting

Agenda

Public invitation to the PAC meeting

PAC Protocols

Meeting Presentation

Meeting Summary

All written and verbal comments collected before, during or a week after the meeting are included in the Meeting Summary, along with answers/responses to all comments and questions raised.



PAC Meeting #2

Tuesday, March 1, 2022
3:00-5:00pm, virtual meeting

Agenda

Public Invitation to the PAC Meeting

Updated PAC #1 Summary - includes comments from the cities of Wilsonville and Aurora

Meeting Presentation

Draft Working Paper No. 1 and Appendices are listed on the "Resources & Documents" page

Meeting Summary

All written and verbal comments collected before, during or a week after the meeting are included in the Meeting Summary, along with answers/responses to all comments and questions raised.



PAC Working Session

Tuesday, April 5, 2022
3:00-5:00pm, virtual meeting

Agenda

Public Invitation to the PAC Meeting

Meeting Presentation

Meeting Summary (updated)

All written and verbal comments collected before, during or a week after the meeting are included in the Meeting Summary, along with answers/responses to all comments and questions raised.



PAC Meeting #3

Tuesday, May 3, 2022
3:00-5:00pm, virtual meeting

Agenda

Public Invitation to the PAC Meeting

Meeting Presentation

Meeting Summary

All written and verbal comments collected before, during or a week after the meeting are included in the Meeting Summary, along with answers/responses to all comments and questions raised.



PAC Working Session #2

Tuesday, November 15, 2022
3:00-5:00pm, virtual meeting

Agenda

Public Invitation to the PAC Working Session

Meeting Summary

All written and verbal comments collected before, during or a week after the meeting are included in the Meeting Summary, along with answers/responses to all comments and questions raised.



PAC Meeting #4

Tuesday, March 12, 2024 from 5-7 pm, virtual meeting.

Agenda

Public Invitation to the PAC Meeting

Press release

UAO Forecast Approval - corrected (01/23/24)

Meeting Presentation

Meeting Summary

All written and verbal comments collected before, during or a week after the meeting are included in the Meeting Summary, along with answers/responses to all comments and questions raised.



PAC Meeting #5

Tuesday, April 30, 2024 from 5-7 pm, virtual meeting.

Agenda

Public Invitation to the PAC Meeting

Meeting Presentation

Chapter 4 overview video - *The video does not include the technical content found in the draft chapter, and it is only intended to guide the reader through their review of the chapter.*

Chapter 4 - Draft Airport Facility Requirements

Chapter 4 - Draft Airport Facility Requirements with FAA comments and responses

Meeting Summary (Updated on 06/28/24 to reflect additional comments and responses)

All written and verbal comments collected before or during the meeting, through May 14, 2024 will be included in the Meeting Summary.



PAC Meeting #6

Tuesday, June 11, 2024 from 5-8 pm, virtual meeting.

This meeting presented the preliminary alternatives for the Aurora State Airport Master Plan.

Agenda

Public Invitation to the PAC Meeting

Preliminary Alternatives Summary (Updated June 7, 2024)

Presentation

Meeting Summary

All written and verbal comments collected before, during or by June 13, 2024 will be provided to the PAC members and included in the Meeting Summary.



PAC Working Session #3

Tuesday, July 30, 2024 from 5:00-8:00pm, virtual meeting

This meeting presented the refined preliminary alternatives for the Aurora State Airport Master Plan.

Agenda

Public Invitation to the PAC Meeting

Presentation

Updated Project Schedule

Refined Preliminary Alternatives Summary

Response to comments submitted by the City of Wilsonville on Chapters 1-4

Meeting Summary

All written and verbal comments collected before, during or a week after the meeting are included in the Meeting Summary.



PAC Meeting #7

Tuesday, October 15, 2024
5:00-8:00 pm, virtual meeting

This meeting, previously scheduled for September, was to further discuss the alternatives for the Aurora State Airport Master Plan.

Agenda

Public Invitation to the PAC Meeting

Presentation

Preferred Alternative Summary

Draft Cost Estimates

Meeting Transcript, Chat, and Q&A

PAC and Public Feedback on Alternatives (comments and responses), following Working Session 3

Meeting Summary

All written and verbal comments collected before, during or a week after the meeting are included in the Meeting Summary.



PAC Meeting #8

Tuesday, December 10, 2024

5:00-8:00 pm, virtual meeting

This meeting for the Aurora State Airport Master Plan covered the noise analysis and included a roundtable discussion of the alternative.

Agenda

Public Invitation to the PAC meeting

Presentation

Meeting Transcript, Chat, and Q&A

Drainfield background information and emails

Century West drainfield questions and answers (02/2022) - email

NV5 and Aron Faegre response to ODAV (12/21/2021) - email

Attachment 1 - Lab Data

Attachment 2 - EMS Drainfield Feasibility Report

Attachment 3 - Geoweb Technical Overview

Attachment 4 - Gulfstream Flight Ops

Attachment 5 - GRI Report

Attachment 6 - 2005 Plans HDSE Drainfield Related Sheets

Meeting Summary

All written and verbal comments collected before, during or a week after the meeting are included in the Meeting Summary.



PAC Meeting #9

Tuesday, February 11, 2025

5:00-8:00 pm, virtual meeting

This meeting for the Aurora State Airport Master Plan reviewed the refined preferred alternative, the Airport Layout Plan (ALP), and Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) for the Airport Master Plan project.

Agenda

Public Invitation to the PAC meeting

Presentation

Meeting Transcript, Chat, and Q&A

Meeting Summary

Airport Layout Plan (ALP) - Full plan set (9.5MB)

All written and verbal comments collected before, during or a week after the meeting are included in the Meeting Summary.



Public Meetings

Public Open House #2 - In-Person

Thursday, June 13, 2024 from 4:00-7:00 pm, North Marion High School

This meeting provided an opportunity for the neighbors, PAC members, and other interested community members to learn about the Airport Master Plan project and the preliminary alternatives. All written and verbal comments collected during the open house are included in the event Summary.

Postcard advertising the event

Preliminary Alternatives Handout

Event and Survey Summary

Public Open House #1

Tuesday, March 1, 2022
5:00-7:00pm, virtual meeting

Event Presentation

Draft Working Paper No. 1 and Appendices are listed on the "Resources & Documents" page

Event Summary

This meeting provided an opportunity for the community, neighbors, PAC, and project stakeholders to learn about the Airport Master Plan project. All written and verbal comments collected during the open house will be included in the event Summary.



Public Survey #1

Thank you to the more than 400 people who took the first survey. The responses will help ODAV understand the Airport's needs for the next twenty years. The survey was open from February 23 to March 25, 2022.

Survey Summary

AURORA STATE AIRPORT

AIRPORT MASTER PLAN - PLANNING ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Below is the proposed approach, including protocols and ground rules, for the Aurora State Airport Master Plan Project's Planning Advisory Committee (PAC).

STRUCTURE

Committee Structure

- The committee includes members appointed by Oregon Department of Aviation (ODA) staff, in accordance with ODA's State Agency Coordination Agreement. Members represent a wide array of organizations, including interested cities/counties, various state agencies, potentially affected tribal communities, adjacent property and business owners, developers, residents and community groups.
    - ODA has tried to get a diverse range of viewpoints involved and represented on the PAC.
    - Additions or refinement of PAC members may take place at the discretion of ODA staff.
- Members will provide input at key decision points in an advisory level; as a **sounding board**. No recommendations will be made by the committee; the group will be asked for feedback through poll questions and break out room discussions. All viewpoints will be represented in the meeting summaries.
- PAC Members will provide input as a representative of their organization. Personal opinions are not the intent of membership.

Decision-making

- All opinions will be part of the meeting record, attributed to specific committee members in the meeting notes. Recordings of the meetings will be posted on the project website.
- Decision points within the planning process will result in round table discussions and collection of committee member opinions. This will not be a formal recommendation; all opinions will be included in the meeting summary.
- As the airport sponsor, ODA staff will be the final decision-making authority. They will decide what is included in the Master Plan.
- The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) reviews all components of a Master Plan as it is prepared to provide input and guidance. However, the FAA only reviews and formally approves these components: Forecasts of aviation activity (based aircraft, operations, and peak activity); Selection of critical aircraft; and Airport Layout Plan (ALP). It is from these listed elements that the FAA makes a determination regarding eligibility of Airport Improvement Program (AIP) funding for any proposed development.

Meeting Process

Before each meeting the agenda and any meeting materials will be emailed (and mailed upon request) to all members. Notice will be posted in the local newspaper, at the Aurora Airport, and on the ODA website and social media accounts 30 days before the meeting, so that interested individuals can choose to attend. Email notification will be sent via GovDelivery for interested parties that have signed up for the service. The proposed meeting topics and dates are below:

1. AMP introduction – 11/16/21 from 3:00-5:00 pm – Zoom
2. Existing conditions – Zoom
3. Optional meeting – if needed
4. Facility goals and requirements – Zoom
5. MOS/RPZ Analysis – Zoom
6. Preliminary development alternatives – Zoom
7. Optional meeting – if needed
8. Preferred development alternatives – Zoom
9. Implementation plan and CIP – Zoom

Meeting Guidelines

- Discussions will be facilitated and time will be allocated for all committee members to speak.
- Meetings will begin and end on time. If agenda items cannot be completed on time, ODA staff will decide if the meeting should be extended or if an additional meeting should be scheduled.
- Meetings summaries will be prepared and distributed following the meetings.
    - All committee opinions will be documented in the summary.
    - All public comments, whether collected verbally or written, will be responded to in the summary.
    - A recording of the meeting will be posted to the project website.
- Facilitator will provide opportunities for 15 minutes of public comment or announcements relating to agenda items at the end of each meeting, with a maximum of 2 minutes per individual.
    - PAC members and staff should not answer public questions or respond, to allow the public their full time to provide comments.
    - Every agenda and virtual meeting will advertise the opportunity for comments to be emailed before or following the meeting.
    - Comments on non-agenda items should be provided in writing. Community members are encouraged to provide comments at least three days before meetings to allow members time to review and reflect on comments.

Group Agreements

The facilitator will:

- Ensure that everyone has an opportunity to participate.
- Keep meetings moving and focused on the agenda.

- Start and end meetings on time, unless ODA agrees to extend the meeting time.
- Enforce group agreements and ground rules.
- Host and facilitate the meetings virtually on Zoom as long as requested by ODA. Settings for the virtual meeting will:
    - Allow PAC members to have dialogue with ODA and consultant staff; though everyone will be muted due to the size of the committee until the comment periods. Members will be labeled on Zoom as “panelists”.
    - Public participants can attend the meeting as “guests/participants” and provide comments at the designated time, but not during the rest of the meeting. They can also submit written comments throughout the meeting.

Committee Agreements

As a committee, we agree to approach this work with honesty, openness and willingness to work together. This includes building trust and assuming good intentions in others and ensuring that our behavior supports a successful process. We will work with each other and staff to address issues as they arise, utilize tools to ensure clear communication and robust participation, and meet the communication needs of members.

Specifically, we agree to the following ground rules:

- Be respectful of each other.
    - In discussions, challenge ideas rather than individuals.
    - Approach different opinions with curiosity, seek to understand.
    - Be mindful of your participation and the space you occupy in meetings: step up and step back.
- Keep the needs and concerns of the local community and the larger region at the forefront of the work.
- Keep focus on the objectives of the meetings; work with facilitator to note additional topics for discussion.
- Keep multi-tasking to a minimum
- Members commit to the spirit of transparency and sharing their interactions with the public by referring the public to provide comments at meetings, via email, or at one of the public outreach activities.
- Members are encouraged to share the committee’s progress with their respective constituencies/organizations at meetings, by e-mail or through newsletters.
- Notify ODA staff of any media inquiries and refer requests for official statements or viewpoints to staff. Committee members will not speak to media on behalf of the committee or ODA, but rather only on their own behalf.
    - Members will not undermine the work of the group by initiating contact with the media or officials to advance their opinions or to counter fellow members’ opinions.
- Attend all of the meetings; an alternate can attend in the place of a member.
    - The alternate must be identified to ODA at the project onset and attend all meetings so that past business doesn’t need to be revisited.
    - Notes/comments from a member can also be sent to the facilitator in advance of a meeting if a member cannot attend; these notes will be read to the committee.

Committee Members

Organization	Name	Alternate
1000 Friends of Oregon	Roger Kaye	
AABC/TLM Holdings	Ted Millar	
Aurora Air Traffic Control	*To be determined*	
Aurora Airport Improvement Association	Bruce Bennett	
Aurora Butteville Barlow Community Planning Organization	Ken Ivey	
Aurora CTE, Inc	Bill Graupp	
Charbonneau Country Club	Gary Newbore	
City of Aurora	Brian Asher	
City of Canby	Scott Archer	
City of Wilsonville	Chris Neamtzu	Charlotte Lehan
Clackamas County	Commissioner Tootie Smith	
Columbia Helicopters	Rob Roedts	Bob Buchanan
Confederated Tribes of Siltez Indians	Robert Kentta	
Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde Community of Oregon	Cheryl Pouley	
Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon	Christian Nauer	
Deer Creek Estates HOA	Matt Williams	
Friends of French Prairie	Ben Williams	Wayne Richards
Helicopter Transport Service	Robert Fournier	
Life Flight Network	Ben Clayton	
Lynx Aviation	Tristan Dorian	
Marion County	Commissioner Danielle Bethell	
Oregon Dept of Aviation	Tony Beach	
Oregon Dept of Aviation Board	*To be determined*	
Oregon Dept of Transportation	Naomi Zwerdling	
Oregon Dept of Land Conservation and Development	Matt Crall	
Oregon Farm Bureau	Mary Anne Cooper	
Oregon Office of Emergency Management	Bill Martin	
Positive Aurora Airport Management	Tony Helbling	
Regional Solutions	Jody Christensen	
Vans Aircraft	Rian Johnson	Greg Hughes
Willamette Aviation	David Waggoner	
Wilsonville Chamber of Commerce	Patrick Donaldson	

PAC Meeting #1 – November 15, 2021

Aurora State Airport

AIRPORT MASTER PLAN PUBLIC MEETING



Planning Advisory Committee (PAC) Meeting #1

Tuesday, November 16, 2021
3:00pm-5:00pm

The first PAC meeting will be held on November 16, 2021. This meeting will provide an opportunity for the PAC, community, neighbors, and other project stakeholders to learn about the Airport Master Plan project and the vision for the Airport over the next 20-years.

Due to social distancing measures and the inability to meet in person, this PAC Meeting will be held via telephone and internet through Zoom. Please register for the online Zoom PAC meeting by scanning the QR code or visiting: https://us02web.zoom.us/webinar/register/WN_0gAyj8zMSMmC-ErrQAH0hQ

Airport planning work products will be available at: https://publicproject.net/AuroraAirport

For Additional Information Contact:

Sarah Lucas, ODA Aviation Planner
Oregon Department of Aviation
503-378-2211
sarah.lucas@aviation.state.or.us

AURORA STATE AIRPORT

AIRPORT MASTER PLAN - PAC MEETING #1

MEETING SUMMARY

Date: Tuesday, November 16, 2021
Time: 3:00-5:00 pm
Location: Zoom Webinar

In Attendance

PAC Members Present

Roger Kaye, *1000 Friends of Oregon*
Ted Millar, *AABC/TLM Holdings*
Bruce Bennett, *Aurora Airport Improvement Association*
Ken Ivey, *Aurora Butteville Barlow Community Planning Organization*
Bill Graupp, *Aurora CTE, Inc*
Steve Switzer, *Charbonneau Country Club*
Brian Asher, *City of Aurora*
Chris Neamtzu, *City of Wilsonville*
Commissioner Tootie Smith, *Clackamas County*
Rob Roedts, *Columbia Helicopters*
Bob Buchanan, Alternate, *Columbia Helicopters*
Cheryl Pouley, *Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde Community of Oregon*
Matt Williams, *Deer Creek Estates HOA*
Ben Williams, *Friends of French Prairie*
Ben Clayton, *Life Flight Network*
Tristan Dorian, *Lynx Aviation*
Matt Lawyer, Alternate, *Marion County*
Tony Beach, Oregon Dept of Aviation
Naomi Zwerdling, *Oregon Dept of Transportation*
Matt Crall, *Oregon Dept of Land Conservation and Development*
Nicole Mardell, Alternate, *Oregon Dept of Land Conservation and Development*
Bill Martin, *Oregon Office of Emergency Management*
Sarah Puls, Alternate, *Oregon Office of Emergency Management*
Tony Helbling, *Positive Aurora Airport Management*
Jody Christensen, *Regional Solutions*
Rian Johnson, *Vans Aircraft*
David Waggoner, *Willamette Aviation*
Patrick Donaldson, *Wilsonville Chamber of Commerce*
Kevin Ferrasci O'Malley, Alternate, *Wilsonville Chamber of Commerce*

PAC Members Absent

Raul Suarez, *Aurora Air Traffic Control*
Scott Archer, *City of Canby*
Robert Kentta, *Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians*
Christian Nauer, *Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon*
Robert Fournier, *Helicopter Transport Service*
Commissioner Danielle Bethell, *Marion County*
Mary Anne Cooper, *Oregon Farm Bureau*

Agency Representatives

Sarah Lucas, *ODA*
Heather Peck, *ODA*
Seth Thompson, *ODA*
Benjamin Mello, *FAA*
Betty Stansbury, *ODA*
Kate Key, *FAA*

Staff and Consultants

Matt Rogers, *Century West*
David Miller, *Century West*
Mike Dane, *Century West*
Samantha Peterson, *Century West*
Mark Steele, *Century West*
Brandy Steffen, *JLA Public Involvement*
Tracie Heidt, *JLA Public Involvement*

Audience / Members of the Public

Loraine Crouch
Robert Zakian
Aron Faegre
F Caughlin
Austin Barnes
Ron Looney
Lisa Brice
Bruce Bergman
Jake Jacobs
Otto Horvath
Cheryl van Grunsven
Greg Leo
jging
Joe Mollahan
James Pererson
Kathryn Kelley
n cs
Jason Paolo
Mark Ottenad
Bill Horton
Jon Denney
James Kirby
Joyce Williams
Tom Herzog
Greg Drew
Wayne Richards
Todd Williams
Linette Dobbins
John Wilson
Council President Hensley
Jake Farrens
Richard VanGrunsven
Leticia Martinez de Cervantes
Dr John
David Carlson
Joseph Schaefer
Dan Fricke
John Rachor
Frank Vedack
Mark Steele
Tyler Meskers
Derek Holland
Barbara Jacobson
Jan Gagnon Zakian
Neal White
Patricia Allen-Sleeman
Mayor Julie Fitzgerald
Josh Pruzek
Maurice Gunderson
Prateek Vasudev
Loita Colebank
City Councilor Charlotte Lehan
Tom Maletis
Carolyn Lee
Richard
Eric Winston
Trevor Conroy
Greg Strecker
Betty Ann Arrasmith

Overview

The meeting goals were to introduce the project, understand the role/expectations for the PAC, prepare for upcoming meetings, and to receive public input.

Welcome and Introductions

Brandy Steffen, JLA Public Involvement, welcomed everyone to the meeting and reviewed the agenda and basic Zoom meeting tips. **Sarah Lucas introduced Oregon Department of Aviation (ODA)** staff and the consultant teams. **Matt Rogers, Century West,** introduced the subconsultants that are involved with the project. Brandy posted a poll question asking if members had concerns about the fact that the meeting was being recorded. There were no concerns. Brandy introduced the PAC members and then posted an icebreaker poll question on the screen to see how people were doing, using a weather metaphor as a gauge.

Meeting Process Roles and Responsibilities

Brandy clarified the PAC's roles, reviewed the meeting guidelines and ground rules and described her role as facilitator. She explained the decision-making process, noting the PAC is an advisory group; a sounding board that will review information and provide feedback but not make a recommendation because ODA staff are the final decision-making body. She stated that the project team will gather all PAC members' viewpoints, consider them, and include them in the meeting summary notes.

Brandy said ODA is committed to a fair and transparent public process. There will be many opportunities for the public's questions and comments during future open houses and interviews. The public is always welcome to attend PAC meetings and at each meeting there will be a 15-minute period for verbal comments.

Brandy polled the members to see if they needed any clarification on the agenda, decision-making process, or public involvement and to make sure they understood the protocols/ground rules.

History and Master Plan Overview

David Miller, Century West, gave a history of the Aurora State Airport from the 1940s through current times. He provided parameters for the project. The Master Plan is a facility plan that follows the requirements set by the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA). The goal is to provide a framework for a cost-effective improvement of airport facilities in response to aviation demands. He explained that the 20-year planning horizon was divided into three periods: short-term, intermediate-term and long-term and gave an existing conditions overview. He shared the 18-month project schedule, noting there would be seven PAC meetings and four open houses (although the schedule is subject to change).

Brandy posted a poll to see if anyone had clarifying questions. Two said they would ask their questions in the chat and six people indicated that they might follow up with her later.

PAC Questions and Comments

Brandy opened up a PAC question and comment session, in which committee members could ask questions about the master plan, give general comments about the information presented, list some goals they would like the plan to accomplish, and share their local expertise and airport knowledge. Full comments, along with responses are provided in the table at the end of the document.

Public Comments

Brandy opened the meeting up to public members in attendance that wanted to provide verbal comments to the PAC and reminded everyone that written comments would be collected anytime through the project website. Four people provided comments, which are listed in the tables below along with responses to their questions.

ODA only endorses/supports data and statements that are released from this study and posted to the project website. All other statements by members of the Planning Advisory Committee and public are personal opinions. Other documents may not be endorsed by the ODA because they are out of date, unless otherwise noted.

Next Steps

Brandy thanked everyone for coming and said the recording of the meeting and Power Point Presentation slides would be posted on the website within the next couple of days.

The meeting summary will be posted to the project website in about two weeks and will include all questions and responses, even to those questions that were asked in the chat and weren't answered today. We will also email the PAC members the meeting summary. Brandy advised members to send the team any other questions they might have in the coming days and announced that the second PAC meeting will be scheduled in the future, but it is anticipated for January/February 2022.

Sarah, Heather, and David all thanked the PAC and members of the public for coming and Brandy closed the meeting.

Questions/Comments and Responses Related to the Meeting Topics

Name	Affiliation	Question/Comment	Response
David Waggoner	Willamette Aviation	Will any elements of last master plan be added to this one?	Past studies are being reviewed for historical reference. This Airport Master Plan (AMP) Project will include a comprehensive evaluation of existing conditions, evaluation of compliance with current FAA standards, and development of alternatives to address forecasted activity at the airport.
Ben Williams	Friends of French Prairie (FOFP)	A Master Plan that actually takes into account the local communities and neighborhoods and the airport impacts upon them!	Maintaining a transparent and thorough process that involves listening to and understanding all comments from the public, surrounding neighbors, and PAC members is a critical component of this AMP Project. ODA will utilize comments in an advisory manner, as applicable to the FAA-approved Scope of Work (SOW) and in accordance with best practices of airport operations management.
Ted Millar	AABC/TLM Holdings	I have been part of the airport for 20-some years and the state of Oregon is making emergency preparedness a major priority in	To clarify, the scope of work approved by the FAA for this master plan doesn't include any resiliency scope, so a future special study might address this, but it

		the case of major disasters, such as earthquakes and fires. The state study indicates that within the first 90 days of an earthquake, the emergency response is going to have to be by air. The Aurora Airport was one of 12 airports designated as an emergency response location. Geo technical studies show that in case of a major earthquake, this airport won't be affected by the liquification like PDX, Hillsboro and McMinnville. He said we already have control towers with all of the emergency preparedness companies located here, such as Columbia Helicopters, Helicopter Transport, Wilson Construction, etc. He thinks it's important that this airport gets special attention because of its capabilities.	is not part of this specific process. Thank you for sharing.
Roger Kaye	1000 Friends of Oregon	I have questions about the scope of work document they all received in advance but wanted to wait until today to ask his questions. The scope of work identified a lot of particulars that are not identified here in this first meeting. Everyone should look at it and see how this process fits within the scope. He had concerns about certain statements made in the scope of work and wanted them addressed by ODA. He wondered if the scope of work was part of this process.	Yes, the scope of work came via email to all committee members in October as part of the packet, and if you didn't receive it, please email Sarah Lucas.
Bruce Bennett	Aurora Airport Improvement Association (AAIA)	Have been on the airport field for 47 years straight and that it was important to keep everything in perspective. He said the runway lengthening safety improvement that has been planned since 1976 has been hugely exaggerated and it is important to keep in perspective that Aurora will never be a long runway, but it should be normal anyway. In the state of Oregon, 30 airports are longer than this one, and only 4 are busier. He said the prior master plan would put Aurora Airport at number 11,	Comment noted; no response required.

		and that was a reasonable target.	
Bruce Bennett	Aurora Airport Improvement Association (AAIA)	Safety improvements that have been delayed for decades are paramount based on my 43 years operation here and lifetime in the Aviation industry.	Comment noted; no response required.
Bruce Bennett	Aurora Airport Improvement Association (AAIA)	Wanted to clarify for the non-pilots in the group that the original runway length requirements for the airport in 1943 were okay. The regulations were that the runway needed to be long enough for an airplane to take off; but today, for safety reasons, the requirements are for take off plus a landing. It is critical that the length is adequate. One of Bruce's best friends died in an accident due to insufficient runway length. Looks can be deceiving on a runway, he said.	Century West will be looking at that. FAA has strict runway length minimum standards.
Naomi Zwerdling	Oregon Department of Transportation	What are the approval processes with land use and transportation? Does ODOT and City go through approval processes?	Marion County is the governing jurisdiction for the Aurora State Airport. Once the AMP is complete there will be a separate process for any Comprehensive Plan amendment or Transportation System Plan (TSP) updates, as required by Marion County. The processes that will be followed are set by Marion County's requirements.
Brian Asher	Mayor, City of Aurora	Will the local community utilities, noise, fire protection needs be addressed in the master plan	Yes. This master plan will include an analysis of noise exposure both for the current traffic and forecast periods. We will go over an inventory of some of the utilities that exist at the airport so you can be more familiar with what the airport's needs are for water, other resources and fire protection.
Ben Williams	FOFP	Also, for the record, we have no knowledge that there was any public notice or comment period for the Scope of Work (SOW) before it was approved and awarded. In other words, this PAC has no input about the SOW.	This AMP is a Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Airport Improvement Program (AIP) funded project. SOW development and approval is an FAA process. For all projects funded by the FAA AIP, the FAA works directly with airport owners/sponsors to determine and approve the SOW in accordance with the FAA's requirements.

Bill Graupp	Aurora CTE, Inc.	Added Goal: Account for future enhancements in aviation technology, including fuel/power and navigation technology, and changes to transportation standards (e-based technology).	ODA and the Consultant Team will address these issues, in accordance with the SOW.
Ken Ivey	Aurora Butteville Barlow Community Planning Organization	In the introduction packet, page 4 of Frequently Asked Questions refers to a "previous planning studies". Where can we access those studies?	The Project Website's resource page will be updated with any and all prior studies that may be deemed necessary and helpful for this project. Previous studies are currently available on ODA's website.
Ben Williams	FOFP	According to the State Geology Dept. the south end of the runway is subject to liquefaction and will disintegrate in a major earthquake!	Please feel free to provide the technical studies and evaluations to which you are referring. No new geotechnical studies are included in the SOW of this project.
Patrick Donaldson	Wilsonville Chamber of Commerce	I look forward to whatever plan is submitted because it seems so comprehensive. From the Chamber's perspective, the ability for people to work at the airport and go back to their homes and further the economy and have a safe work environment that they can return to is essential. He said it's important for the committee to bring forth all their ideas and documents they have questions about (such as liquification in the event of an earthquake) and we can independently look at the veracity of them and if they are contemporary.	We will review existing and past engineering studies that have been done on the runway, current pavement strength data, and other data. That will definitely be in our review of the inventory and incorporated into future planning for facility improvements. We will look at what information is available so we can understand current conditions. We will not be doing direct Geotech investigations with this work. We will review current studies done by professional engineers on the subject of liquification and review any additional documents that are available, as well.
Tony Helbling	Positive Aurora Airport Management	His group is focused on respectful operations of the aircraft and the airport in conjunction with their neighbors. He has worked with ODA in the past and done outreach. Their members, Bruce Bennett, for example, have worked with Charbonneau and others to get some of the routes in and out of the airport changed. John Wilson worked hard on the VFR routes for voluntary noise complaints. Tony is glad this is moving forward. His group wants to operate safely and respectfully of their neighbors.	Comment noted; no response required.

Tristan Dorian	Lynx Aviation	Agrees with Tony. Lynx has some big priorities as an FBO network. Items such as maintaining an efficient and sustainable site for operation, taxi way widening and weight limitations are important to them and their operation.	Comment noted; no response required.
Tristan Dorian	Lynx Aviation	Will CFR-Part 139 categorization of UAO likely be included in this master plan, bringing minimum security/safety standards and AOA (Airport Operating Area)?	No. For clarification, 14 CFR Part 139 requires FAA to issue airport operating certificates to airports that: • Serve schedule and unscheduled air carrier aircraft with more than 30 seats; • Serve scheduled air carrier operations in aircraft with more than 9 seats but less than 31 seats; and • The FAA Administrator requires to have a certificate. Certification is not an objective of this AMP or ODA.
Tristan Dorian	Lynx Aviation	Tristan Dorian wanted to circle back on the 139 piece. He recognizes it is not an immediate priority but because Aurora Airport is in the Portland metro area, it would bring a lot of economic benefit and efficiency in minimal standards for safety and security for the airport. He said this is a huge priority for them, their customers, base tenants and everyone on this call. Because it seemed like a logical step in the journey for Aurora, he wanted to challenge why Part 139 is not a priority item.	Comment noted. The goal is to operate at the highest level of safety. The Aurora Airport implements as many of the components of 139 as we can, but those components that require certification are less feasible to achieve. NOTE: 139 is a FAR (Federal Aviation Regulation) for commercial service airports and lays out a set of safety and security measures.
Bruce Bennett	AAIA	Ben's information is outdated and inaccurate, I'll provide correct information.	Please feel free to provide the technical studies and evaluations to which you are referring. No new geotechnical studies are included in the SOW of this project.
Tony Helbling	Positive Aurora Airport Management (PAAM)	The claim the south end of the runway will disintegrate is inaccurate. New geotechnical studies show differently.	Please feel free to provide the technical studies and evaluations to which you are referring. No new geotechnical studies are included in the SOW of this project.
Chris Neamtzu	City of Wilsonville	Is it a goal of this AMP process to comply with Oregon land use and public process goals?	Yes. ODA will complete the AMP in compliance with the Department of Land Conservation and Development's (DLCD) State Agency Coordination (SAC) Program. Compliance with

			Oregon's Statewide Planning Program is a core requirement of the SAC Program. The ODA will ensure the Aurora State Airport AMP is completed in accordance with ORS 187.180; OAR 660-30 & 31. Oregon's Statewide Planning Program also emphasizes the importance of public involvement, which is a key component of the SAC Program. Accordingly, the ODA has established a Planning Advisory Committee (PAC) that includes members from all affected Federal, State, Local Special Districts, and Interested Parties. The PAC will meet up to nine times throughout the 18-month Aurora State Airport AMP project timeline. All PAC meetings are open to the public.
Tristan Dorian	Lynx Aviation	Just to make sure it's on record - weight limitation from 45,000lbs dual to 110,000lbs and taxiway widening to 50ft is a huge priority for this process.	Comment noted; no response required.
Chris Neamtzu	City of Wilsonville	Want to recommend ODA (Oregon Department of Agriculture) and DEQ (Oregon Department of Environmental Quality) as entities that warrant seats at the table.	Comment noted. All project information for this AMP will be readily available to all state, federal and local agencies and jurisdictions. ODA works with DEQ and Agriculture, as required, on all Capital Improvement Projects.
Ken Ivey	Aurora Butteville Barlow Community Planning Organization	Will you be sending out contact information for the hosts?	Contact information was shared in the presentation and is available on the project website.
Bruce Bennett	AAIA	Great points to strengthen the runway and widen the taxiway Tristan, somehow that was mistakenly communicated as "commercial service" use. So that will need to be sorted out.	The AMP will address current (existing) conditions and future facility requirements.
Wayne Richards	FOFP	I wonder about the airport operational count? Predications from 2012 were extremely high compared to actual use. Pilots need landing strip that is long enough to take off and land. Are they allowed to take off?	In the AMP forecasting effort, a variety of contributing factors, as well as the validated count of based aircraft, will be reviewed. The answer to that question will be studied in the aeronautical activity forecasting effort and the resulting facility requirements analysis.
Steven Benson and Lisa Brice	--	I live at Daydream Ranch near Charbonneau. Why aren't we represented on the committee because we are most impacted	You will be added to the mailing list, and it is recommended you reach out to a PAC member that represents your

		by the noise? We live in the City of Wilsonville.	area (City of Wilsonville and/or Clackamas County).
Lori Crouch	--	I live across street on Highway 551 in sunset estates. What is a noise contour and I wonder what noise volume this project will add? Will there be a wall added?	The AMP will develop noise contours (which are a representation of the average noise level) for both the existing and forecasted airport geometry and operations. More information on this item will be available as the project progresses.
"n cs" Nancy	--	I'm a neighbor and it used to be very peaceful and nice but now it feels like warzone with noise volume of 105 decibels. Expanding the airport can't make it better. What will be done to address that? I would like representation of the neighbors on the PAC. Didn't receive a note about this meeting.	Postcards were mailed to residents and property owners within 1,000 feet of the airport. Additionally, notice was printed in multiple papers and sent via GovDelivery email to those signed up for that service. All future meetings will be noticed in the same manner. PAC meetings are open to the public and allow comment opportunities, as well as providing opportunities to connect with PAC members. It is too early to talk about outcomes of the AMP, as the process is just beginning. **Brian Asher** commented in the chat: "If you let Nancy know, I will be an ear for her area."

Additional Questions/Comments and Responses

Name	Affiliation	Question/Comment	Response
Roger Kaye	1000 Friends of Oregon	Will need a video of this presentation before he can evaluate all of this information and asked when the recording will become available.	The recording of this meeting will be posted to the project website in the next few days.
Ben Williams	Friends of French Prairie (FOFP)	Does ODA, JLA and Century West own and operate an embarrassment meter. The PAC members were informed in advance that they are a sounding board but no recommendations will be made by the committee. How are they an "advisory" committee if they won't take advice from the committee, he asked.	Throughout this Aurora State Airport Master Plan Project, ODA is interested in all comments from the public and PAC members. We are committed to a transparent and thorough process. ODA is committed to listening and understanding the comments we receive and utilize the comments in an advisory manner as applicable to the scope of work and in accordance with the best practices of airport operations management. ODA will review and utilize comments as applicable to our requirements as a general aviation airport owner and sponsor, and in compliance with federal grant

			assurances and Oregon Revised Statutes. ODA will be seeking recommendations from the PAC at various times. All recommendations will be submitted to the Aviation Board.
Matt Williams	Deer Creek Estates HOA	Glad you had this meeting and look forward to the next! Thank you	Comment noted; no response required.
Commissioner Tootie Smith	Clackamas County Board of Commissioners	Happy to be here and listen to the comments	Comment noted; no response required.
Bill Martin	Oregon Office of Emergency Management	Thank you for a most interesting and efficient first meeting. Looking forward to the process.	Comment noted; no response required.
Brian Asher	Mayor, City of Aurora	thank you good meeting	Comment noted; no response required.
Linette Dobbins	--	I own property on Boones Ferry across from south end of airport and changed approaches since last plan and going over their property and home. I received letter about cutting down trees.	Please reach out to Tony Beach, State Airports Manager (contact information on ODA website). The referenced letter was about existing conditions at the airport and is unrelated to this Master Plan Project.
Ben Williams Frank Vedaqk	FOFP	Frank Vedaqk, resident on Lower Boones Ferry Road can't get recognized for Public Comment and asks: 1) How do they plan on forcing residents into the aviation easement regarding the RPZ, and 2) Is ODA accounting for the negative impact on property values there and in the impact area within Deer Creek Estates?	This comment appears to be about a different project. Please Contact Tony Beach for information pertaining to the Aurora State Airport Obstruction Removal Project.

AURORA STATE AIRPORT

AIRPORT MASTER PLAN - PAC MEETING #1

AGENDA

Date/Time: Tuesday, November 16, 2021 from 3:00-5:00 pm
Location: Zoom Webinar

Meeting Goals: *Introduce the project, understand the role/expectations for the PAC, and prepare for upcoming meetings; as well as the opportunities for public input and involvement*

Time	Topic	Person	Notes
3:00-3:10 pm	Introductions and Welcome	Brandy Steffen and Sarah Lucas	
3:10-3:30 pm	Meeting Process Roles and Responsibilities	Brandy	Review the: • Purpose of the meeting and agenda • Draft protocols and ground rules • Decision making process • Opportunities for public involvement
3:30-4:15 pm	Past, Present, and Future	Sarah/ Heather Peck / David Miller	• UAO History • FAA Master Plan overview • Airport Master Plan introduction • Brief discussion of inventory/existing condition
4:15-4:45 pm	PAC Comments	Brandy	Questions (round table about 1 minute each)
4:45-5:00 pm	Public Comments	Brandy	• Comments may be emailed before the meeting to sarah.lucas@aviation.state.or.us • Commenters may have up to 2 minute to speak. We ask that only one representative from each organization speaks. We will not be able to hear from everyone. • *Reminder:* public comments typed into Zoom may not be answered during the meeting, but answers will be included in the written meeting summary and shared with the PAC members, as well as posted to the project website within two weeks.

Accessible Meeting Information

Special accommodations are available upon advance request. Please contact Sarah Lucas at least 48 hours prior to the event to discuss specific needs.

Attendees

Planning Advisory Committee (PAC):

Organization	Name	Alternate
1000 Friends of Oregon	Roger Kaye	
AABC/TLM Holdings	Ted Millar	
Aurora Air Traffic Control	*To be determined*	
Aurora Airport Improvement Association	Bruce Bennett	
Aurora Butteville Barlow Community Planning Organization	Ken Ivey	
Aurora CTE, Inc	Bill Graupp	
Charbonneau Country Club	Gary Newbore	
City of Aurora	Brian Asher	
City of Canby	Scott Archer	
City of Wilsonville	Chris Neamtzu	Charlotte Lehan
Clackamas County	Commissioner Tootie Smith	
Columbia Helicopters	Rob Roedts	Bob Buchanan
Confederated Tribes of Siltez Indians	Robert Kentta	
Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde Community of Oregon	Cheryl Pouley	
Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon	Christian Nauer	
Deer Creek Estates HOA	Matt Williams	
Friends of French Prairie	Ben Williams	Wayne Richards
Helicopter Transport Service	Robert Fournier	
Life Flight Network	Ben Clayton	
Lynx Aviation	Tristan Dorian	
Marion County	Commissioner Danielle Bethell	
Oregon Dept of Aviation	Tony Beach	
Oregon Dept of Aviation Board	*To be determined*	
Oregon Dept of Transportation	Naomi Zwerdling	
Oregon Dept of Land Conservation and Development	Matt Crall	
Oregon Farm Bureau	Mary Anne Cooper	
Oregon Office of Emergency Management	Bill Martin	
Positive Aurora Airport Management	Tony Helbling	
Regional Solutions	Jody Christensen	
Vans Aircraft	Rian Johnson	Greg Hughes
Willamette Aviation	David Waggoner	
Wilsonville Chamber of Commerce	Patrick Donaldson	

Staff Attendees:

Sarah Lucas, Heather Peck, Seth Thompson, and Betty Stansbury with Oregon Department of Aviation (ODA)

Matt Rogers, Samantha Peterson, and David Miller with CenturyWest

Brandy Steffen and Tracie Heidt with JLA Public Involvement


Aurora State Airport
Airport Master Plan



Planning Advisory Committee Meeting #1
Online Meeting
November 16, 2021

Virtual Meeting Tips

- You will be muted during the presentation
- Raise your hand virtually (reaction button) or physically
  - Press *9 to raise your hand over the phone
- Keep your video on, if possible
- The PAC can chat with:
  - “panelists” for all PAC members
- Public attendees can submit comments via the website comment form



Meeting Process & Agenda

Time	Topic
3:00-3:10	Introductions/Welcome
3:10-3:30	Meeting Process; Roles and Responsibilities
3:30-4:15	Past, Present, and Future
4:15-4:45	PAC Comments
4:45-5:00	Public Comments https://publicproject.net/AuroraAirport

Introductions / Welcome

Oregon Department of Aviation (ODA)

Betty Stansbury

Director

Tony Beach

Deputy Director, State Airports Manager

John Wilson

Operations Specialist

Heather Peck

Planning & Project Manager

Sarah Lucas

Aviation Planner / AMP Project Contact

Sarah.Lucas@aviation.state.or.us

Seth Thompson

Aviation Planner, State Aviation and Land Use Coordination

Project Team

Agency Oversight & Funding

Airport Owner (Sponsor)

Planning & Engineering

Public Involvement

Cultural Resources

Archaeological Investigations Northwest, Inc.

Environmental Review

AGIS Survey

MAGYAR LAND SURVEYING LLC

PAC Members

- Airport Users/Businesses/Organizations
- Airport Neighbors
- Local Municipalities
- Tribal Organizations
- State Agencies
- Local and Regional Non-Profit Groups
- Environmental / Land Use Groups

Organization	Name	Alternate
1000 Friends of Oregon	Roger Kaye	
AABC/TLM Holdings	Ted Millar	
Aurora Air Traffic Control	Raul Suarez	
Aurora Airport Improvement Association	Bruce Bennett	
Aurora Butteville Barlow Community Planning Organization	Ken Ivey	
Aurora CTE, Inc	Bill Graupp	
Charbonneau Country Club	Steve Switzer	
City of Aurora	Brian Asher	
City of Canby	Scott Archer	
City of Wilsonville	Chris Neamtzu	Charlotte Lehan
Clackamas County	Commissioner Tootie Smith	
Columbia Helicopters	Rob Roedts	Bob Buchanan
Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians	Robert Kentta	
Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde Community of Oregon	Cheryl Pouley	
Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon	Christian Nauer	
Deer Creek Estates HOA	Matt Williams	
Friends of French Prairie	Ben Williams	Wayne Richards
Helicopter Transport Service	Robert Fournier	
Life Flight Network	Ben Clayton	
Lynx Aviation	Tristan Dorian	
Marion County	Commissioner Danielle Bethell	
Oregon Dept of Aviation	Tony Beach	
Oregon Dept of Aviation Board	*To be determined*	
Oregon Dept of Transportation	Naomi Zwerdling	
Oregon Dept of Land Conservation and Development	Matt Crall	
Oregon Farm Bureau	Mary Anne Cooper	
Oregon Office of Emergency Management	Bill Martin	
Positive Aurora Airport Management	Tony Helbling	
Regional Solutions	Jody Christensen	
Vans Aircraft	Rian Johnson	Greg Hughes
Willamette Aviation	David Waggoner	
Wilsonville Chamber of Commerce	Patrick Donaldson	

Meeting Process & Roles/Responsibilities

Members of the Committee will:



- **Attend up to nine (9) meetings.**
  - alternates or proxies are allowed; please brief them before the meeting.
  - comments/questions can be sent ahead of the meeting.
- Actively **participate**.
- Abide by the meeting **ground rules**.
- **Represent** the interests and perspectives of their constituencies (if applicable).
- **Talk to others** in the community to give and receive information about the project.
- **Ask questions** and seek information.
- **Share differences of opinion** on ideas - silence is considered consent.
- Create an atmosphere in which **divergent views and opinions are respected**.

Facilitator will:

- Ensure that everyone has an **opportunity** to participate.
- Keep meetings moving and focused on the **agenda**.
- Start and end meetings **on time**.
- Provide time for **public comment** at the end of the meeting.
- **Enforce** protocols and ground rules.



Meeting Guidelines and Ground Rules



- **Be respectful of each other.**
  - In discussions, challenge ideas rather than individuals.
  - Approach different opinions with curiosity, seek to understand.
  - Be mindful of your participation and the space you occupy in meetings: step up and step back.
- Keep the **needs and concerns of the local community** and the larger region at the forefront of the work.
- Keep **focus on the objectives of the meetings**; work with facilitator to note additional topics for discussion.
- **Attend all of the meetings**; an alternate can attend in the place of a member.
- Keep **multi-tasking to a minimum.**

Decision-making Process

- This PAC will provide **input at key decision points in an advisory level; as a sounding board**. No recommendations will be made.
- **All opinions/viewpoints** will be part of the meeting record (in meeting notes and recordings).
- ODA staff will be the final decision-making authority.
- The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) reviews all components of the Master Plan to provide input and guidance.



Communications Outside Meetings

- Members **commit to the spirit of transparency** and sharing their interactions with the public by referring the public to provide comments at meetings, via email, or at one of the public outreach activities.
- **Notify ODA staff of any media inquiries** and refer requests for official statements or viewpoints to staff. Committee members will not speak to media on behalf of the committee or ODA, but rather only on their own behalf.
- **Members will not undermine the work of the group** by initiating contact with the media or officials to advance their opinions or to counter fellow members' opinions.



Public Involvement

- The Airport Master Plan will take approximately 18 months to prepare;
- PAC meetings and open houses are scheduled at key points during the study to present information and seek local input;
- PAC meetings will be open to the public in addition to a public open house; and
- Draft work products will be available for public review and may be accessed through the project website, or by request to ODA.
- All public and PAC meeting comments will be collected by JLA.



Project Website: https://publicproject.net/AuroraAirport

Past, Present, and Future

Aurora State Airport (UAO) History

1943	Airport was established & managed by United States Bureau of Public Roads
1953	Transferred airport to State of Oregon's Highway Division
1973	State of Oregon's Highway Division transferred ownership to Aeronautics Division
1976	First Airport Master Plan was completed
1978	Parallel Taxiway, Rotating Beacon, Runway Reconstruction, Drainage, Lighting, and Apron Projects
1979	Property Acquisition (22 Acres)
1986	Property Acquisition (10 Acres, including tiedown apron)
1988	Airport Master Plan
1995	Runway Extension Project (from 4,104' to 5,004')
2004	Runway Reconstruction Project
2009	Parallel Taxiway Shift Project
2012	Airport Master Plan
2015	Air Traffic Control Tower Constructed
2019	Runway Justification Study



FAA Airport Master Plan Overview

The goal of a master plan is to provide the framework needed to guide future airport development that will cost-effectively satisfy aviation demand, while considering potential environmental and socioeconomic impacts.

Airport master plans are prepared to support the modernization or expansion of existing airports or the creation of a new airport. The master plan is the sponsor's (ODA) strategy for the development of the airport.



FAA Airport Master Plan Overview

FAA has review and approval authority of the following work products:

- Aviation Forecasts
- Runway Object Free Area Modification of Standards Analysis
- Runway Protection Zone Analysis
- Airport Layout Plan

Eighteen-month project schedule may be adjusted to accommodate FAA reviews and other agency coordination

FAA Airport Master Plan Overview


FAA Airport Master Plans have a 20-year planning horizon that is divided into three periods:

- Short-term (0-5 years)
- Intermediate-term (6-10 years)
- Long-term (11-20 years)



Airport master plans are typically completed every 10 years, or as changing conditions require.


Airport Master Plan Introduction



Aurora Airport Property




Existing Conditions Overview



Project Schedule

* Schedule is subject to change



PAC Comments

PAC Questions and Comments

- Do you have questions about the plan?
- Do you have any general comments about the information presented?
- What are some goals you'd like this plan to accomplish?
- Please share with us your local expertise.
- We want to hear your airport knowledge and history.



Project Website: https://publicproject.net/AuroraAirport

Public Comments

Public comments

If you would like to speak, you have 2 minutes:

- Please “raise your hand”
- Press *9 for callers



Submit your comments via the online comment form:
publicproject.net/AuroraAirport

- All comments will be responded to in the meeting summary
- Themes from comments will be shared at PAC Meeting #2





Thank You

Heather Peck – ODA

Sarah Lucas – ODA

Brandy Steffen – JLA Public Involvement

David Miller – Century West

Project Website: https://publicproject.net/AuroraAirport

PAC Meeting #2 – March 1, 2022

Aurora State Airport

AIRPORT MASTER PLAN PUBLIC MEETING



Planning Advisory Committee (PAC) Meeting #2 and Public Open House

Tuesday, March 1, 2022
PAC Meeting #2 from 3:00pm – 5:00pm
Public Open House #1 from 5:00pm – 7:00pm

Due to social distancing measures and the inability to meet in person, this PAC Meeting and Open House will be held via telephone and internet through Zoom. These meetings will provide an opportunity for the PAC, community, neighbors, and other project stakeholders to learn about the Airport Master Plan project.

Airport planning work products and registration links for the virtual **PAC Meeting** and **Public Open House** at: **https://publicproject.net/AuroraAirport**

For Additional Information Contact:
Sarah Lucas, ODA Aviation Planner
Oregon Department of Aviation
503-378-2211
sarah.lucas@odav.oregon.gov

Special accommodations are available upon request (with 48 hours notice)

AURORA STATE AIRPORT

AIRPORT MASTER PLAN - PAC MEETING #2

AGENDA

Date/Time: March 1, 2022 from 3:00-5:00 pm
Location: Zoom Webinar

Meeting Goals: Review existing conditions and preliminary forecasts

Time	Topic	Person	Notes
3:00-3:10 pm **(10 min)**	**Introductions**	**Brandy and Sarah**	• Staff Introductions • Brandy will introduce each PAC member to save time
3:10-3:50 pm **(40 min)**	**Existing Conditions and Preliminary Forecasts**	**David Miller**	**Review Chapter 2 (Existing Conditions Analysis)** **Review Chapter 3 (preliminary Aviation Activity Forecasts)**
3:50-4:50 pm **(60 min)**	**PAC Comments**	**Brandy**	**Questions (round table about 2 minutes each)** • PAC comments/questions can also be added into the chat. • All verbal and typed comments/questions will be included in the meeting summary
4:50-5:00 pm **(10 min)**	**Public Comments**	**Brandy**	• Anyone in attendance may have up to 2 minute to speak. • We may not be able to hear from everyone. • We always will take comments via the website, which will be included in the meeting notes and shared with the PAC members: https://publicproject.net/AuroraAirport# • A meeting summary with all PAC and public comments will be posted to the project website within two weeks. The public open house is open right after this meeting. • Register at https://us02web.zoom.us/webinar/register/WN_SL-fL1YMSJaLwRcVii-M1Q

AURORA STATE AIRPORT

AIRPORT MASTER PLAN
PLANNING ADVISORY COMMITTEE (PAC)
MEETING #2 SUMMARY

Date: Tuesday, March 1, 2022
Time: 3:00-5:00 pm
Location: Zoom Webinar

In Attendance

PAC Members Present

Aron Faegre (for Ted Millar[1]), *AABC/TLM Holdings*
Bob Hala, *Atlantic Aviation*
Bruce Bennett, *Aurora Airport Improvement Association*
Ken Ivey, *Aurora Butteville Barlow Community Planning Organization*
Bill Graupp, *Aurora CTE, Inc*
Steve Switzer, *Charbonneau Country Club*
Brian Asher, *City of Aurora*
Councilor Charlotte Lehan, *City of Wilsonville*
Chris Neamtzu, *Alternate, City of Wilsonville*
Rob Roedts, *Columbia Helicopters*
Bob Buchanan, Alternate, *Columbia Helicopters*
Matt Williams, *Deer Creek Estates HOA*
Ben Williams, *Friends of French Prairie*
Wayne Richards, Alternate, *Friends of the French Prairie*
Commissioner Danielle Bethel, *Marion County*
Austin Barnes, *Marion County Planning Dept.*
Tony Beach, Oregon Dept of Aviation (ODAV)
Cathryn Stephens, *ODAV Board*
Naomi Zwerdling, *Oregon Dept of Transportation*
Matt Crall, *Oregon Dept of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD)*
Nicole Mardell, Alternate, *DLCD*
Bill Martin, *Oregon Office of Emergency Management*
Tony Helbling, *Positive Aurora Airport Management*
Jody Christensen, *Regional Solutions*
Rian Johnson, *Vans Aircraft*
David Waggoner, *Willamette Aviation*
Patrick Donaldson, *Wilsonville Chamber of Commerce*

PAC Members Absent

Roger Kaye, *1000 Friends of Oregon*
Raul Suarez, *Aurora Air Traffic Control*
Scott Archer, *City of Canby*
Commissioner Tootie Smith, *Clackamas County*
Cheryl Pouley, *Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde Community of Oregon*
Robert Kentta, *Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians*
Christian Nauer, *Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon*
Robert Fournier, *Helicopter Transport Service*
Ben Clayton, *Life Flight Network*
Brandon Reich, Alternate, *Marion County Planning Dept.*
Mary Anne Cooper, *Oregon Farm Bureau*
Sarah Puls, Alternate, *Oregon Office of Emergency Management*
Greg Hughes, Alternate, *Vans Aircraft*

[1] Substitutions are not generally allowed; however, this one time substitution was granted by Oregon Department of Aviation Director.

Kevin Ferrasci O'Malley, Alternate, *Wilsonville Chamber of Commerce*

Agency Representatives

Betty Stansbury, *ODAV*
Heather Peck, *ODAV*
Sarah Lucas, *ODAV*
Seth Thompson, *ODAV*
Benjamin Mello, Federal Aviation Administration (*FAA)*
Kate Key, *FAA*

Staff and Consultants

Matt Rogers, *Century West*
David Miller, *Century West*
Mike Dane, *Century West*
Samantha Peterson, *Century West*
Mark Steele, *Century West*
Brandy Steffen*, JLA Public Involvement*
Ariella Frishberg*, JLA Public Involvement*

Audience / Members of the Public

Chad Hanson
Andria Abrahamson
Bruce Bergman
Corey Buchanan
Cornelia Gibson
Dan Fricke
Greg Leo
James Kirby
Jillian Capistrano
Joann Linville
Joe Mollahan
John Rankin
Julie Fitzgerald
Nancy CS
Neal White
Rayna Jenks
Sara Kim
Sarah Anderson
Steven Benson
Tom Herzog
Traci Hensley
Kriss Wright
Peter Shikli
Peter Murphy
Lee Barckmann
Don Richcreek
Denis Pilon
Jan Fritz
Carolyn Lee
John Hick
Lori Loen
George Van Hoomissen
Matt Lawyer

Overview

The meeting goals were to review Working Paper No. 1 and present information, then allow the members of the PAC to ask questions or provide comment.

Welcome and Introductions

Brandy Steffen, JLA Public Involvement, welcomed everyone to the meeting and reviewed the agenda and basic Zoom meeting tips. She reminded attendees that there would be a public open house immediately following the PAC meeting. There would be time for public comment at the end of the current meeting. There are also opportunities for comment through the online survey or during the public open house. **Sarah Lucas, Oregon Department of Aviation (ODAV),** introduced **ODAV** staff and the consultant teams. She briefly explained the recent change to the ODAV acronym. She thanked everyone for their attendance and participation. Brandy and **Matt Rogers, Century West,** introduced the subconsultants that are involved with the project. Brandy introduced the PAC members. Matt said that several members were displeased with the

short amount of time given to review the working paper before the meeting. He explained that the review process took longer than anticipated and staff wanted to ensure everything was presented correctly before making the document public. Future deliverables will be posted sooner for review, and everyone would be able to comment on the document. There could also be another PAC work session in a month to discuss the document after everyone has a chance to review and discuss with constituents.

Existing Conditions and Preliminary Forecast

David Miller, Century West, gave a brief overview of Working Paper No. 1 focusing on Chapter 2 and 3, which cover the existing conditions (including land use and zoning of the airport) and preliminary aviation activity forecasts. The presentation is posted to the project website. Brandy asked the PAC if they had any clarifying questions or comments.

- **Charlotte Lehan, City of Wilsonville**: Where does the issue of constrained size of aircraft come into the discussion?
    - David: That comes in at the facility requirements step. One of the technical evaluations is the constrained operations evaluation. Aircraft have different runway requirements based on different conditions and we'll be evaluating that. Larger aircraft that fall in the design group of C-II and C-III currently operate at the airport. Whether they are constrained will be dependent on various factors, and we will be evaluating that, which will tie into facility requirements and runway requirements.
- **Steven Switzer, Charbonneau Country Club**: In your 2018 study, you listed 328 based aircraft. Can you explain the number drop? Did we lose those 49 airplanes?
    - David: Yes and no. There were 20+ helicopters that were previously counted and some have moved and others are located off airport property at Columbia Helicopters and Helicopter Transport Services (HTS)[2] that do not have through-the-fence agreements[3] and are not attributed to the airport. The level of scrutiny in this update made it necessary to be more precise in the aircraft counts and we had access to more information than before.
    - **Tony Beach, ODAV:** The biggest change was the helicopters. This 2021-22 based aircraft update was the most comprehensive and thorough one we have done. There was a high level of scrutiny because of the Master Plan project.
    - Steven Switzer: Thank you, that makes sense based on the number of helicopters.
- **Rian Johnson, Vans Aircraft**: I'm based at Troutdale with my personal airplane and I fly into Aurora for work. Does your study include the possibility for reduction of capacity of other airports? The Troutdale runway will be shortened due to Amazon. When flying into an airport for business, you have Hillsboro, Troutdale, and Aurora by major freeways. Did you account for that increase?
    - David: Yes, when we forecasted the various growth scenarios, we did. Each of these airports are competing for business and movement of aircraft between airports is not uncommon. We look at the general health of aviation in the Portland metro area, and that gets factored in both

[2] Columbia Helicopters Heliport (FAA Identifier: OR68) and HTS Aurora Heliport (FAA Identifier: OR24) operate independently of the Aurora State Airport under Marion County Conditional Use Permits.
[3] Through-the-Fence (TTF) is a term used to describe how off-airport aviation users access an airport, rather than having facilities located on airport property.

based aircraft and aircraft operations projections. I suspect that as Troutdale changes, some of those aircraft will disperse around the region and some will end up at Aurora.

Brandy reminded the PAC that the AMP schedule will periodically change. She asked members if they would like an additional work session.

- **Ben Williams, Friends of French Prairie:** The paper was delivered Friday at almost end of day and I don't think I've had enough time to read it. I don't know that I can answer this question without time to digest what was said to us.
    - Brandy: If we have another work session then we can talk through it and you'll have time to read through the materials.

Seventeen PAC members said they wanted to have an additional work session and Brandy said staff will move forward with scheduling the work session.

PAC Questions and Comments

Brandy opened the PAC question and comment session, in which committee members could ask questions about the master plan, give general comments about the information presented, list some goals they would like the plan to accomplish, and share their local expertise and airport knowledge. Full comments, along with responses are provided in the table at the end of the document.

Public Comments

Brandy reminded the group that they could submit comment through the survey, website, or at the public meeting after the PAC meeting. She encouraged PAC members to distribute the survey among their constituents. The next portion of the meeting was for public comment, and full responses are provided at the end of the document.

Next Steps

Brandy thanked everyone for attending and encouraged those who wanted to attend the public open house to move to the next Zoom meeting. The next working meeting will occur in about a month, and PAC members were advised to watch for an email related to that. Brandy then closed the meeting.

Questions/Comments and Responses from the PAC[4]

ID	Name	Affiliation	Question/Comment	Response
2.1	**Aron Faegre** (for Ted Millar)	*AABC/TLM Holdings*	Will the noise contours include helicopters?	The noise contours to be generated will reflect the existing and forecasted activity once approved by the FAA. Columbia and HTS helicopter traffic is separate from the Airport's traffic, as they are private facilities. Unless the FAA says

[4] Live responses are included, along with additional information/clarification, as needed.

				otherwise, expect the noise contours to only reflect Aurora State Airport-generated traffic.
2.2	**Bob Hala**	*Atlantic Aviation*	I'm new to the PAC and happy to answer any questions. We are on the south end of the field, so come talk to us.	No response needed
2.3	**Bruce Bennett**	*Aurora Airport Improvement Association*	I want to highlight the people who aren't represented – the hundreds, thousands, or possibly millions who benefit from the fires that are put out using the Aurora Airport, but who don't have any official association with the Aurora Airport.	No response needed
2.4	**Ken Ivey**	*Aurora Butteville Barlow Community Planning Organization*	How many planes are in the category of size required to get special permissions to land at Aurora Airport due to their larger size or weight?	ODAV requires an overweight waiver for aircraft that exceed the runway's weight-bearing capacity. There are aircraft that meet our current critical design category that do exceed weight bearing capacity. When we receive those requests, we review the information and may issue those. We have one based aircraft that requires that waiver from ODAV.
2.5	**Bill Graupp**	*Aurora CTE, Inc*	I enjoyed reading the paper over the weekend and thought it was a great high-level initial set of review data.	No response needed
2.6	**Steve Switzer**	*Charbonneau Country Club*	I need more time to review this and talk it over with some of the folks here at Charbonneau. I represent the board, who represent 3,000+ people, so I'm just the voice for them. I look forward to another meeting where we can discuss this.	No response needed; work session will be scheduled.
2.7	**Mayor Brian Asher**	*City of Aurora*	I also have issue with the helicopter noise not being included or controlled in the master plan. I'd like to figure out a way to get the FAA involved and include it in the master plan, to get the noise level under control.	We understand the concern and will be coordinating with FAA to see if it is possible to include the off-airport helicopter activity in the airport's noise contours. It is also important to note that airport master plan evaluations of airport noise reflect an assessment of noise exposure, consistent with FAA methodologies. There are no "control" elements associated with master plan noise analyses. The scope of work includes an FAA noise analysis that utilizes the FAA noise model for existing and forecast activity levels, fleet mix and flight tracks. This analysis will not include any evaluation of impacts

				outside the 65DNL[5] noise contour and no evaluation of "changes" in aircraft flight tracks to mitigate overflights in adjacent communities. There will be a detailed discussion of how the noise model is developed and the resulting noise contours later in the planning process.
2.8	**Charlotte Lehan**	*City of Wilsonville*	I would like to do a deeper dive into constrained operations and waivers, and what their definitions and criteria are at the next meeting	No response needed; discussion will continue at the work session.
2.9	**Rob Roedts**	*Columbia Helicopters*	I'm happy to support this. Columbia has been a part of the airport since 1976. We try to be as mindful of the public as possible. We are noticing that some other operators are not being that way, even when flying over communities outside the airport. We need to figure out a way to fix this. We also own some airport property and have noticed times getting in and out of the airport are getting extended, sometimes by up to 20 minutes. We want to figure out a way to make things as efficient as possible, and help the airport grow successfully	No response needed.
2.10	**Matt Williams**	*Deer Creek Estates HOA*	We are within a mile of the airport and are always concerned about noise, but we appreciate the opportunity to be heard.	No response needed.
2.11	**Ben Williams**	*Friends of French Prairie*	Goal Six of the draft chapter one states, "identify potential environmental and land use requirements that may impact development." Since most PAC members and staff weren't here for the last master plan, I'd like to remind everyone that WH Pacific presented the alternatives of the 2011 master plan process to the Aviation Board. The recommendation was "no build" which means no expansion of the physical size for runway lengthening. The alternatives to lengthen the runway are what generated the legal disputes for ODAV and the airport for the last decade. The former recommendation stated ODAV has decided that any extension would prove infeasible at this time. An	Comments received. We are not yet to the point in the planning process where these issues will be evaluated. These issues will be considered in the Development Alternatives later in the process. Please note this is a new Master Plan and it will arrive to decision points using new data and information.

[5] DNL represents day-night sounds levels, a mathematical method of measuring noise exposure based on cumulative, rather than single event impacts.

			extension to the north might constrain Columbia Helicopter's ability to expand on their private property. An extension to the south might have a negative impact on farmland, a potential environmentally infeasible situation. It may also have a negative impact on private property at Keil Road. Keil Road provides necessary access for farm equipment, machinery, and emergency responders. What has changed in terms of the impact on farmland and potentially environmentally infeasible situations?	
2.12	**Commissioner Danielle Bethel**	*Marion County*	I appreciate this process and hearing from the members of the community surrounding the airport. I would love to have a conversation around helicopter noise for companies that aren't residents of the airport and see if we can encourage them to take alternative paths to support the community. I also think information needs to be provided and shared in a way that the community understands. I hope future processes going forward provide a more thorough process for communication and participation to occur for the scheduled activities that are outlined.	The project team will send materials to the PAC further in advance, particularly for meetings that require focused discussions of long-term facility planning. We understand the concern related to helicopter noise and will be coordinating with FAA to see if it is possible to include the off-airport helicopter activity in the airport's noise contours.
2.13	**Cathryn Stephens**	*Oregon Dept of Aviation Board*	I understand the helicopter operations are on private property, but are they through-the-fence operations? If you have a through-the-fence operation, those based aircraft would be included? Forecasting is tricky and it's important to get as accurate as possible. Flight plan filings are not necessarily a good indicator because there are many operations that you don't file a flight plan for. I was pleased to see how stable your 2020 operations were. I was wondering if the residential properties beneath the west transitional surface south of the Willamette River, near the runway 17 approach surface, had an avigation easement or airport development overlay zone in place?	Columbia and HTS do not have a through-the-fence agreement with ODAV. They operate from adjacent privately-owned properties without direct airfield access. These facilities (heliports) have individual airport identifier codes (OR24, OR68). There are helicopters that operate on the airport and potentially in the adjacent through-the-fence areas, but those aren't Columbia or HTS helicopters. Yes, the through-the-fence aircraft would be included. The use of instrument flight plan filings provides the most accurate data available for gauging business aviation activity at most airports. It is understood that some filed IFR flight plans are not activated or canceled enroute, and some aircraft complete their flights operating under visual flight rules (VFR). However, the Traffic Flow Management System

			Would any potential runway extension require a property purchase or rezoning?	(TFMSC[6]) data are recognized by FAA as the most accurate measure of critical or design aircraft activity for general aviation airports with significant business aviation use. In this case, the TFMSC data supplements the Aurora State Airport air traffic control tower data to identify critical aircraft use and to evaluate common off-hours activity trends. We haven't reached the point in the Plan to provide informed comments on runway lengths and if a runway extension is needed. The runway length requirements will be evaluated in the Facility Requirements and if a runway extension is justified, options for accommodating a runway extension will be evaluated in the Development Alternatives.
2.14	**Naomi Zwerdling**	*Oregon Dept of Transportation*	It was my understanding that TSP's (Transportation System Planning) would be happening in another phase of the project (related to previous questions).	Transportation System Plans are not included in the scope of work for the Airport Master Plan. Individual transportation planning studies may be required to support individual development projects that are an outcome of the planning process.
2.15	**Tony Helbling**	*Positive Aurora Airport Management*	I met with some residents of the Charbonneau area, as well as Councilwoman Joann Linville from Wilsonville. We would like for a noise study to come out of this master plan	A noise study will be included as part of this plan that includes noise exposure maps generated for current and future forecast aircraft operations and runway configuration(s).
2.16	**Rian Johnson**	*Vans Aircraft*	There are other types of airplanes that will be coming along in the future with the expansion of Mosaic. They would have different noise signatures, such as quad copter type aircraft. This will be approved by Congress in 2023 but should be considered. We at Vans try to avoid Charbonneau and Aurora, but the flight paths that the tower puts us on, put us over where we are. We still try to avoid those and be respectful.	The needs of aircraft that are anticipated to be based at Aurora over the 20-year planning horizon will be considered in the Development Alternatives. We are aware that many new types of electric aircraft will be entering the market in the next 10 years. The planning team will consider options to accommodate electric aircraft when alternative concepts are developed.
2.17	**Patrick Donaldson**	*Wilsonville Chamber of Commerce*	Prior message: As I am going to be driving, I offer this comment when you come to 'Wilsonville Area Chamber of Commerce' - Draft Airport Master Plan Working Paper	No response needed.

[6] TFMS is a data exchange system for supporting the management and monitoring of national air traffic flow.

			No. 1 appears to be a rich and deep source of helpful materials that the Wilsonville Chamber of Commerce will review and bring forward our comments at the anticipated work session. Thank you.	
2.18	**David Waggoner**	*Willamette Aviation*	How is the noise contour being developed?	Once the FAA approves the aviation activity forecasts, the noise analysis for the master plan will be driven by those numbers. There is a series of exercises done using computer modeling software, which would be inputted with the existing and forecasted future aircraft operations. Any recommendations would also be reflected in those contours. That exercise will be driven by the air traffic represented in the forecast. We agree that having an appreciation of the helicopter activity within the overall area would be valuable to the broader discussion of noise that may extend beyond the scope of an individual airport master plan.
2.19	**Wayne Richards**	*Friends of the French Prairie*	I wanted to empathize with Rob (Columbia Helicopters). We have been counting the flights over Charbonneau that are on flight aware. There have been 4,500 in the last 12 months. We are concerned about noise, and we are also concerned about leaded fuel raining down on our communities. There is no safe level of lead with that many flights. Small traces of it can affect children's neurological makeup and the health and safety of our citizens. I would like to see what the plan is for the reduction of the forever chemicals such as lead and polyfluoroalkyl in the next meeting. They are in flame retardants, and they don't break down. Jet exhaust burns sulfur, and the FAA's chief scientist has a report out that notes that jet fuel creates 11 toxic chemicals and jets that fly over Charbonneau are raining some of those sulfur compounds down on us. The overflight isn't just noise, and I'd love to address that at the next meeting.	There are ongoing nationwide efforts that the FAA, in coordination with the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), is undertaking to address leaded fuel use in aviation and also emissions from jet exhaust. The purpose of these efforts is to investigate fuel alternatives to reduce emissions and the presence of lead in aviation fuel. More information is available at: https://www.faa.gov/airports/environmental/air_quality The opportunities to mitigate these issues are not within the scope of the Airport Master Plan project.
2.20	**Aron Faegre**	*AABC/TLM Holdings*	Ted asked that I add to the record that the development at the airport	No response needed.

			puts taxes into the public sector. According to the Marion County tax record, that is almost 2 million a year. Almost $800,000 of that goes to North Marion County School District, and $300,000 goes to Aurora Fire. There is strong support of community from the airport, so it's good to keep that in mind.	
2.21	**Bruce Bennett**	*Aurora Airport Improvement Association*	The helicopters burn fuel that has no lead in it. The trace amounts mentioned earlier are piston engines, not helicopters.	No response needed.

Public Comment

ID	Name	Affiliation	Question/Comment	Response
2.22	**Nancy Davis**	*Community member*	I live in Charbonneau, and I'm concerned about the noise. I'm also concerned there will be increased traffic on our roadways with the flight increase. It also seems like the flight paths go directly over our homes. Could the planes and helicopters fly over open space or fields instead of coming over our houses? Can rules or time limits be imposed? There are busier airports that have restricted hours.	Noise will be evaluated in the master plan based on the current and forecast activity from the FAA-approved forecasts. Flight paths, once the aircraft have left the ground, are the responsibility of the pilot in command of the aircraft and directions from Air Traffic Control when operating in the controlled airspace surrounding Aurora State Airport. ODAV does not have the ability to dictate aircraft flight paths or times of operation in accordance with FAA regulations. Surface transportation impacts are studied on a project-by-project basis when development occurs and reviewed by the controlling jurisdiction (in this instance, Marion County). If a proposed development is shown to have a significant impact on local transportation facilities, mitigation projects may be a condition of approval for the project.
2.23	**Steven Benson**	*Community member*	I live in Daydream Ranch and didn't get a copy of the working paper. It seems the forecast shows an increase of air traffic and jets are projected to increase. I'm concerned about larger planes and traffic coming with the increase in space at the airports and a longer runway. Is the forecast for the airport staying	The forecasts of aviation activity are not constrained and not dependent on airport expansion. The current activity is within the capabilities of the airport. We will be evaluating any future activity or facility needs as part of the next chapter.

			the same size, or more airport builds and development?	
2.24	**Traci Hensley**	*City Council President, City of Canby*	I also think a noise study should be a part of this process.	A noise study is included as part of this Airport Master Plan.
2.25	**Mayor Julie Fitzgerald**	*City or Wilsonville*	I appreciate the comment about the airport helping schools. That is very important to me and everyone in Wilsonville. I'm concerned about transportation around the airport, and I want to recognize that jobs are so important in keeping our freight moving. We have 21,000 jobs and combined payroll of $1.3 billion. We are developing some industrial land and managing the facilities on that land. We want to make sure freight keeps moving for Oregon's economy. I'm concerned about the expansion of facilities at the airport which would increase traffic. We have unimproved roads approaching the airport. We want to keep supporting the economy and schools, but I want to know how this will be addressed for safety.	Surface transportation impacts are studied on a project-by-project basis when development occurs and reviewed by the controlling jurisdiction (Marion County). If a proposed development is shown to have a significant impact on local transportation facilities, mitigation projects may be a condition of approval for the project.
2.26	**Nancy CS**	*Community member*	I live very close to the airport noise. In late February, one of the HTS helicopters passed over my field and dumped fluid on it. This has happened before, and it's wrong. I also have it on film, and others have seen it. I also have read decibels going from 90-105 for an extended period of time. This can impact hearing, and no one should be exposed to that at home. I can't have people over to my home when I want, and it feels like the airport dictates my life. My family was here before the airport. How do the areas outside the airport get approved to be next to homes and farms?	HTS's development was permitted through Marion County and operates independent of Aurora State Airport. ODAV has no authority to control how they operate their aircraft. If you have noise or concerns with impacts to your property contact HTS directly or Marion County code enforcement. If you have safety concerns you can also contact the Portland FAA Flight Standards District Office (FSDO) at (503) 615-3200.
2.27	**John Rankin**	*Former City Attorney for the City of Aurora*	I'm representing four different properties of about 108 acres. All but one are rural inside the growth boundary of the City of Aurora. They are south and east of Keil Road, and they will be impacted by expansion and development of the airport. We have had several interested parties and offers from airport related	Future facility needs will be identified in the Facility Requirements and Development Alternatives. If land adjacent to the airport is identified for potential airport-related activity within the proposed development alternatives, property owners will be consulted at that time.

			businesses and contractors. My clients have property that could be dedicated or sold for taxiways and that sort of thing. I have done work with different agencies regarding the future vacation of Keil Road.	
2.28	**Kriss Wright**	*Planning Commissioner, City of Newberg*	My father lives next door to the airport and our water line was breached by a fire truck. I have not seen any fire hydrants around the airport. Infrastructure is needed for that, especially since airplanes are flying over residential areas.	On-site utilities will be evaluated in the Development Alternatives task in the master plan.

Written Public Comment[7]

ID	Name	Affiliation	Question/Comment	Response
2.29	Wayne Richards	*Community member*	First, sending an 83 page detailed document to us the night before this meeting is not a good start for you. Second, allowing ten minutes for public comment with two minutes each allowed will only let five people speak! I understand that there are rules about everyone wishing to speak be allowed to. Health and wellbeing are an important part of livability. According to the a report by the US Department of Health and Human Services Agency for Toxic Substance and Disease Registry, The toxicity of lead in humans has been known for 2000 years, and is not disputed. On the Aurora State Airports voluntary agreement with our community regarding overflights, they said they would make the effort. Over the last 12 months, just on Flight Aware, there were over 4,500 flights directly over Wilsonville spewing lead from their reciprocating engines. There is a reason we don't use lead paint, lead water pipes and leaded gasoline. Jets. Jet exhaust is even more toxic. Sulfur in jet fuel is a major killer. The FAAs own Lourdes Maurice (the administration's chief scientist) notes that jet fuel creates 11 toxic chemicals in their exhaust.	Thank you for your comment; we've shared your concerns with the technical team.

[7] Letter was sent before the meeting.

			The noise is clearly a form of pollution from the Aurora State Airport and is documented as a health hazard They're known as "Forever Chemicals". Whenever fire suppressant foams (as one example) are used (for instance) it stays in the environment forever. These PFAS (polyfluoroalkyl) are in our environment now. Like lead, they do not disintegrate. PFAS are known to cause serious health problems in humans (heightened cholesterol as well as thyroid and immune system disorders) Safe is their goal? What's safe about this.	

AURORA STATE AIRPORT

AIRPORT MASTER PLAN - PAC MEETING #1

MEETING SUMMARY

Date: Tuesday, November 16, 2021
Time: 3:00-5:00 pm
Location: Zoom Webinar

In Attendance

PAC Members Present

Roger Kaye, *1000 Friends of Oregon*
Ted Millar, *AABC/TLM Holdings*
Bruce Bennett, *Aurora Airport Improvement Association*
Ken Ivey, *Aurora Butteville Barlow Community Planning Organization*
Bill Graupp, *Aurora CTE, Inc*
Steve Switzer, *Charbonneau Country Club*
Brian Asher, *City of Aurora*
Chris Neamtzu, *City of Wilsonville*
Commissioner Tootie Smith, *Clackamas County*
Rob Roedts, *Columbia Helicopters*
Bob Buchanan, Alternate, *Columbia Helicopters*
Cheryl Pouley, *Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde Community of Oregon*
Matt Williams, *Deer Creek Estates HOA*
Ben Williams, *Friends of French Prairie*
Ben Clayton, *Life Flight Network*
Tristan Dorian, *Lynx Aviation*
Matt Lawyer, Alternate, *Marion County*
Tony Beach, Oregon Dept of Aviation
Naomi Zwerdling, *Oregon Dept of Transportation*
Matt Crall, *Oregon Dept of Land Conservation and Development*
Nicole Mardell, Alternate, *Oregon Dept of Land Conservation and Development*
Bill Martin, *Oregon Office of Emergency Management*
Sarah Puls, Alternate, *Oregon Office of Emergency Management*
Tony Helbling, *Positive Aurora Airport Management*
Jody Christensen, *Regional Solutions*
Rian Johnson, *Vans Aircraft*
David Waggoner, *Willamette Aviation*
Patrick Donaldson, *Wilsonville Chamber of Commerce*
Kevin Ferrasci O'Malley, Alternate, *Wilsonville Chamber of Commerce*

PAC Members Absent

Raul Suarez, *Aurora Air Traffic Control*
Scott Archer, *City of Canby*
Robert Kentta, *Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians*
Christian Nauer, *Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon*
Robert Fournier, *Helicopter Transport Service*
Commissioner Danielle Bethell, *Marion County*
Mary Anne Cooper, *Oregon Farm Bureau*

Agency Representatives

Sarah Lucas, *ODA*
Heather Peck, *ODA*
Seth Thompson, *ODA*
Benjamin Mello, *FAA*
Betty Stansbury, *ODA*
Kate Key, *FAA*

Staff and Consultants

Matt Rogers, *Century West*
David Miller, *Century West*
Mike Dane, *Century West*
Samantha Peterson, *Century West*
Mark Steele, *Century West*
Brandy Steffen, *JLA Public Involvement*
Tracie Heidt, *JLA Public Involvement*

Audience / Members of the Public

Loraine Crouch
Robert Zakian
Aron Faegre
F Caughlin
Austin Barnes
Ron Looney
Lisa Brice
Bruce Bergman
Jake Jacobs
Otto Horvath
Cheryl van Grunsven
Greg Leo
jging
Joe Mollahan
James Pererson
Kathryn Kelley
n cs
Jason Paolo
Mark Ottenad
Bill Horton
Jon Denney
James Kirby
Joyce Williams
Tom Herzog
Greg Drew
Wayne Richards
Todd Williams
Linette Dobbins
John Wilson
Council President Hensley
Jake Farrens
Richard VanGrunsven
Leticia Martinez de Cervantes
Dr John
David Carlson
Joseph Schaefer
Dan Fricke
John Rachor
Frank Vedack
Mark Steele
Tyler Meskers
Derek Holland
Barbara Jacobson
Jan Gagnon Zakian
Neal White
Patricia Allen-Sleeman
Mayor Julie Fitzgerald
Josh Pruzek
Maurice Gunderson
Prateek Vasudev
Loita Colebank
City Councilor Charlotte Lehan
Tom Maletis
Carolyn Lee
Richard
Eric Winston
Trevor Conroy
Greg Strecker
Betty Ann Arrasmith

Overview

The meeting goals were to introduce the project, understand the role/expectations for the PAC, prepare for upcoming meetings, and to receive public input.

Welcome and Introductions

Brandy Steffen, JLA Public Involvement, welcomed everyone to the meeting and reviewed the agenda and basic Zoom meeting tips. **Sarah Lucas introduced Oregon Department of Aviation (ODA)** staff and the consultant teams. **Matt Rogers, Century West,** introduced the subconsultants that are involved with the project. Brandy posted a poll question asking if members had concerns about the fact that the meeting was being recorded. There were no concerns. Brandy introduced the PAC members and then posted an icebreaker poll question on the screen to see how people were doing, using a weather metaphor as a gauge.

Meeting Process Roles and Responsibilities

Brandy clarified the PAC's roles, reviewed the meeting guidelines and ground rules and described her role as facilitator. She explained the decision-making process, noting the PAC is an advisory group; a sounding board that will review information and provide feedback but not make a recommendation because ODA staff are the final decision-making body. She stated that the project team will gather all PAC members' viewpoints, consider them, and include them in the meeting summary notes.

Brandy said ODA is committed to a fair and transparent public process. There will be many opportunities for the public's questions and comments during future open houses and interviews. The public is always welcome to attend PAC meetings and at each meeting there will be a 15-minute period for verbal comments.

Brandy polled the members to see if they needed any clarification on the agenda, decision-making process, or public involvement and to make sure they understood the protocols/ground rules.

History and Master Plan Overview

David Miller, Century West, gave a history of the Aurora State Airport from the 1940s through current times. He provided parameters for the project. The Master Plan is a facility plan that follows the requirements set by the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA). The goal is to provide a framework for a cost-effective improvement of airport facilities in response to aviation demands. He explained that the 20-year planning horizon was divided into three periods: short-term, intermediate-term and long-term and gave an existing conditions overview. He shared the 18-month project schedule, noting there would be seven PAC meetings and four open houses (although the schedule is subject to change).

Brandy posted a poll to see if anyone had clarifying questions. Two said they would ask their questions in the chat and six people indicated that they might follow up with her later.

PAC Questions and Comments

Brandy opened up a PAC question and comment session, in which committee members could ask questions about the master plan, give general comments about the information presented, list some goals they would like the plan to accomplish, and share their local expertise and airport knowledge. Full comments, along with responses are provided in the table at the end of the document.

Public Comments

Brandy opened the meeting up to public members in attendance that wanted to provide verbal comments to the PAC and reminded everyone that written comments would be collected anytime through the project website. Four people provided comments, which are listed in the tables below along with responses to their questions.

ODA only endorses/supports data and statements that are released from this study and posted to the project website. All other statements by members of the Planning Advisory Committee and public are personal opinions. Other documents may not be endorsed by the ODA because they are out of date, unless otherwise noted.

Next Steps

Brandy thanked everyone for coming and said the recording of the meeting and Power Point Presentation slides would be posted on the website within the next couple of days.

The meeting summary will be posted to the project website in about two weeks and will include all questions and responses, even to those questions that were asked in the chat and weren't answered today. We will also email the PAC members the meeting summary. Brandy advised members to send the team any other questions they might have in the coming days and announced that the second PAC meeting will be scheduled in the future, but it is anticipated for January/February 2022.

Sarah, Heather, and David all thanked the PAC and members of the public for coming and Brandy closed the meeting.

Questions/Comments and Responses Related to the Meeting Topics

Name	Affiliation	Question/Comment	Response
David Waggoner	Willamette Aviation	Will any elements of last master plan be added to this one?	Past studies are being reviewed for historical reference. This Airport Master Plan (AMP) Project will include a comprehensive evaluation of existing conditions, evaluation of compliance with current FAA standards, and development of alternatives to address forecasted activity at the airport.
Ben Williams	Friends of French Prairie (FOFP)	A Master Plan that actually takes into account the local communities and neighborhoods and the airport impacts upon them!	Maintaining a transparent and thorough process that involves listening to and understanding all comments from the public, surrounding neighbors, and PAC members is a critical component of this AMP Project. ODA will utilize comments in an advisory manner, as applicable to the FAA-approved Scope of Work (SOW) and in accordance with best practices of airport operations management.
Ted Millar	AABC/TLM Holdings	I have been part of the airport for 20-some years and the state of Oregon is making emergency preparedness a major priority in	To clarify, the scope of work approved by the FAA for this master plan doesn't include any resiliency scope, so a future special study might address this, but it

		the case of major disasters, such as earthquakes and fires. The state study indicates that within the first 90 days of an earthquake, the emergency response is going to have to be by air. The Aurora Airport was one of 12 airports designated as an emergency response location. Geo technical studies show that in case of a major earthquake, this airport won't be affected by the liquification like PDX, Hillsboro and McMinnville. He said we already have control towers with all of the emergency preparedness companies located here, such as Columbia Helicopters, Helicopter Transport, Wilson Construction, etc. He thinks it's important that this airport gets special attention because of its capabilities.	is not part of this specific process. Thank you for sharing.
Roger Kaye	1000 Friends of Oregon	I have questions about the scope of work document they all received in advance but wanted to wait until today to ask his questions. The scope of work identified a lot of particulars that are not identified here in this first meeting. Everyone should look at it and see how this process fits within the scope. He had concerns about certain statements made in the scope of work and wanted them addressed by ODA. He wondered if the scope of work was part of this process.	Yes, the scope of work came via email to all committee members in October as part of the packet, and if you didn't receive it, please email Sarah Lucas.
Bruce Bennett	Aurora Airport Improvement Association (AAIA)	Have been on the airport field for 47 years straight and that it was important to keep everything in perspective. He said the runway lengthening safety improvement that has been planned since 1976 has been hugely exaggerated and it is important to keep in perspective that Aurora will never be a long runway, but it should be normal anyway. In the state of Oregon, 30 airports are longer than this one, and only 4 are busier. He said the prior master plan would put Aurora Airport at number 11,	Comment noted; no response required.

		and that was a reasonable target.	
Bruce Bennett	Aurora Airport Improvement Association (AAIA)	Safety improvements that have been delayed for decades are paramount based on my 43 years operation here and lifetime in the Aviation industry.	Comment noted; no response required.
Bruce Bennett	Aurora Airport Improvement Association (AAIA)	Wanted to clarify for the non-pilots in the group that the original runway length requirements for the airport in 1943 were okay. The regulations were that the runway needed to be long enough for an airplane to take off; but today, for safety reasons, the requirements are for take off plus a landing. It is critical that the length is adequate. One of Bruce's best friends died in an accident due to insufficient runway length. Looks can be deceiving on a runway, he said.	Century West will be looking at that. FAA has strict runway length minimum standards.
Naomi Zwerdling	Oregon Department of Transportation	What are the approval processes with land use and transportation? Does ODOT and City go through approval processes?	Marion County is the governing jurisdiction for the Aurora State Airport. Once the AMP is complete there will be a separate process for any Comprehensive Plan amendment or Transportation System Plan (TSP) updates, as required by Marion County. The processes that will be followed are set by Marion County's requirements.
Brian Asher	Mayor, City of Aurora	Will the local community utilities, noise, fire protection needs be addressed in the master plan	Yes. This master plan will include an analysis of noise exposure both for the current traffic and forecast periods. We will go over an inventory of some of the utilities that exist at the airport so you can be more familiar with what the airport's needs are for water, other resources and fire protection.
Ben Williams	FOFP	Also, for the record, we have no knowledge that there was any public notice or comment period for the Scope of Work (SOW) before it was approved and awarded. In other words, this PAC has no input about the SOW.	This AMP is a Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Airport Improvement Program (AIP) funded project. SOW development and approval is an FAA process. For all projects funded by the FAA AIP, the FAA works directly with airport owners/sponsors to determine and approve the SOW in accordance with the FAA's requirements.

Bill Graupp	Aurora CTE, Inc.	Added Goal: Account for future enhancements in aviation technology, including fuel/power and navigation technology, and changes to transportation standards (e-based technology).	ODA and the Consultant Team will address these issues, in accordance with the SOW.
Ken Ivey	Aurora Butteville Barlow Community Planning Organization	In the introduction packet, page 4 of Frequently Asked Questions refers to a "previous planning studies". Where can we access those studies?	The Project Website's resource page will be updated with any and all prior studies that may be deemed necessary and helpful for this project. Previous studies are currently available on ODA's website.
Ben Williams	FOFP	According to the State Geology Dept. the south end of the runway is subject to liquefaction and will disintegrate in a major earthquake!	Please feel free to provide the technical studies and evaluations to which you are referring. No new geotechnical studies are included in the SOW of this project.
Patrick Donaldson	Wilsonville Chamber of Commerce	I look forward to whatever plan is submitted because it seems so comprehensive. From the Chamber's perspective, the ability for people to work at the airport and go back to their homes and further the economy and have a safe work environment that they can return to is essential. He said it's important for the committee to bring forth all their ideas and documents they have questions about (such as liquification in the event of an earthquake) and we can independently look at the veracity of them and if they are contemporary.	We will review existing and past engineering studies that have been done on the runway, current pavement strength data, and other data. That will definitely be in our review of the inventory and incorporated into future planning for facility improvements. We will look at what information is available so we can understand current conditions. We will not be doing direct Geotech investigations with this work. We will review current studies done by professional engineers on the subject of liquification and review any additional documents that are available, as well.
Tony Helbling	Positive Aurora Airport Management	His group is focused on respectful operations of the aircraft and the airport in conjunction with their neighbors. He has worked with ODA in the past and done outreach. Their members, Bruce Bennett, for example, have worked with Charbonneau and others to get some of the routes in and out of the airport changed. John Wilson worked hard on the VFR routes for voluntary noise complaints. Tony is glad this is moving forward. His group wants to operate safely and respectfully of their neighbors.	Comment noted; no response required.

Tristan Dorian	Lynx Aviation	Agrees with Tony. Lynx has some big priorities as an FBO network. Items such as maintaining an efficient and sustainable site for operation, taxi way widening and weight limitations are important to them and their operation.	Comment noted; no response required.
Tristan Dorian	Lynx Aviation	Will CFR-Part 139 categorization of UAO likely be included in this master plan, bringing minimum security/safety standards and AOA (Airport Operating Area)?	No. For clarification, 14 CFR Part 139 requires FAA to issue airport operating certificates to airports that: • Serve schedule and unscheduled air carrier aircraft with more than 30 seats; • Serve scheduled air carrier operations in aircraft with more than 9 seats but less than 31 seats; and • The FAA Administrator requires to have a certificate. Certification is not an objective of this AMP or ODA.
Tristan Dorian	Lynx Aviation	Tristan Dorian wanted to circle back on the 139 piece. He recognizes it is not an immediate priority but because Aurora Airport is in the Portland metro area, it would bring a lot of economic benefit and efficiency in minimal standards for safety and security for the airport. He said this is a huge priority for them, their customers, base tenants and everyone on this call. Because it seemed like a logical step in the journey for Aurora, he wanted to challenge why Part 139 is not a priority item.	Comment noted. The goal is to operate at the highest level of safety. The Aurora Airport implements as many of the components of 139 as we can, but those components that require certification are less feasible to achieve. NOTE: 139 is a FAR (Federal Aviation Regulation) for commercial service airports and lays out a set of safety and security measures.
Bruce Bennett	AAIA	Ben's information is outdated and inaccurate, I'll provide correct information.	Please feel free to provide the technical studies and evaluations to which you are referring. No new geotechnical studies are included in the SOW of this project.
Tony Helbling	Positive Aurora Airport Management (PAAM)	The claim the south end of the runway will disintegrate is inaccurate. New geotechnical studies show differently.	Please feel free to provide the technical studies and evaluations to which you are referring. No new geotechnical studies are included in the SOW of this project.
Chris Neamtzu	City of Wilsonville	Is it a goal of this AMP process to comply with Oregon land use and public process goals?	Yes. ODA will complete the AMP in compliance with the Department of Land Conservation and Development's (DLCD) State Agency Coordination (SAC) Program. Compliance with

			Oregon's Statewide Planning Program is a core requirement of the SAC Program. The ODA will ensure the Aurora State Airport AMP is completed in accordance with ORS 187.180; OAR 660-30 & 31. Oregon's Statewide Planning Program also emphasizes the importance of public involvement, which is a key component of the SAC Program. Accordingly, the ODA has established a Planning Advisory Committee (PAC) that includes members from all affected Federal, State, Local Special Districts, and Interested Parties. The PAC will meet up to nine times throughout the 18-month Aurora State Airport AMP project timeline. All PAC meetings are open to the public.
Tristan Dorian	Lynx Aviation	Just to make sure it's on record - weight limitation from 45,000lbs dual to 110,000lbs and taxiway widening to 50ft is a huge priority for this process.	Comment noted; no response required.
Chris Neamtzu	City of Wilsonville	Want to recommend ODA (Oregon Department of Agriculture) and DEQ (Oregon Department of Environmental Quality) as entities that warrant seats at the table.	Comment noted. All project information for this AMP will be readily available to all state, federal and local agencies and jurisdictions. ODA works with DEQ and Agriculture, as required, on all Capital Improvement Projects.
Ken Ivey	Aurora Butteville Barlow Community Planning Organization	Will you be sending out contact information for the hosts?	Contact information was shared in the presentation and is available on the project website.
Bruce Bennett	AAIA	Great points to strengthen the runway and widen the taxiway Tristan, somehow that was mistakenly communicated as "commercial service" use. So that will need to be sorted out.	The AMP will address current (existing) conditions and future facility requirements.
Wayne Richards	FOFP	I wonder about the airport operational count? Predications from 2012 were extremely high compared to actual use. Pilots need landing strip that is long enough to take off and land. Are they allowed to take off?	In the AMP forecasting effort, a variety of contributing factors, as well as the validated count of based aircraft, will be reviewed. The answer to that question will be studied in the aeronautical activity forecasting effort and the resulting facility requirements analysis.
Steven Benson and Lisa Brice	--	I live at Daydream Ranch near Charbonneau. Why aren't we represented on the committee because we are most impacted	You will be added to the mailing list, and it is recommended you reach out to a PAC member that represents your

		by the noise? We live in the City of Wilsonville.	area (City of Wilsonville and/or Clackamas County).
Lori Crouch	--	I live across street on Highway 551 in sunset estates. What is a noise contour and I wonder what noise volume this project will add? Will there be a wall added?	The AMP will develop noise contours (which are a representation of the average noise level) for both the existing and forecasted airport geometry and operations. More information on this item will be available as the project progresses.
"n cs" Nancy	--	I'm a neighbor and it used to be very peaceful and nice but now it feels like warzone with noise volume of 105 decibels. Expanding the airport can't make it better. What will be done to address that? I would like representation of the neighbors on the PAC. Didn't receive a note about this meeting.	Postcards were mailed to residents and property owners within 1,000 feet of the airport. Additionally, notice was printed in multiple papers and sent via GovDelivery email to those signed up for that service. All future meetings will be noticed in the same manner. PAC meetings are open to the public and allow comment opportunities, as well as providing opportunities to connect with PAC members. It is too early to talk about outcomes of the AMP, as the process is just beginning. **Brian Asher** commented in the chat: "If you let Nancy know, I will be an ear for her area."

Additional Questions/Comments and Responses

Name	Affiliation	Question/Comment	Response
Roger Kaye	1000 Friends of Oregon	Will need a video of this presentation before he can evaluate all of this information and asked when the recording will become available.	The recording of this meeting will be posted to the project website in the next few days.
Ben Williams	Friends of French Prairie (FOFP)	Does ODA, JLA and Century West own and operate an embarrassment meter. The PAC members were informed in advance that they are a sounding board but no recommendations will be made by the committee. How are they an "advisory" committee if they won't take advice from the committee, he asked.	Throughout this Aurora State Airport Master Plan Project, ODA is interested in all comments from the public and PAC members. We are committed to a transparent and thorough process. ODA is committed to listening and understanding the comments we receive and utilize the comments in an advisory manner as applicable to the scope of work and in accordance with the best practices of airport operations management. ODA will review and utilize comments as applicable to our requirements as a general aviation airport owner and sponsor, and in compliance with federal grant

			assurances and Oregon Revised Statutes. ODA will be seeking recommendations from the PAC at various times. All recommendations will be submitted to the Aviation Board.
Matt Williams	Deer Creek Estates HOA	Glad you had this meeting and look forward to the next! Thank you	Comment noted; no response required.
Commissioner Tootie Smith	Clackamas County Board of Commissioners	Happy to be here and listen to the comments	Comment noted; no response required.
Bill Martin	Oregon Office of Emergency Management	Thank you for a most interesting and efficient first meeting. Looking forward to the process.	Comment noted; no response required.
Brian Asher	Mayor, City of Aurora	thank you good meeting	Comment noted; no response required.
Linette Dobbins	--	I own property on Boones Ferry across from south end of airport and changed approaches since last plan and going over their property and home. I received letter about cutting down trees.	Please reach out to Tony Beach, State Airports Manager (contact information on ODA website). The referenced letter was about existing conditions at the airport and is unrelated to this Master Plan Project.
Ben Williams Frank Vedaqk	FOFP	Frank Vedaqk, resident on Lower Boones Ferry Road can't get recognized for Public Comment and asks: 1) How do they plan on forcing residents into the aviation easement regarding the RPZ, and 2) Is ODA accounting for the negative impact on property values there and in the impact area within Deer Creek Estates?	This comment appears to be about a different project. Please Contact Tony Beach for information pertaining to the Aurora State Airport Obstruction Removal Project.

Mayors of the Aurora State Airport Area Communities

Aurora **Wilsonville**

December 13, 2021

The Honorable Kate Brown, Governor of Oregon
c/o Staff of the Office of the Governor — *Submitted via email to:*
Gina Zejdlik, Chief of Staff — *gina.zejdlik@oregon.gov*
Amira Streeter, Policy Advisor–Climate, Energy and Transportation — *amira.streeter@oregon.gov*
Annie McColaugh, Director–Federal Affairs — *annie.mccolaugh@oregon.gov*
Jason Miner, Policy Director–Natural Resources — *jason.miner@oregon.gov*
Leah Horner, Director–Regional Solutions — *leah.horner@oregon.gov*
Jody Christensen, Mid Valley Regional Solutions Coordinator — *jody.christensen@oregon.gov*

RE: Issues of Public Concern with Oregon Department of Aviation's Aurora State Airport Master Planning Process

Dear Governor Brown:

We write to you as the elected leaders of the communities located in closest proximity to the Aurora State Airport to express our profound disappointment at the Oregon Department of Aviation's biased handling of the Aurora State Airport Master Planning process. Our communities bear the brunt of impacts of the airport's operations, and yet the Aviation Department appears to be discounting our concerns and is primarily responsive to vested financial interests at the airport.

This observation is true in general, as Department of Aviation staff and board members indicate meeting constantly with private-sector airport interests, while rarely meeting with local community members, city councilors and staff. Multiple communications from officials at the Cities of Aurora and Wilsonville to the Aviation Department over the past several years are generally ignored and not responded to.

The Cities of Aurora and Wilsonville, along with other Planning Advisory Committee (PAC) members to the Department of Aviation's Aurora State Airport Master Planning process such as 1000 Friends of Oregon and Friends of French Prairie, seek to raise significant issues of public concern. This federally funded master plan has gotten off to a rocky start in a manner that demonstrates the Department's apparent bias and inability at providing fair public processes that meet Oregon's standards for meaningful public engagement.

We are concerned that the Department of Aviation is again making similar mistakes as it did with the 2011 or 2012 Aurora State Airport Master Plan process that both the Oregon Supreme Court and the Oregon Court of Appeals found in 2021 violated Oregon land-use and public-process laws. We request that the Governor's Office demonstrate decisive leadership that provides confidence to local-government officials that federal and state planning processes are

conducted in a legal and ethical manner above reproach, which at this time appears questionable.

A primary concern pertains to the extremely lopsided membership composition of the Planning Advisory Committee (PAC). The Department of Aviation has stacked the Planning Advisory Committee with self-dealing financial interests at the Airport that benefit from taxpayer-funded Airport operations and capital improvements. A review of the PAC membership demonstrates that well over half of the PAC membership is comprised of entities with direct pecuniary interest in furthering airport expansion at taxpayer expense.

The same pro-airport expansion entities are represented multiple times on the PAC. Two associations placed on the PAC are composed of a majority of Airport financial interests:

- The attorney for the Aurora Airport Improvement Association represented at the June 3, 2021, Oregon Aviation Board meeting that most of the businesses at the Aurora State Airport belonged to the Aurora Airport Improvement Association.
- In a similar manner, most of the same airport entities are also members of Positive Aurora Airport Management association, a local airport operations management group.

By all appearances, the process and committee composition has the appearance of a "tick the box" exercise in public involvement. This leaves us to conclude that the outcome is predetermined and that the inevitable result will lead to airport expansion regardless of the impacts on safety, the environment and surrounding infrastructure.

Another key problem is that the Department of Aviation has omitted two key state agencies as PAC members: Department of Agriculture and Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ). The Aurora State Airport is located in the heart of the Oregon's best "foundation farmland" of French Prairie, which hosts some of Oregon's foremost traded-sector ag producers, nurseries and food processors. Real-estate speculation and uncontrolled urban-level development—as are occurring at the Aurora State Airport area—are harmful to this prime ag-sector economic cluster. By excluding the Department of Agriculture from the public process, the Department of Aviation continues a trend of excluding parties that may provide valuable information or may question the Aviation agency's objectives.

We read in the media that the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) indicates that 750 Oregon sites could expose residents to 'forever chemicals' of per- and poly-fluorinated substances or PFAS, where growing evidence points to their adverse health effects, including some cancers. In Oregon, the state Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) is testing locations including the Aurora State Airport for known or suspected PFAS use. Again, the Department of Aviation's exclusion of DEQ demonstrates an on-going pattern of discriminatory conduct.

We understand that the Governor's Office Executive Order 20-04 on Climate Action "Directing State Agencies to Take Actions to Reduce and Regulate Greenhouse Gas Emissions" (GHG)

directs DEQ to develop strategies that "Cap and Reduce Greenhouse Gas Emissions." We are concerned that representatives of the Governor's Office appointed to the Oregon Aviation Board and Department of Aviation staff simultaneously are advocating for major expansion of the Aurora State Airport that results in substantial increases in aviation-gas fossil-fuel consumption and GHG emissions, contrary to the Executive Order on Climate Action.

One of the major reasons stated by aviation interests for Aurora State Airport runway extension is to increase the sale of aviation fuel so that a larger class of aircraft may takeoff from the airport with full tanks of gas. We note that the tax on aviation fuel is the primary source of operational revenue for the Department of Aviation. Thus, the Department of Aviation has a direct pecuniary interest in advocating for increased aviation-gas fuel sales that would accompany expansion of the Aurora State Airport, seemingly in direct conflict with the Governor's Executive Order on Climate Action.

Additionally, DEQ data appears to indicate that the NMPDES (National Pollution Discharge Elimination System) permit for the Department of Aviation's Aurora State Airport discharge into Mill Creek-Pudding River watershed expired June 30, 2017. We understand that area residents have expressed concerns for surface-water, ground-water and well-water quality due to prospective airport run-off pollutants, unregulated septic systems and potential ground water pollution. Cumulatively, these all appear to be good reasons from the Department of Aviation's perspective to exclude DEQ from Airport planning efforts.

The Department of Aviation's tightly controlled master planning process fails to meet the test for meaningful public engagement. The Zoom meeting format used by the Department of Aviation does not list or show all participants in the meeting and provide clear labeling of names and affiliations. It is unclear to the public who is attending the meetings and who or what entity that participants represent. At the November 16, 2021, PAC meeting, it was difficult to ascertain from many of the name labels who was attending in what role. Names and affiliations of all PAC members and staff/consultants should be clearly evident.

Additionally, some PAC members were allowed to have two representatives participate in the meeting, while some PAC members were ignored and not allowed to participate in the meeting. These elements indicate a failure of meaningful public process.

The facilitators for the PAC meeting used a series of unscientific "polls" to gauge participants' thoughts or perspectives; however, it was unclear who was participating — was it PAC members, Aviation staff and consultants, and/or the public? Moreover, the facilitators interpreted the results of the poll that may or may not be an accurate reflection of the participants involved.

The Department of Aviation states that "As the airport sponsor, ODA staff will be the final decision-making authority. They will decide what is included in the Master Plan." Setting aside the fact that this pronouncement at the start of a "public involvement" process sends a message that is contrary to Oregon's Statewide Planning Goal Number 1, we believe this is false

information; only the appointed body *(i.e.,* the Oregon Aviation Board) can legally approve a master plan. The failure of the Aviation Board to adopt the 2011 or 2012 Aurora State Airport Master Plan was a centerpiece for the Oregon Supreme Court's affirmation of the Court of Appeal's decision against the Department of Aviation for failure to comply with Oregon law.

During the November 16, 2021, PAC meeting, aviation consultants indicated that they would consider nearby external "outside the fence" proposed urban-level developments in the Airport master-planning process — implying that such proposed developments would favor Airport expansion. However, the consultants gave no indication of reviewing such information in light of Oregon's EFU land-use laws, nor the potential reality of such proposed developments ever actually occurring. Additionally, consultants gave no indication of considering the "negative" aspects of proposed developments outside the Airport, such as increased surface-transportation impacts/traffic congestion and potential mitigation, increased land-speculation harming the ag industry, and increased pollution and environmental impacts.

The Department of Aviation has allowed and promoted the dissemination of false information about the seismic resilience of the Aurora State Airport. At the October 6, 2021, Oregon Aviation Board planning session and at the November 16, 2021, PAC meeting, misinformation about the seismic conditions of the Aurora State Airport area was provided without rebuttal. At the October meeting, the Aviation Board had considerable discussion on resilience, and the importance of selling the resilience concept to the public and government officials as a component of building support for state and federal funds for the Aurora State Airport expansion. Aviation Board Chair Meeker indicated a desire to improve "lines of communication" between the Governor's Office and airport businesses to promote resilience.

Contrary to statements that depict the Aurora State Airport as a crucial facility for the projected 9.0 Cascadia Subduction Zone Earthquake, the Aurora State Airport is listed at the lowest-level of Tier 3 airports in the Oregon Resilience Plan. The Tier designations "indicate the priorities for making future investments." In other words, the Department of Aviation is effectively targeting one of the lowest priority airports to prepare for recovery in the Oregon Resilience Plan for potentially one the largest airport capital improvement projects ever planned by the state.

With respect to the airport's ability to withstand a Cascadia Subduction Zone Earthquake, reports by the Oregon Department of Geology and Mineral Industries (DOGAMI) show that the Aurora State Airport is located in an area subject to major potential damage in a projected 9.0 Cascadia Subduction Zone Earthquake. The "Mid/Southern Willamette Valley Geologic Hazards, Earthquake and Landslide Hazard Maps, and Future Earthquake Damage Estimates," DOGAMI publication IMS-24, shows that the Aurora State Airport specifically is located in an area:

- Rated High for Ground Shake Amplification
- Rated High for Amplification Susceptibility
- Rated Moderate to High for Liquefaction Susceptibility

The same deep, fine soils that make the French Prairie area such exemplary foundation farmland also mean these soils are subject to amplification and liquefaction. As a result of such an earthquake, the airport runway would likely be unserviceable for a long period of time (6-12 months) post-earthquake. Rather than allow aircraft to take off or land due to an inoperable runway, the most likely role of the Aurora State Airport will be to accommodate vertical take-off and landing of heavy-lift helicopters with locally-based Columbia Helicopters and Helicopter Transport Services, neither of which require a runway extension to operate.

In all of our years of government service, we have never seen a state agency act with such disregard to the concerns of the local communities, and appropriate and fair public process. We request your intervention now to provide for an unbiased process that produces trust-worthy results. We believe that if the Department of Aviation were to comply with—rather than seek to evade—the letter and spirit of Oregon's land-use and public-process laws, judicial intervention to set a course correction would not be a necessary remedy that must be pursued by local governments and concerned citizens.

Again, we appreciate your time and consideration of these important issues, and we look forward to your response. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Brian Asher, Mayor
City of Aurora

Julie Fitzgerald, Mayor
City of Wilsonville

Enc:

- Letter from Cities of Aurora and Wilsonville to Sen. Lee Beyer and Rep. Susan McLain, Co-Chairs Joint Committee on Transportation, RE Request for Public Hearing on HB 2497 – Proposed Legislation to Create Transparent Public Process for State Aviation Department Agency Communications and Coordination with Local Governments and Communities on Aurora State Airport Issues of Concern, March 11, 2021
- Aurora State Airport in Relation to The Oregon Resilience Plan and DOGAMI Earthquake Susceptibility Maps – 2019

cc: Oregon Aviation Board
Senator Ron Wyden
Senator Jeff Merkley
Congressman Kurt Schrader
Congresswoman Suzanne Bonamici
House Speaker Tina Kotek
Senate President Peter Courtney
Representative Susan McLain (HD 29)
Representative Courtney Neron (HD 26)
Representative Christine Drazan (HD 39)
Senator Bill Kennemer (SD 20)
Metro Council President Lynn Peterson
Metro Councilor Garrett Rosenthal
Clackamas County Board of County Commissioners
Marion County Board of County Commissioners
FAA Mountain Region staff
Heather Fernuik, Director
Chris Schaffer, Planning & Programming Manager
Warren Ferrell (Acting) Manager, Seattle Airports District Office

March 11, 2021

Senator Lee Beyer, Co-Chair — *Sen.LeeBeyer@oregonlegislature.gov*
Representative Susan McLain, Co-Chair — *Rep.SusanMcLain@oregonlegislature.gov*
Joint Committee on Transportation — *patrick.h.brennan@oregonlegislature.gov*
Oregon Legislative Assembly

RE: Request for Public Hearing on HB 2497 – Proposed Legislation to Create Transparent Public Process for State Aviation Department Agency Communications and Coordination with Local Governments and Communities on Aurora State Airport Issues of Concern

Dear Co-Chairs Beyer and McLain and Members of the Committee:

We are writing to you as the elected leaders of two cities each located near the Aurora State Airport to request your support this legislative session in resolving a decade's-long controversy between the Oregon Department of Aviation (ODA) and our communities regarding the agency's uncooperative attitude with respect to the Aurora State Airport Master Plan and management of the airport.

At the request of the Aurora and Wilsonville City Councils, Representative Courtney Neron (HD-26) has introduced HB 2497 as a "process bill" that does not dictate predetermined results. Rather, the proposed legislation creates an open transparent, public process to establish formal channels of intergovernmental communication and coordination between the state Aviation agency and directly impacted local governments, which has been sorely lacking over the past 10 years.

We believe that ODA circumvented Oregon public-process laws regarding the purported adoption of the *2012 Aurora State Airport Master Plan.* Ever since we began disputing what we view as an illegal process, the state agency has been virtually unresponsive to our local communities. We are alarmed about the agency's efforts to promote increasingly urbanized levels of activity in unincorporated county territory of high-value EFU farmland without inviting meaningful public input and without supporting public infrastructure — all contrary to Oregon Goals for citizen-involvement and land-use planning. The PSU Oregon Solutions' *Aurora State Airport Assessment Report* commissioned by the legislature in 2018 found a host of agency management troubles, improper influence and poor public engagement and communications problems regarding ODA's operations and planning at the Aurora State Airport.

HB 2497 also provides for updating the controversial *2012 Aurora State Airport Master Plan* that has been the subject of significant community concern and litigation, conducting a much-needed environmental assessment of current airport pollution levels, and planning for eventual annexation of the airport by the City of Aurora to provide municipal governance and urban services.

We respectfully request that the Joint Committee on Transportation provide a public-hearing opportunity for HB 2497 as a way to prepare a roadmap forward for resolving the 10-year-long Aurora State Airport conflict between the state agency and local communities. To date, *the only open public forum* on ODA's efforts to expand the Aurora State Airport was held by the Wilsonville City Council in November 2018 that drew 200 attendees.

Sincerely,

Brian Asher, Mayor
Mayor@ci.aurora.or.us

Julie Fitzgerald, Mayor
Mayor@ci.wilsonville.or.us

cc: Senate President Peter Courtney; House Speaker Tina Kotek; Gina Zejdlik, Governor's Chief of Staff

Aurora State Airport in Relation to The Oregon Resilience Plan and DOGAMI Earthquake Susceptibility Maps - 2019

The Oregon Resilience Plan

Reducing Risk and Improving Recovery for the Next Cascadia Earthquake and Tsunami

Report to the
77th Legislative Assembly

from
Oregon Seismic Safety Policy
Advisory Commission (OSSPAC)





Salem, Oregon
February 2013

Air Transportation

The state of Oregon has an extensive aviation system that provides valuable transportation options for the public, ranging from small airports in remote regions of the state to large commercial service airports. Ninety-seven public-use airports provide support to the economic health and vitality of Oregon and contribute to the quality of life for its citizens and visitors.

- Fifty-seven public-use airports are partially supported by FAA and included in the National Plan of Integrated Airport System (NPIAS).
- Sixteen public-use airports are either owned by other municipalities or are privately owned.
- Over 400 private airports and landing strips are located within Oregon.

The 2007 Oregon Aviation Plan established five categories of airports, based on the definitions outlined within the National Plan of Integrated Airports System (NPIAS), the design criteria outlined by the Airport Reference Code (ARC), and the facilities inventory.

CATEGORY I: COMMERCIAL SERVICE AIRPORTS
These airports support some level of scheduled commercial airline service in addition to a full range of general aviation aircraft. This includes both domestic and international destinations.

CATEGORY II: URBAN GENERAL AVIATION AIRPORTS
These airports support all general aviation aircraft and accommodate corporate aviation activity including business jets, helicopters, and other general aviation activity. The primary users are business related and service a large geographic region, or they experience high levels of general aviation activity.

CATEGORY III: REGIONAL GENERAL AVIATION AIRPORTS
These airports support most twin and single engine aircraft, may accommodate occasional business jets, and support regional transportation needs.

CATEGORY IV: LOCAL GENERAL AVIATION AIRPORTS
These airports primarily support single engine, general aviation aircraft, but are capable of accommodating smaller twin-engine general aviation aircraft. They also support local air transportation needs and special use aviation activities.

CATEGORY V: REMOTE ACCESS AND EMERGENCY SERVICE AIRPORTS
These airports primarily support single-engine, general aviation aircraft, special use aviation activities, and access to remote areas; or they provide emergency service access.

The following list identifies airports within each category that have the potential to maintain or quickly restore operational functions after a major earthquake. The Transportation Task Group arranged these 29 airports into a tier system to indicate the priorities for making future investments. Tier 1 (T1) is comprised of the essential airports that will allow access to major population centers and areas

considered vital for both rescue operations and economic restoration. Tier 2 (T2) is a larger network of airports that provide access to most rural areas and will be needed to restore major commercial operations. Tier 3 (T3) airports will provide economic and commercial restoration to the entire region after a Cascadia subduction zone event.

Category I	Category II	Category III	Category IV	Category V
*Redmond (T1)	Scappoose (T2)	Tillamook (T2)	Mulino State (T3)	Independence State (T3)
PDX (T1)	Troutdale (T3)	Roseburg (T1)	Albany (T3)	Siletz Bay State (T2)
Salem (T1)	Hillsboro (T2)	Bandon State (T2)	Lebanon (T3)	Cape Blanco State (T2)
Eugene (T1)	Portland Heliport (T3)	Grants Pass (T3)	Florence (T3)	
Rogue Valley Medford (T1)	Aurora State (T3)		Creswell (T3)	
Klamath Falls (T1)	McMinnville (T3)		Cottage Grove State (T3)	
	Newport (T2)		Myrtle Creek (T3)	
	Corvallis (T3)		Brookings (T2)	

*Primary emergency response airport for FEMA Region X: Redmond municipal airport, centrally located in central Oregon, is ideally situated to be the primary FEMA emergency response airport.

Figure 5.16: Oregon Airports (Source: Oregon Department of Aviation)

The Portland International Airport (PDX) is one of Oregon's vital transportation network links. As the state's major airport, PDX will play a key role in re-establishing our economy by facilitating the movement of people, goods, and services after a major statewide emergency event. Other airports in Oregon will also play a vital role during the post-disaster emergency response and initial recovery phase. During the emergency response, for example, displaced residents, injured people, and the elderly may need to be evacuated by means of airports; and airports will also provide a staging area for needed supplies (such as water, food, medical supplies, and materials for temporary housing). Until highway and rail transportation can be fully restored, air transportation, along with ships off the coast, will be the lifelines for Oregon's citizens.

Oregon Transportation Resiliency Status


***Key to the Table**

TARGETS TO ACHIEVE DIFFERENT LEVELS OF RECOVERY:	
Minimal: (A minimum level of service is restored, primarily for the use of emergency responders, repair crews, and vehicles transporting food and other critical supplies.)	R
Functional: (Although service is not yet restored to full capacity, it is sufficient to get the economy moving again—e.g. some truck/freight traffic can be accommodated. There may be fewer lanes in use, some weight restrictions, and lower speed limits.)	Y
Operational: (Restoration is up to 90% of capacity: A full level of service has been restored and is sufficient to allow people to commute to school and to work.)	G
ESTIMATED TIME FOR RECOVERY TO 60% OPERATIONAL GIVEN CURRENT CONDITIONS:	S
ESTIMATED TIME FOR RECOVERY TO 90% OPERATIONAL GIVEN CURRENT CONDITIONS:	X

Comparison of Target States and Estimated Time for Recovery

Infrastructure Facilities	*Event Occurs*	*0 – 24 hours*	*1 – 3 days*	*3 – 7 days*	*1 – 4 weeks*	*1 – 3 months*	*3 – 6 months*	*6 – 12 months*	*1 – 3 years*	*3+ years*
Central Oregon Zone										
▶OREGON STATE HIGHWAY SYSTEM										
State Highway System - Tier 1 SLR [1)]			R	Y	G			S	X	
Roadways			R	Y	G/S		X			
Bridges			R	Y	G		S	X		
Landslides			R	Y	G			S	X	
State Highway System - Tier 2 SLR			R		Y	G			S	X
Roadways			R		Y	G/S		X		
Bridges			R		Y	G		S	X	
Landslides			R		Y	G			S	X
State Highway System - Tier 3 SLR				R		Y	G		S	X
Roadways				R		Y	G/S		X	
Bridges				R		Y	G		S	X
Landslides				R		Y	G		S	X
State Highway System - Other Routes					R		Y	G	S	X
Roadways					R		Y	G	X	
Bridges					R		Y	G	S	X
Landslides					R		Y	G	S	X
▶AIRPORTS & AIR TRANSPORTATION										
Tier I - Oregon Airports System										
Redmond Municipal Roberts Field Airport - FEMA		R	S		Y	G	X			
Klamath Falls Airport		R	S		Y	G	X			
FAA Facility			R	Y	G					
▶OREGON RAIL TRANSPORTATION										
UPRR										
CA/OR State Line to Bieber Line Jct. (Klamath Falls)			Y	G	S	X				

Infrastructure Facilities	*Event Occurs*	*0 – 24 hours*	*1 – 3 days*	*3 – 7 days*	*1 – 4 weeks*	*1 – 3 months*	*3 – 6 months*	*6 – 12 months*	*1 – 3 years*	*3+ years*
Bieber Ln Jct. (Klamath Falls) to Chemult (Shared			Y	G	S	X				
Chemult to Eugene					Y	G	S	X		
BNSF										
CA/OR State Line to Bieber Line Jct. (Klamath Falls)		G	S	X						
Chemult to Redmond		G	S	X						
Redmond to O.T. Jct. (connection with UP at Columbia			Y	G	S	X				
▶**OREGON PUBLIC TRANSIT**										
Admin & Maintenance Facilities [2)]						R	Y	G	S	X
Local Area Paratransit On-Demand Service (critical				R	Y	S	G	X		
Local Area Paratransit On-Demand Service (full						R	Y	G	S	X
Local Roadway Fixed Route Service (emergency				R	Y	S	G	X		
Local Roadway Fixed Route Service (regular						R	Y	G	S	X
Intercity & Commuter Bus [4)]						R	Y	G	S	X
Willamette Valley Zone										
▶**OREGON STATE HIGHWAY SYSTEM**										
State Highway System - Tier 1 SLR [1)]			R	Y	G			S	X	
Roadways			R	Y	G		S	X		
Bridges			R	Y	G			S	X	
Landslides			R	Y	G			S	X	
State Highway System - Tier 2 SLR			R		Y	G			S	X
Roadways			R		Y	G	S	X		
Bridges			R		Y	G			S	X
Landslides			R		Y	G			S	X
State Highway System - Tier 3 SLR				R		Y	G		S	X
Roadways				R		Y	G	S	X	
Bridges				R		Y	G		S	X
Landslides				R		Y	G		S	X
State Highway System - Other Routes					R		Y	G	S	X
Roadways					R		Y	G	S	X
Bridges					R		Y	G	S	X
Landslides					R		Y	G	S	X
▶**AIRPORTS & AIR TRANSPORTATION** [5)]										
Tier I - Oregon Airports System										
Portland International Airport (PDX) (Tier 1)		R			Y	S		G	X	
Salem McNary Field		R			Y	S		G	X	
Eugene Mahlon Sweet Filed		R			Y	S		G	X	
Rogue Valley International Medford		R			Y	S		G	X	
Roseburg Regional Airport		R			Y	S		G	X	
Tier III Oregon General Aviation Airport System										
Troutdale			R		S	Y		G		X
Portland Heliport			R		S	Y		G		X
Aurora State			R		S	Y		G		X
McMinnville Municipal			R		S	Y		G		X
Corvallis			R		S	Y		G		X



The City of Wilsonville, Oregon

Clackamas and Washington Counties

Liquefaction Susceptibility

0 1 2 3 4 5

Lower → Higher

County Boundary

City Limits

Summary: This map shows liquefaccction susceptibility for Oregon calculated following the methods of FEMA's 2011 HAZUS-MH MR4 technical manual. The map was prepared in support of a series of ground motion and ground failure maps for a scenario Magnitude 9.0 Cascadia Subduction Earthquake developed by the Oregon Department of Geology aand Mineral Industries. The scenario maps were prepared for the Oregon Sesimic Safety Policy Advisory Commission for its use in preparing a report to the 77th Oregon Legislative Assembly entitled " The Oregon Resilience Plan; Reducing Risk and Improving Recovery for the Next Cascadia Earthquake and Tsunami".

WILSONVILLE OREGON

M:\projects\2018\100918_Liq\Liq.mxd

Aurora State Airport Area Earthquake Liquefaction Susceptibility

0 Miles 0.5

APPENDIX E:
MARION COUNTY

CRUSTAL EARTHQUAKE SCENARIO
- Scenario Details
- Ground Motion Map

SUBDUCTION ZONE EARTHQUAKE SCENARIO
- Scenario Details
- Ground Motion Map

GEOLOGIC HAZARD MAPS
- Relative Ground-Shaking Amplification Susceptibility Map
- Relative Liquefaction Hazard Susceptibility Map
- Relative Earthquake-induced Landslide Susceptibility Map
- Identified Landslide Areas Map

HAZUS-MH GLOBAL REPORT FOR CRUSTAL SCENARIO
HAZUS-MH GLOBAL REPORT FOR SUBDUCTION ZONE SCENARIO

CRUSTAL EARTHQUAKE SCENARIO DETAILS FOR MARION COUNTY

Crustal Earthquake Scenario: A magnitude 6.9 earthquake on the Mount Angel Fault.

For the magnitude 6.9 earthquake on the Mount Angel Fault scenario, we defined the fault source using the "deterministic seismic source" option within HAZUS-MH (Figure E1) (FEMA, 2003b). The fault and earthquake event were chosen by examination of USGS (2004) data and data in the Geomatrix Consultants, Inc. (1995) *Seismic Design Mapping, State of Oregon* report prepared for the Oregon Department of Transportation. In general, a likely worst-case scenario was selected. Figure E1 has the location of the fault, shown as the dark line, and the census tracts within Marion County. Figure E2 displays the peak ground acceleration (PGA) for the crustal scenario.

Scenario Name	Mount Angel M6.9
Type of Earthquake	Source
Fault Name	Mount Angel Fault
Historical Epicenter ID #	67
Probabilistic Return Period	NA
Longitude of Epicenter	–122.83
Latitude of Epicenter	45.05
Earthquake Magnitude	6.90
Depth (km)	0.00
Rupture Length (km)	30.69
Rupture Orientation (degrees)	0.00
Attenuation Function	Project 2000 West - Non Extensional

Crustal Earthquake Scenario Ground Motion Map




Figure E2. Peak ground acceleration (PGA) by census tracts map for the crustal earthquake scenario, Marion County, Oregon (FEMA, 2003b)

GEOLOGIC HAZARD MAPS

Relative Ground-Shaking Amplification Susceptibility Map




Figure E5. Relative ground-shaking amplification susceptibility map for Marion County, Oregon.

STATE OF OREGON
DEPARTMENT OF GEOLOGY AND MINERAL INDUSTRIES
ARVID KRAUSKOPF, STATE GEOLOGIST

Canby-Barlow-Aurora Urban Area

Relative Earthquake Hazard Maps
for Selected Urban Areas in Western Oregon

By Ian P. Madin and Zhenming Wang

CANBY-BARLOW-AURORA

Relative Amplification Hazard Map

Hazard zones are based on the degree to which ground shaking from a given earthquake is likely to be amplified

- Highest amplification hazard (UBC soil type E)
- Medium amplification hazard (UBC soil type D)
- Low amplification hazard (UBC soil type C)
- No amplification hazard (UBC soil type B)

See the accompanying text for an explanation of how these zones were defined and what the various levels of hazard mean.

IMPORTANT NOTICE

This map depicts only amplification hazard zones that are based on limited geological and geophysical data as described in the accompanying report. At any given site in the map area, the maps for other types of hazards may show different hazard levels and need to be taken into consideration along with this map. This map cannot replace site-specific investigations. Some appropriate uses are discussed in the accompanying report.

Aurora State Airport

This map was produced by the Oregon Department of Geology and Mineral Industries with funding by the State of Oregon and the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS), Department of the Interior, under USGS award #1434-97-GR-03118.

The views and conclusions contained in this document are those of the authors and should not be interpreted as necessarily representing the official policies, either expressed or implied, of the U.S. Government

STATE OF OREGON
DEPARTMENT OF GEOLOGY AND MINERAL INDUSTRIES
JOHN D. BEAULIEU, STATE GEOLOGIST

Canby-Barlow-Aurora Urban Area

Relative Earthquake Hazard Maps
for Selected Urban Areas in Western Oregon

By Ian P. Madin and Zhenming Wang

CANBY-BARLOW-AURORA

Relative Earthquake Hazard Map

Hazard zones are based on the combined effects of ground shaking amplification, liquefaction, and earthquake-induced landsliding.

- Zone A – Highest hazard
- Zone B – Intermediate to high hazard
- Zone C – Low to intermediate hazard
- Zone D – Lowest hazard

See the accompanying text for an explanation of how these zones were defined and what the various levels of hazard mean.

IMPORTANT NOTICE

This map depicts earthquake hazard zones that are the result of combining the maps of individual hazards and are based on limited geologic and geophysical data. These hazards and data are described in the accompanying report. At any given site in the map area, site-specific data could give results that differ from those shown on this map. This map cannot replace site-specific investigations. Some appropriate uses are discussed in the accompanying report.

This map shows areas that are relatively more or less hazardous due to local geological conditions within a community. For a complete understanding of the earthquake hazard, see also GMS-100, Earthquake Hazard Maps for Oregon.

0 0.5 1 Mile

Aurora State Airport

This map was produced by the Oregon Department of Geology and Mineral Industries with funding by the State of Oregon and the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS), Department of the Interior, under USGS award #1434-97-GR03119.

The views and conclusions contained in this document are those of the authors and should not be interpreted as necessarily representing the official policies, either expressed or implied, of the U.S. Government.

STATE OF OREGON
DEPARTMENT OF GEOLOGY AND MINERAL INDUSTRIES
JOHN D. BEAULIEU, STATE GEOLOGIST

Canby-Barlow-Aurora Urban Area

Relative Earthquake Hazard Maps
for Selected Urban Areas in Western Oregon

By Ian P. Madin and Zhenming Wang

CANBY-BARLOW-AURORA

Relative Hazard Map of Earthquake-Induced Landslides

Hazard zones are based on the possibility that a given earthquake will trigger landslides.

- High landslide hazard
- Medium landslide hazard
- Low landslide hazard

See the accompanying text for an explanation of how these zones were defined and what the various levels of hazard mean.

IMPORTANT NOTICE

This map depicts only landslide hazard zones that are based on limited geologic and geophysical data as described in the accompanying report. At any given site in the map area, the maps for other types of hazards may show different hazard levels and need to be taken into consideration along with this map. This map cannot replace site-specific investigations. Some appropriate uses are discussed in the accompanying report.

0 0.5 1 Mile

Aurora State Airport

This map was produced by the Oregon Department of Geology and Mineral Industries with funding by the State of Oregon and the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS), Department of the Interior, under USGS award #1434-97-GR-03118.

The views and conclusions contained in this document are those of the authors and should not be interpreted as necessarily representing the official policies, either expressed or implied, of the U.S. Government.

STATE OF OREGON
DEPARTMENT OF GEOLOGY AND MINERAL INDUSTRIES
JOHN D. BEAULIEU, STATE GEOLOGIST

Canby-Barlow-Aurora Urban Area

IMS-8

Relative Earthquake Hazard Maps for Selected Urban Areas in Western Oregon

By Ian P. Madin and Zhenming Wang

CANBY-BARLOW-AURORA

Relative Liquefaction Hazard Map

Hazard zones are based on the likelihood that liquefaction will occur in a given earthquake.

- Highest liquefaction hazard
- Medium liquefaction hazard
- Low liquefaction hazard
- No liquefaction hazard

See the accompanying text for an explanation of how these zones were defined and what the various levels of hazard mean.

IMPORTANT NOTICE

This map depicts only liquefaction hazard zones that are based on limited geologic and geophysical data as described in the accompanying report. At any given site in the map area, the maps for other types of hazards may show different hazard levels and need to be taken into consideration along with this map. This map cannot replace site-specific investigations. Some appropriate uses are discussed in the accompanying report.

0 0.5 1 Mile

Aurora State Airport

This map was produced by the Oregon Department of Geology and Mineral Industries with funding by the State of Oregon and the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS), Department of the Interior, under USGS award #1434-97-GR-03118.

The views and conclusions contained in this document are those of the authors and should not be interpreted as necessarily representing the official policies, either expressed or implied, of the U.S. Government.


Aurora State Airport
Airport Master Plan



Planning Advisory Committee Meeting #2
Online Meeting
March 1st, 2022
3:00pm-5:00pm

Virtual Meeting Tips

- You will be muted during the presentation
- Raise your hand virtually (reaction button) or physically
  - Press *9 to raise your hand over the phone
- Keep your video on, if possible
- The PAC can chat with:
  - “panelists” for all PAC members
- Public attendees can submit comments via the website comment form



Meeting Process & Agenda

Time	Topic
3:00-3:10	Introductions
3:10-3:50	Existing Conditions and Aviation Activity Forecasts
3:50-4:50	PAC Comments
4:50-5:00	Public Comments https://publicproject.net/AuroraAirport

Introductions

Oregon Department of Aviation (ODAV)

Betty Stansbury

Director

Heather Peck

Planning & Project Manager

Tony Beach

Deputy Director, State Airports Manager

Sarah Lucas

Aviation Planner / AMP Project Contact

John Wilson

Operations Specialist

Seth Thompson

Aviation Planner, State Aviation and Land Use Coordination

Project Team

Agency Oversight & Funding

Airport Owner (Sponsor)

Planning & Engineering

Public Involvement

Cultural Resources

Archaeological Investigations Northwest, Inc.

Environmental Review

AGIS Survey

PAC Members

- Airport Users/Businesses/Organizations
- Airport Neighbors
- Local Municipalities
- Tribal Organizations
- State Agencies
- Local and Regional Non-Profit Groups
- Environmental / Land Use Groups

Organization	Name	Alternate
1000 Friends of Oregon	Roger Kaye	
AABC/TLM Holdings	Ted Millar	
Atlantic Aviation (formerly Lynx Aviation)	Bob Hala	
Aurora Air Traffic Control	Raul Suarez	
Aurora Airport Improvement Association	Bruce Bennett	
Aurora Butteville Barlow Community Planning Organization	Ken Ivey	
Aurora CTE, Inc	Bill Graupp	
Charbonneau Country Club	Steven P. Switzer	
City of Aurora	Brian Asher	
City of Canby	Scott Archer	
City of Wilsonville	Charlotte Lehan	Chris Neamtzu
Clackamas County	Commissioner Tootie Smith	
Columbia Helicopters	Rob Roedts	Bob Buchanan
Confederated Tribes of Siltez Indians	Robert Kentta	
Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde Community of Oregon	Cheryl Pouley	
Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon	Christian Nauer	
Deer Creek Estates HOA	Matt Williams	
Friends of French Prairie	Ben Williams	Wayne Richards
Helicopter Transport Service	Robert Fournier	
Life Flight Network	Ben Clayton	
Marion County	Commissioner Danielle Bethell	
Marion County Planning Department	Austin Barnes	Brandon Reich
Oregon Dept of Aviation	Tony Beach	
Oregon Dept of Aviation Board	Cathryn Stephens	
Oregon Dept of Land Conservation and Development	Matt Crall	Nicole Mardell
Oregon Dept of Transportation	Naomi Zwerdling	
Oregon Farm Bureau	Mary Anne Cooper	
Oregon Office of Emergency Management	Bill Martin	Sarah Puls
Positive Aurora Airport Management	Tony Helbling	
Regional Solutions	Jody Christensen	
Vans Aircraft	Rian Johnson	Greg Hughes
Willamette Aviation	David Waggoner	
Wilsonville Chamber of Commerce	Patrick Donaldson	Kevin O'Malley


Existing Conditions

Airport Master Plan Funding

The Airport Master Plan is 100% funded through an FAA Airport Improvement Program (AIP) grant with no local match requirement.



Airport Location and Vicinity



Aurora State Airport is located about 1 mile northwest of the City of Aurora, in northern Marion County.

Five counties converge near the I-5 corridor, in the vicinity of the Airport.

Nearby incorporated cities include Aurora, Wilsonville, and Barlow.

Socio-Economic Data

Population and economic activity in Aurora State Airport's service area has steadily increased over the last ten years, often outpacing Oregon's statewide growth.


Several areas that experienced downturns related to the COVID pandemic are rebounding.

Marion and Clackamas County economic growth has averaged about 8% annually over the last ten years.

Local forecasts of population and economic activity project continued growth.

Area Airports

Twelve airports, including Aurora State Airport, generate the majority of aircraft flight activity within the Portland Metro area and upper Willamette Valley.



Source: AirportIQ 5010, Esri, USGS, NOAA

Note: FAA 5010 data for each airport depicted for reference only. 5010 data not independently verified.

Baseline Aviation Activity Summary

Task: Develop baseline activity data to support new twenty-year aviation activity forecasts.

2021 data is used as the base for the airport master plan forecasts

(2021-2041)

Baseline Aviation Activity Summary

Based Aircraft

ODAV updated the Airport's based aircraft count through a process of aircraft verification in December 2021.

The updated count was 281 aircraft.

The FAA National Based Aircraft Inventory for the Airport was updated in January 2022.

FAA accepted the validated count for use in the airport master plan forecast.

Baseline: 281 aircraft

Aurora State Airport – Based Aircraft
January 2022 Validated Count (281 Aircraft)

ODAV also updated its based aircraft storage data for on-airport and through-the-fence (TTF) aircraft for the current count.

Aircraft Type	On-Airport	Off-Airport (TTF)	Total
Single Engine	45	175	220
Multi Engine	1	14	15
Jet	3	33	36
Helicopter	1	9	10
Total	**50**	**231**	**281**

Source: National Based Aircraft Inventory – January 2022

Baseline Aviation Activity Summary

Aircraft Operations

Air Traffic Control Tower (ATCT) aircraft takeoff and landing counts are available beginning in fall 2015.



Six years of historical ATCT data was analyzed.

The Aurora ATCT is open 13 hours per day.

Ten years of instrument flight plan data for the Airport was analyzed.

Baseline Aviation Activity Summary

Aircraft Operations

ATCT data was adjusted to account for aircraft activity when the tower is closed and to remove activity associated with two private heliports.

Baseline: 76,028 Aircraft Operations


Aircraft Operations (Historical)


Annual Aircraft Operations Historical ATCT Data (Adjusted)	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Itinerant						
Air Taxi	2,194	2,319	2,121	1,670	1,129	2,006
General Aviation	32,174	33,502	35,665	33,638	31,621	36,390
Military	265	199	277	107	38	79
Subtotal	**34,633**	**36,020**	**38,063**	**35,415**	**32,788**	**38,475**
Local						
General Aviation	16,191	25,075	28,011	30,453	36,333	37,488
Military	139	129	245	34	19	65
Subtotal	**16,330**	**25,204**	**28,256**	**30,487**	**36,352**	**37,553**
Total	**50,963**	**61,223**	**66,320**	**65,902**	**69,140**	**76,028**

Land Use Summary

The Airport and its adjacent through-the-fence (TTF) development are located in unincorporated Marion County. All land use actions related to facility development require Marion County approval.


The Airport and adjacent TTF aeronautical development is zoned **Public (P)** by Marion County.






Airport Land Use & Zoning

Marion County Zoning[1]		Clackamas County and City of Wilsonville Zoning[2]			City of Aurora Zoning[3]	FAR Part 77 Overlay[4]
AR	ID-LU	CN	PF	SFR3	C	Primary Surface
C	P	EFU	RI	SFR5	FH	Appproach Surface
EFU	P-LU	FUD	RRFU	SFR7	I	Transitional Surface
I	RS	IC	SFR10		R1	Horizontal Surface
ID	UT-20	MFR1	SFR2		R2	Conical Surface






FAR Part 77 Airspace

The Airport's FAR Part 77 airspace extends over areas of Marion and Clackamas Counties, and the Cities of Aurora, Wilsonville, and Barlow.

Each of these jurisdictions are responsible for protecting the areas of airport airspace that fall within their boundaries and most employ overlay zoning districts as a mechanism to do so.


For Aurora State Airport, the approach surfaces for the runway extend 10,000 feet beyond each runway (beginning 200 beyond the runway end).



Aurora Airport Property – ODAV Owned




Existing Conditions Overview




Pavement Condition Analysis

ODAV completed its most recent pavement evaluation in July 2018.



Note: The survey was performed using a Pavement Condition Index (PCI) methodology developed by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

General Aviation (GA) Areas & Vehicle Gate Locations



Hangars & Airport Buildings Summary

	T-Hangar Buildings	T-Hangar Buildings SF	Conventional / Multiple-Aircraft	Conventional / Multiple-Aircraft SF	Other (business, office, etc)	Other (business, office, etc) SF	Total	Total SF
Northern TTF Development Area	5	47,300	33	163,100	1	1,500	35	211,900
ODA Terminal Development Area	5	64,400	10	73,300	3	6,000	17	143,700
Southern TTF Development Area	-	-	28	623,000	2	14,500	30	637,500
Total	**10**	**111,700**	**71**	**859,400**	**6**	**22,000**	**82**	**993,100**

Source: Century West Engineering - Aerial photo based analysis

New construction at Aurora State Airport has added nearly 140,000 square feet (net increase) over the last ten years.

Hangar Inventory	
Includes On-Airport and Off-Airport (TTF) Development	
2012	833,000 SF
2021	971,100 SF
Net Change	138,100 (+17%)
CAGR	1.72%

CAGR: Compound Annual Growth Rate

Aviation Activity Forecasts

Aviation Activity Forecasts


Based Aircraft

- Baseline (2021: 281 Aircraft)
- Several existing forecasts were reviewed and compared to baseline.
- COVID-19 impacts were not anticipated in previous forecasts.
- Seven new forecast models were developed using a variety of methodologies and all models were applied to the baseline:
  - Three models were identified for further evaluation
  - Annual growth rates range from 0.2% to 1.7%
  - Range of +13 to +114 aircraft over twenty years

Based Aircraft Forecasts

	CAGR	2021	2026	2031	2036	2041
Historical Hangar Development Trend Model	1.7%	281	306	333	363	395
Federal Contract Tower (Oregon) TAF Model - Recommended Forecast	**1.1%**	**281**	**300**	**317**	**333**	**350**
National Aerospace Forecast (Weighted By UAO Fleet Mix) Model	0.2%	281	282	285	289	294

Source: Century West Engineering



Aviation Activity Forecasts

Based Aircraft

- Recommended Forecast:
  - **Federal Contract Tower (Oregon) Terminal Area Forecast (TAF) Model**
  - 20-year average annual growth rate: 1.1 percent
  - Forecast increase from 281 to 350 aircraft

This model reflects FAA TAF forecast growth for all of Oregon's GA airports with contract air traffic control towers. These airports share many operational characteristics with Aurora State Airport, which provides a reasonable projection of future activity.

Aviation Activity Forecasts

Aircraft Operations

Baseline (2021: 76,028 annual operations)

Several existing forecasts were reviewed and compared to baseline.

COVID-19 impacts were not anticipated in previous forecasts.


Ten new forecast models were developed using a variety of methodologies and applied to the baseline:

- Five models were identified for further evaluation

Aircraft Operations Forecasts

Operations Forecast Models	CAGR	2021	2026	2031	2036	2041
	CAGR	2021	2026	2031	2036	2041
Historical Tower Counts Trend	3.6%	76,028	95,039	114,646	134,254	153,862
TFMSC Historic Trend (20-Year) - Recommended Forecast	**2.3%**	**76,028**	**85,201**	**95,480**	**107,000**	**119,909**
Marion County Population Correlation	2.9%	76,028	96,244	112,162	124,981	135,506
National Aerospace Forecast Operations (w/ ATCT)	0.8%	76,028	78,939	81,966	85,114	88,388
Federal Contract Tower (Oregon) TAF	0.6%	76,028	81,924	82,972	84,046	85,151

Source: Source: Century West Engineering developed using FAA TFMSC Data



Aviation Activity Forecasts

Aircraft Operations

Recommended Forecast:

- **TFMSC Historic Trend (20-year) Model**
- The model is based on an extended trend line of documented flight activity at the Airport
- 20-year average annual growth rate: 2.3 percent
- Forecast increase from 76,028 to 119,909 annual aircraft operations

This model reflects a trend line of documented instrument flight activity at the Airport that represents the current and future design aircraft and broad mix of general aviation users.

Operations Fleet Mix

Aircraft Type	2021	2026	2031	2036	2041
Total Airport Operations	**76,028**	**85,201**	**95,480**	**107,000**	**119,909**
Single Engine*	60,823	67,650	75,143	83,674	92,929
Multi Engine Piston	760	767	764	642	600
Turbo Prop	3,041	3,578	4,297	5,029	5,995
Jet	5,322	6,390	7,638	9,095	10,792
Helicopter	6,082	6,816	7,638	8,560	9,593
Fleet Mix Percentages					
Single Engine*	80.0%	79.4%	78.7%	78.2%	77.5%
Multi Engine Piston	1.0%	0.9%	0.8%	0.6%	0.5%
Turbo Prop	4.0%	4.2%	4.5%	4.7%	5.0%
Jet	7.0%	7.5%	8.0%	8.5%	9.0%
Helicopter	8.0%	8.0%	8.0%	8.0%	8.0%

Source: Century West Engineering
*Includes LSA/Experimental Operations Fleet Mix

FAA Design Standards

The design standards for an airport are determined by the current and future **Design Aircraft;**

The Design Aircraft is defined as the most demanding aircraft or grouping of aircraft that make **regular use** of the airport; and

Regular use is 500 annual operations (takeoffs and landings), including both itinerant and local operations, but excluding touch-and-go operations.

Current and Future Design Aircraft

The existing and future design aircraft identified in the aviation activity forecasts corresponds to Airport Reference Code C-II (ARC C-II)



AIRPORT REFERENCE CODE (ARC)


Aircraft Approach Category	Aircraft Approach Speed	Airplane Design Group	Aircraft Wingspan
A	less than or equal to 91	I	less than or equal to 49′
B	92 to 121	II	50′ to 79′
C	122 to 141	III	80′ to 118′
D	142 to 166	IV	119′ to 171′



Source: Century West Engineering

Next Steps

- Review PAC comments received
- FAA review of Working Paper 1
- After reviews are complete, a preferred forecast will be confirmed.
- Prepare the Facility Goals and Requirements
- Next PAC meeting & public open house May 3rd (tentatively)



AMP schedule updated February 2022

Please visit the project website for ongoing schedule updates

Poll Questions



PAC Comments

PAC Questions and Comments

Project Website:
https://publicproject.net/AuroraAirport

Organization	Name	Alternate
1000 Friends of Oregon	Roger Kaye	
AABC/TLM Holdings	Ted Millar	
Atlantic Aviation (formerly Lynx Aviation)	Bob Hala	
Aurora Air Traffic Control	Raul Suarez	
Aurora Airport Improvement Association	Bruce Bennett	
Aurora Butteville Barlow Community Planning Organization	Ken Ivey	
Aurora CTE, Inc	Bill Graupp	
Charbonneau Country Club	Steven P. Switzer	
City of Aurora	Brian Asher	
City of Canby	Scott Archer	
City of Wilsonville	Charlotte Lehan	Chris Neamtzu
Clackamas County	Commissioner Tootie Smith	
Columbia Helicopters	Rob Roedts	Bob Buchanan
Confederated Tribes of Siltez Indians	Robert Kentta	
Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde Community of Oregon	Cheryl Pouley	
Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon	Christian Nauer	
Deer Creek Estates HOA	Matt Williams	
Friends of French Prairie	Ben Williams	Wayne Richards
Helicopter Transport Service	Robert Fournier	
Life Flight Network	Ben Clayton	
Marion County	Commissioner Danielle Bethell	
Marion County Planning Department	Austin Barnes	Brandon Reich
Oregon Dept of Aviation	Tony Beach	
Oregon Dept of Aviation Board	Cathryn Stephens	
Oregon Dept of Land Conservation and Development	Matt Crall	Nicole Mardell
Oregon Dept of Transportation	Naomi Zwerdling	
Oregon Farm Bureau	Mary Anne Cooper	
Oregon Office of Emergency Management	Bill Martin	Sarah Puls
Positive Aurora Airport Management	Tony Helbling	
Regional Solutions	Jody Christensen	
Vans Aircraft	Rian Johnson	Greg Hughes
Willamette Aviation	David Waggoner	
Wilsonville Chamber of Commerce	Patrick Donaldson	Kevin O'Malley

Public Comments

Public comments

If you would like to speak, you have 2 minutes:

- Please “raise your hand”
- Press *9 for callers



Submit your comments via the online comment form:
publicproject.net/AuroraAirport

- All comments will be responded to in the meeting summary
- Themes from comments will be shared at PAC Meeting #3





Thank You

Heather Peck – ODAV

Sarah Lucas – ODAV

Brandy Steffen – JLA Public Involvement

David Miller – Century West Engineering

Project Website: https://publicproject.net/AuroraAirport

PAC Working Session #1 – April 5, 2022

Aurora State Airport

AIRPORT MASTER PLAN PUBLIC MEETING



Planning Advisory Committee (PAC) Working Session Meeting

Tuesday, April 5, 2022
PAC Working Session from 3:00pm – 5:00pm

Due to social distancing measures and the inability to meet in person, this PAC Working Session will be held via telephone and internet through Zoom. These meetings will provide an opportunity for the PAC, community, neighbors, and other project stakeholders to learn about the Airport Master Plan project.

Airport planning work products and registration links for the virtual **PAC Working Session** at: **https://publicproject.net/AuroraAirport**

For Additional Information Contact:
Sarah Lucas, ODAV Aviation Planner
Oregon Department of Aviation
503-378-2211
sarah.lucas@odav.oregon.gov

Special accommodations are available upon request (with 48 hours notice)

AURORA STATE AIRPORT

AIRPORT MASTER PLAN - PAC WORKING SESSION

AGENDA

Date/Time: April 5, 2022 from 3:00-5:00 pm
Location: Zoom Webinar

Meeting Goals: Continue conversation about existing conditions and preliminary forecasts (Working Paper No. 1)

Time	Topic	Person	Notes
3:00-3:10 pm **(10 min)**	**Introductions**	**Brandy Steffen and Sarah Lucas**	• Staff Introductions • Brandy will introduce each PAC member to save time
3:10-3:20 pm **(10 min)**	**Quick review of materials**	**David Miller**	• Review Chapter 2 (Existing Conditions Analysis) • Review Chapter 3 (preliminary Aviation Activity Forecasts) • Themes collected during PAC meeting #2
3:20-4:40 pm **(80 min)**	**PAC Comments**	**Brandy**	**Questions (round table about 4 minutes each)** • PAC comments/questions can also be added into the chat. • All verbal and typed comments/questions will be included in the meeting summary
4:40-4:50 pm **(10 min)**	**Snapshot of survey results**	**Brandy**	**Review preliminary results; full summary being developed**
4:50-5:00 pm **(10 min)**	**Public Comments**	**Brandy**	• Anyone in attendance may have up to 2 minute to speak. • We may not be able to hear from everyone. • We always will take comments via the website, which will be included in the meeting notes and shared with the PAC members: https://publicproject.net/AuroraAirport# • A meeting summary with all PAC and public comments will be posted to the project website within two weeks.

Next PAC meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, May 3, 2022 from 3:00-5:00 pm on Zoom

AURORA STATE AIRPORT

AIRPORT MASTER PLAN
PLANNING ADVISORY COMMITTEE (PAC)
WORKING SESSION SUMMARY

Date: Tuesday, April 5, 2022
Time: 3:00-5:00 pm
Location: Zoom Webinar

In Attendance

PAC Members Present

Roger Kaye, *1000 Friends of Oregon*
Aron Faegre (for Ted Millar[1]), *AABC/TLM Holdings*
Bob Hala, *Atlantic Aviation*
Bruce Bennett, *Aurora Airport Improvement Association*
Ken Ivey, *Aurora Butteville Barlow Community Planning Organization*
Bill Graupp, *Aurora CTE, Inc*
Steve Switzer, *Charbonneau Country Club*
Brian Asher, *City of Aurora*
Councilor Charlotte Lehan, *City of Wilsonville*
Chris Neamtzu, *City of Wilsonville*
Commissioner Tootie Smith, *Clackamas County*
Bob Buchanan, Alternate, *Columbia Helicopters*
Matt Williams, *Deer Creek Estates HOA*
Ben Williams, *Friends of French Prairie*
Commissioner Danielle Bethel, *Marion County*
Matt Lawyer, Alternate, *Marion County*
Austin Barnes, *Marion County Planning Dept.*
Tony Beach, Oregon Dept of Aviation (ODAV)
Cathryn Stephens, *ODAV Board*
Naomi Zwerdling, *Oregon Dept of Transportation*
Matt Crall, *Oregon Dept of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD)*
Tony Helbling, *Positive Aurora Airport Management*
Jody Christensen, *Regional Solutions*
Rian Johnson, *Vans Aircraft*
David Waggoner, *Willamette Aviation*
Patrick Donaldson, *Wilsonville Chamber of Commerce*

PAC Members Absent

Raul Suarez, *Aurora Air Traffic Control*
Scott Archer, *City of Canby*
Cheryl Pouley, *Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde Community of Oregon*
Robert Kentta, *Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians*
Christian Nauer, *Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon*
Rob Roedts, *Columbia Helicopters*
Wayne Richards, Alternate, *Friends of the French Prairie*
Robert Fournier, *Helicopter Transport Service*
Ben Clayton, *Life Flight Network*
Brandon Reich, Alternate, *Marion County Planning Dept.*
Mary Anne Cooper, *Oregon Farm Bureau*
Bill Martin, *Oregon Office of Emergency Management*

[1] Substitutions are not generally allowed; however, this one-time substitution was granted by Oregon Department of Aviation Director.

Sarah Puls, Alternate, *Oregon Office of Emergency Management*
Greg Hughes, Alternate, *Vans Aircraft*
Kevin Ferrasci O'Malley, Alternate, *Wilsonville Chamber of Commerce*

Agency Representatives
Betty Stansbury, *ODAV*
Heather Peck, *ODAV*
Sarah Lucas, *ODAV*
Seth Thompson, *ODAV*
Cathy Clark, *ODAV*
Kate Glassey (Key), *FAA*

Staff and Consultants
Matt Rogers, *Century West*
David Miller, *Century West*
Mike Dane, *Century West*
Samantha Peterson, *Century West*
Mark Steele, *Century West*
Brandy Steffen*, JLA Public Involvement*
Jen Winslow*, JLA Public Involvement*

Audience / Members of the Public
Andria Abrahamson, ODAV
Candy Cates
Carolyn Lee
Cathy Clark, ODAV
Corey Buchanan
Dusty Hanson
Greg Leo
James Kirby
Jim Gingo
Joe Mollahan
Joseph Schaefer
Kirk Laubach
Kriss Wright
Lori Leon
Mark Ottenad1, City of Wilsonville
Mark Ottenad2, City of Wilsonville
Mark Shull
Mayor Julie Fitzgerald, City of Wilsonville
Nancy CS
Neal While
Pete Nickerson
Peter Rempp
Shawn Hempel
Tim Warren
Traci Hensley
Tom Herzog

Overview

The meeting goals were to continue the conversation about existing conditions and preliminary forecasts (Working Paper No. 1, consisting of Draft Chapters 1, 2 and 3); provide more time to talk and learn about the materials; ensure that everything from the scope was provided; and see if anything major was missing. Additional notes are in *italics*.

Welcome and Introductions

Brandy Steffen, JLA Public Involvement, welcomed everyone to the meeting and reviewed the agenda and basic Zoom meeting tips and etiquette. She reminded the group that all public comments received before April 12 and during the meeting would be added to the summary. **Sarah Lucas, Oregon Department of Aviation (ODAV),** introduced **ODAV** staff, consultant, and subconsultant team members involved with the project. She reiterated that the **Federal Aviation Administration (FAA)** was funding the project and the team was following the FAA-approved scope of work. She added that the schedule for the PAC meetings is flexible and may change. Brandy reminded the PAC of the decision-making process and that the PAC gives opinions and

expertise, which ODAV considers in their decision-making process. The FAA will review all elements of the Master Plan, with formal approval responsibilities for the aviation activity forecasts and the airport layout plan (ALP) drawing set. The FAA held off on their formal review of Working Paper No. 1 until after the April 12, 2022 deadline established by ODAV for receiving comments from the PAC and public. The review and approval process for the master plan aviation activity forecasts will coincide with review of Working Paper No. 1. ODAV and the consultant will document and formally respond to all review comments received.

Review of Existing Conditions and Preliminary Forecast


David Miller, Century West, gave a brief overview of Working Paper No. 1 focusing on Draft Chapters 2 and 3, which cover the existing conditions (including land use and zoning of the airport) and preliminary aviation activity forecasts. *The presentation is posted to the project website.*

Brandy asked if the PAC had any clarifying questions or comments about the information:

- **Bruce Bennett,** *Aurora Airport Improvement Association*: I want to make a clarification that the airport does have a fire suppression system of 600,000 gallons underground, which is independent and paid for by private property owners and ODAV. Unlike the surrounding area, the airport is completely covered by fire suppression.

Draft Chapter 2

Brandy polled the PAC members to see how they were feeling about Draft Chapter 2. Most (77%) felt good about the data presented in Draft Chapter 2 and moving on to the next step, though 23% replied that they had questions that they would email to the project team before April 12. Brandy then asked the PAC to voice their comments, questions and concerns.




- **Ben Williams**, *Friends of French Prairie:* The Land Use section in Draft Chapter 2 is minimally treated, especially when considering the Court of Appeals ruling in September 2021 against ODAV, which was almost all about land use.
    - Can you clarify what you mean by minimally treated? This is a Master Plan, and there are no land use actions.
  - **Ben Williams:** Well, it should be noted. David pointed out that the Land Use action is the responsibility of Marion County. Is that correct?
    - That is correct for specific actions. There is no land use action for a Master Plan itself.
  - **Ben Williams:** I understand that, but this Master Plan is following preceding Master Plans. Since 1976, no Master Plan has been adopted into the Marion County Master Plan. Following

the 2012 Master Planning Process, Marion County sent a letter saying they "acknowledge the Master Plan" but it was never adopted into the Marion County Comprehensive Plan. As the Court of Appeals rulings have pointed out, that is a necessary step. I think it's important that everyone understands that we have a history here of "unconcluded" land use activity.

- History is important, but this is a new Master Plan, and we are looking to move forward despite issues with the 2012 plan which was not formally adopted. This is not an update to the 2012 plan, and I want to clarify that. We can supplement the chapter to be clearer on that history as long as everyone understands how we're moving forward.

Draft Chapter 3

Brandy then polled the PAC members and attendees to see how they were feeling going about Draft Chapter 3. Most (74%) felt good about the Draft Chapter and moving forward, though 26% replied that they had questions that they would email to the project team before April 12.



Brandy opened comments for those who wanted to speak about or ask questions about Draft Chapter 3.

- **Ben Williams**, *Friends of French Prairie:* I realize this is a new Master Plan, but the previous forecast numbers were wildly optimistic and never came close to being achieved. There was never any adjustment to the process to accommodate for that. When reading the introduction and overview for draft Draft Chapter 3 of this Master Planning process, it states that the overall goal is to prepare forecasts that accurately depict current conditions and historical trends which can be translated into airport facility needs. The most recent aviation forecast approved by the FAA were developed on the 2012 Master Plan and 2019 Constrained Operations Runway Justification Study. It fails to mention that the 2012 Master Plan was found to be invalid by the Oregon Court of Appeals in 2021. While Draft Chapter 3 may be about forecasts, I submit that the Court of Appeals ruling on the validity of the Master Plan, and much of this Master Planning Process is dependent on "current conditions and historical trends." Given the 18 references to the 2012 Master plan and the 99 references to the Constrained Operations Study, it becomes clear that the validity of the data from 2012 should be taken into consideration when assessing current conditions and relevant historical trends if a reasonable projection of future activity is to be achieved. Two major trends that impact conditions are being ignored. The first is the difference in forecasting of based aircraft for 2031, when compared to the forecast for based aircraft in 2010. There are huge discrepancies in the forecasting, including total operations. The constrained study only makes one reference to this reduction of activity, and then says

that relying on traffic count improves accuracy of the overall forecast, while saying overall growth rates are reasonable. The entire forecasting process is questionable.

- **Councilor Charlotte Lehan**, *City of Wilsonville:* The Airport is currently 5,003 square feet and is strength weighted for 45,000 pounds. There has been a decade long history of attaining waivers, which pushes the constrained operations. I'm concerned about the Falcon 900 having 68 operations of which 75 were constrained. That doesn't make any sense, because the numbers don't add up. This makes me question other numbers and I'm also concerned about manufacturer's specifications for weight and runway length. How do they differ from what is allowed at Aurora or what is in the aviation activity forecast? I'm worried these are based on pilot surveys and not validated against flight plans.
    - **Sarah:** noted that this discrepancy would be addressed when the written comment was sent in. The verification process for aircraft has evolved in the past several years.
- **Bruce Bennett**, *Aurora Airport Improvement Association:* I want to note that the helicopter operations caused the count to be reduced and that changes the forecasts. They aren't through the fence. I appreciate how the forecast has been adjusted downward which shows accuracy, and the tower helps with that. It's important to realize there were well over 100,000 a year in the 1970's and we are still not back to where we were in the heyday. It has fluctuated.
    - **David:** It's important to remember this Master Plan is independent of others and there have been many changes in the last 10 years that have had significant effects on air traffic. We don't want to correlate or bias against prior forecasts. The addition of the tower is significant. It was not in operation for previous Master Plans, and it does help with accuracy.
- **Steve Switzer,** *Charbonneau Country Club:* The table previously discussed was table 3-14 on the forecast-based aircraft and I'm comparing that to your own company's Constrained Operations Justification Study. In Table 8 you showed up to 87 jet aircraft in 2038. The current one is 50. My constituents are concerned about how many jets will be flying over their house. The 2018 study was 3 years ago, and the tower was open then. The data seems suspect and it is recent data. The overall constrained operations study has many repeating answers. Did anyone check this against actual flight plans? We are concerned about the accuracy of the data being presented.
    - **David:** Air traffic operations numbers are challenging because we are dealing with movement, and based aircraft is validated and documented, so on Table 3-14, the based year number is the important number to consider. In 2021, ODAV's data said there were 36 based jets at the Airport. That's the baseline for the forecast, so projections are applied to that current baseline count. We must acknowledge that Covid also may have impacted these numbers. I want to reiterate that 2021-41 forecasts are independent and based on established baseline numbers that were provided and the growth rates that are presented in the different forecast models. We do have a recommendation and will let the FAA review to see if there is anything questionable about it. Comments will be an important part of the record for their assessment.
- **Steve:** Did your formula change? You went from 36-50 then 38-85. Aside from Covid, did the methodology change?
    - **David:** The forecast work that was done in the 2019 study was a limited update of the 2012 Master Plan forecasts. It is recognized that the growth rates assumptions in the 2012 Master Plan were overly optimistic, so one of the reasons our numbers have changed is that the current growth rate assumptions are more modest. We are projecting 2.3%, which is in line with historical trends. We


are starting with 2021 baseline numbers and developed forecast models based on the historical data that was available and a variety of relevant factors.

- **Ben Williams**, *Friends of French Prairie:* David, I appreciate your answer, but you stated the 2019 Study is separate from the 2012 Master Plan and this Master Plan is separate from both of those. But you're still using data from the 2019 Study, which has data pulled from the 2012 Master Plan. So current data is still being pulled for the current draft chapters. Hopefully the FAA can confirm if this is appropriate or not.
- **Bruce Bennett (from the chat)**, *Aurora Airport Improvement Association*: I believe it's important to understand the changes to the entire aviation industry; the loud & inefficient old piston twins have been replaced worldwide with the far safer, faster, quieter business jets. The is not just Aurora but everywhere.
- **Cathryn Stephens,** *ODAV Board:* I know the FAA relies on Terminal Area Forecast and historical trends. It looks like the choice here is to go with the 20-year historical trend, which is informed by the terminal area forecast. When we did our last Master Plan in Eugene, we didn't agree with the terminal area forecast. The FAA is always conservative with their terminal area forecast and always want to rely on historical data. There isn't a lot of wiggle room with the FAA, I think this recommendation is correct because it's the one that the FAA is going to accept. Since they have to approve the aviation forecast for this Master Plan, I think it's prudent to forward to them. They may look at it and think there is something else to take into consideration, but from my experience, that rarely happens. I think you're on track here.

PAC Questions and Comments

Brandy opened the PAC question and comment session, in which committee members could ask questions and comment about the information presented. *Full comments, along with responses are provided in the table at the end of the document.*

She then polled members to get a temperature check on how they were feeling going into the next PAC meeting. Most (65%) felt good, some (20%) were feeling okay or a little confused and may need to follow up with questions, while a few (15% or 3 people) were worried or uncomfortable and needed more information.



Snapshot of Survey Results

Brandy presented a high-level update on the recently closed online survey. *The full survey summary will be available on the project website.*

Public Comments


Brandy reminded the group that they could submit comments through the website at any time and public comment would be added to the meeting summary. The last day to submit public comments before they go to the FAA for review would be April 12. *Full comments and responses are provided at the end of the document.*

Next Steps

Sarah reminded the group that the deadline for comments and questions regarding Working Paper No. 1 is April 12 and that the FAA would begin their review after getting all public and PAC comments.

David briefly reviewed themes heard during previous PAC meetings, which are available on the presentation located on the website. He also mentioned how to report noise concerns, and who has responsibility for surface transportation and funding.

Brandy polled the group to see how they might attend a hybrid open house in July. Answers were split between attending in-person (35%), virtually (30%), and feeling unsure (30%). One person said they would not attend the event.



The next PAC meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, May 3, 2022, from 3:00-5:00 pm on Zoom with a focus on facility goals and requirements. Sarah and Brandy then thanked everyone for attending and closed the meeting.

Questions/Comments and Responses from the PAC[2]

ID	Name	Affiliation	Question/Comment	Response
WS.1	**Bruce Bennett**	*Aurora Airport Improvement Association*	Clarification that the airport does have a fire suppression system of 600,000 gallons underground, which is independent and paid for by private property owners and ODAV. Unlike the surrounding area, the airport is completely covered by fire suppression.	Thank you, comment noted.
WS.2	**Roger Kaye**	*1000 Friends of Oregon*	I submitted written comment, but I don't have anything in addition to that. It reports that the study goes back to 2012 master plan legal validity and going back to that previous data. I also don't believe data from 2019 counts as historical data in terms of its proximity to current projections, as it's only one year's worth of data.	Thank you, comment noted.
WS.3	**Aron Faegre**	*AABC/TLM Holdings*	In these airports, we are typically looking out 20 years, which is a long time out to forecast the future. Infrastructure takes a long time due to funding and the time to construct things. Part of this process to maintain a good airport is to look out into the future and project what the options may be and typically the FAA won't fund anything unless the operations are necessary. It's important to view airport infrastructure in that context.	Thank you, comment noted.
WS.4	**Bob Hala**	*Atlantic Aviation*	I'm the general manager for the FBO, or fuel provider and services at the airport. If there are any questions about the types of businesses we support and are bringing here, I'm happy to answer questions. It's a diverse list and they support the local economy. I also have access to aircraft tracking software called Passur if anyone has more questions about historical numbers.	Thank you, comment noted.
WS.5	**Bruce Bennett**	*Aurora Airport Improvement Association*	A large majority of operators at Aurora are people who specialize in emergencies, so try to understand the importance of safety and improvements. These are commonly	Thank you, comment noted.

[2] Live responses are included, along with additional information/clarification, as needed.

			putting out fires and restoring power to small towns and saving lives. These aren't just numbers on a sheet. If you spend time at the airport, you understand the critical nature of this. I can also answer any questions. I operated a Falcon 900 out of there and technically every operation is constrained due to the weight of the aircraft in relation to the runway. Thank you for organizing this.	
WS.6	**Ken Ivey**	*Aurora Butteville Barlow Community Planning Organization*	The concerns I will write in later – it's the large jets that request permission to go to this airport and function there. They become part of statistics used to justify a longer runway. When you have a longer runway, you can let in larger jets, and we will get into a cyclical system where we will continue to need a longer runway. I'm concerned how the information is put together aiming for a particular outcome.	Thank you, comment noted.
WS.7	**Bill Graupp**	*Aurora CTE, Inc*	I'm representing education in the county, and we're focused on the planning meeting the future needs of our kids to have careers in the area and not have to leave for better paying jobs. The airport is a big part of our economy in the region, and we want to look ahead to the future as the aviation industry evolves so that our kids have good career job options.	Thank you, comment noted.
WS.8	**Steve Switzer**	*Charbonneau Country Club*	I looked at the 126 waivers for the last 12 years, including the Global Express plane. The last 50 waivers were to one aircraft, a Gulfstream 450. I liken this to me buying a Ferrari and stating you need to move the freeway so I can drive 160 mph. The airport allows the Global Express and its base weight is more than the runway. Some of the other waivers anticipated it to be 80K pounds before takeoff. My daughter was flying a Gulfstream 450, and I asked her what she would do if there was engine trouble. She replied that she would fly to PDX and not Aurora. I'm concerned about the data and how you got the constrained operations that you are using to justify this. I	Thank you, comment noted. We will continue to work with you to help advertise future opportunities for public comment.

			hope the FAA takes a closer look. It looks suspiciously like it was put in to fit the needs, and much of it was done on surveys. The FAA also requires a public involvement program, and all of the PI fits onto one page. I'm concerned about the survey that went out, because no one in Charbonneau knew anything about it. It didn't get advertised very well. We did have meetings in Charbonneau during the last Master Plan, and I would love for more of those and more outreach in this community. Charbonneau is 3,000 people and the decisions made affect all of us. In 20 years, who will we look back on to have represented us at these meetings?	
WS.9	**Brian Asher**	*Mayor, City of Aurora*	I don't have comments, but keep the discussions going and find a happy medium.	No response necessary.
WS.10	**Councilor Charlotte Lehan**	*City of Wilsonville*	We have a lot of businesses and jobs, and our objection is to doing businesses and building businesses in farmland, one of OR's largest industries. It takes business away from other cities which provide appropriate urban services such as sewer and water. Just stating "We love business" as a reason for this misses a lot of the peripheral.	Thank you, comment noted.
WS.11	**Ben Williams**	*Friends of French Prairie*	We submitted comments in writing.	No response necessary.
WS.12	**Tony Beach**	*ODAV*	Thank you for your participation.	
WS.13	**Cathryn Stephens**	*ODAV Board*	Thank you for your work on this. Master Plans are a lot of work. Flight plans are not a good indication of activity, as many pilots don't have to file one. Historical data and terminal area forecasts are much more accurate. The FAA regulation drives this process and accommodates all kinds of aviation. If the demand is showing at an airport, they will not support trying to block that demand. The FAA has to approve aviation forecasts. Are they going to be able to review this in a timely manner?	It would not be wise to go too far into the master plan evaluations without FAA forecast approval. We have been meeting with (FAA Seattle Airport District Office - ADO) Ben Mello and Kate Key bi-weekly, but we do not have a timeline on forecast approval or discussion because they wanted to wait until the PAC/public comment period for Working Paper No. 1 was over. We will continue our bi-weekly discussions and respond to any questions the FAA may have. After the ADO completes its review, the draft forecasts will go to FAA

				headquarters for review of the ADO's review. Final FAA approval of master plan draft aviation activity forecasts occurs when all FAA comments are addressed.
WS.14	**Naomi Zwerdling**	*Oregon Dept of Transportation*	I have already heard comments I would have made.	No response necessary.
WS.15	**Matt Crall**	*Oregon Dept of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD)*	I appreciate the note about the county having land use authority and that ODAV is really just a property owner.	No response necessary.
WS.16	**Tony Helbling**	*Positive Aurora Airport Management.*	I'm the president of PAAM and have had some good recent visits with airport operators and a first in person meeting. We'd be happy to support local outreach to the community so they can learn how aviation functions work. We have a location on the airport and could show maps and charts with the why's and how's of the airport. We want to be good neighbors.	Thank you, comment noted.
WS.17	**Patrick Donaldson**	*Wilsonville Chamber of Commerce*	We continue to be impressed by the deliberative discipline process that allows all voices to come in on these calls and through comments, collecting them, and then sending them back out. This is the definition of openness and transparency and is a contemporary record that will help us in our decision-making process. At our next meeting, we need to spend some time revisiting the covenant we made to one another about openness, fairness, transparency, and respectfulness. We need to recenter on this.	Thank you, comment noted.
WS.18	**Matt Lawyer (for Commissioner Bethel)**	*Marion County*	Thank you for being able to take an additional look at this.	Thank you, comment noted.
WS.19	**Bob Hala (in the chat)**	*Atlantic Aviation*	The aircraft at UAO support the businesses in the surrounding cities rather than take away from them.	Thank you, comment noted.

Public Comment

ID	Name	Affiliation	Question/Comment	Response
WS.20	**Kriss Wright**	*Planning Commissioner, City of Newberg*	I noticed that the Appendix 2 of the Master Plan update env overview says that the ESA helps public and private sector clients plan and provide climate change regulations and limits of emissions. This purpose is to provide the environmental conditions of the airport. Under the bird species, I'm not seeing a red-tailed hawk and junior eagle. Some of the endangered species have habitat in this area and are not on this list or being considered. I wanted to make you aware of that. Additionally, I heard from last meeting that there was fuel being dumped from the air and I want to know if there is anything in place or repercussions for those found doing that.	Thank you, comment noted. ODAV: It wasn't fuel, it was a substance, and we don't want to presume we know what that was. The reported event was related to a low-flying helicopter from an adjacent private heliport. We encouraged the property owner to submit their video of the event to Marion County.
WS.21	**Peter Rempp**	*Community member*	What is the permitting process for airport projects or expansion? Who approves and makes decisions on how you build something? How do neighbors find out that there are new limitations to their property?	This is simply a Master Plan looking at how to maintain and develop the Airport. Recommendations (for implementation of individual projects) requiring local land use actions go through a public process defined by Marion County, as the land use jurisdiction for the Airport and adjacent airport-related development areas. All of that is after the Master planning process concludes. There is also a federal NEPA process that would bring in additional agencies, but that is specific to FAA-funded projects. We don't know what the next steps will look like at this time, but everything is through Marion County. This may be a question for them as well.
WS.22	**Mayor Julie Fitzgerald**	*City or Wilsonville*	The City of Wilsonville, with 27,000 residents, is very business oriented. There are 21,000 jobs and 1,000 businesses and growing, and the total payroll is $1.3 billion. We have several companies investing in our city and bringing new jobs. I'm concerned about safety and the	Thank you, comment noted.

			septic tanks that service this area. Why is a longer runway needed for a life flight?	

Written Public Comment[3]

ID	Name	Affiliation	Question/Comment	Response
WS.23	Roger Kaye	*President, Friends of Marion County*	RE: **Question of Legal Validity of 2012 Master Plan** My comments are about the propriety and legality of the data presented in the Draft chapters. Chapter 3 is titled **Aviation Activity Forecasts**, and beginning on page 8 is a section titled **Recent Events Summary.** No mention is made of the 2021 Final Judgment by the Oregon Court of Appeals, later ratified by the Oregon Supreme Court, that the 2012 Aurora Airport Master Plan is invalid because it was never legally approved or adopted by the Oregon Aviation Board, and it was never adopted into the Marion County Comprehensive plan. Certainly, this qualifies as a "recent event!" This matters because the Forecast chapter and the data therein are built on data from the **2019 Aurora State Airport Constrained Operations Runway Justification Study** and the unapproved **2012 Aurora State Airport Master Plan.** The Constrained Operations study references the 2012 master plan 99 times and includes such statements as "intended to supplement the 2012 AMP document," and "the current 2012 Airport Master Plan should be consulted for specific plans related to airport development and protection," and finally, The primary purpose of the forecast update associated with the Aurora State Airport Constrained Operations Runway Justification Study is to evaluate the forecasts of aviation activity (2010-2030) contained in the 2012 Aurora State Airport Master Plan (AMP), which supported the planned runway extension depicted on the 2012 Airport Layout Plan (ALP). On top of that, the Draft Chapters for the current master planning processes are not	Thank you for your comment; we've shared your concerns with the technical team. References to historical data contained in previous plans are provided for information only. The 2021-2041 airport master plan is a new master plan and no correlation between plans is assumed.

[3] Letter was sent before the meeting.

			only based on the Constrained Operations Study, but directly refer back to the 2012 Master Plan and include 18 references to it. This linkage and dependency is confirmed in the **Previous Airport Planning** section of Chapter 3 that states The 2012 Aurora State Airport Master Plan Update provides the most recent FAA-approved airport layout plan (ALP) drawing for the Airport. The 2019 Constrained Operations Runway Justification Study provided updated aviation activity forecasts and airside facility requirements assessment related to the critical aircraft. The Court of Appeals ruling on the 2012 Master Plan raises real legal questions about the Forecast chapter in as much as the data is built on the Constrained Operations study which in turn is dependent on the unapproved 2012 master plan. Last week's Court of Appeals ruling on a private development next to the Aurora Airport makes clear that expanding the Aurora Airport must comply with Oregon's land use laws and requires it being adopted into the Marion County comprehensive plan, something that hasn't happened since 1976.	

Aurora State Airport
Master Plan Project



Planning Advisory Committee Working Session
Online Meeting
April 5, 2022

Meeting Process & Agenda

Time	Topic
3:00-3:05	Introductions
3:05-3:25	Quick Review of Draft Working Paper #1 Materials
3:25-4:35	PAC Comments
4:35-4:40	Snapshot of Survey Results
4:40-4:50	Public Comments https://publicproject.net/AuroraAirport
4:50-5:00	Next Steps/PAC Themes

Introductions

In Attendance

Panelists

- Oregon Department of Aviation (ODAV) Staff
- Century West Engineering (Prime Contractor)
- JLA Public Involvement (Meeting Facilitator)
- Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Staff
- Planning Advisory Committee (PAC) Members

Attendees

- Members of the Public

PAC Meetings*

- AMP introduction – Nov 2021
- Existing conditions – Mar 2022
- Working Session – Apr 2022  *We are here*
- Facility goals and requirements – May 2022
- MOS/RPZ Analysis – Jul 2022
- Preliminary development alternatives – Aug 2022
- Optional meeting – if needed
- Preferred development alternatives – Sep 2022
- Implementation plan and CIP – Nov 2022


**** The schedule is flexible and may be changed***

PAC Meeting Guidelines

- Meeting time will be allocated for all committee members to speak.
- Meetings summaries will be prepared and distributed following the meetings; to include all comments along with responses/follow up.
- Comments on non-agenda items should be provided in writing. Community members are encouraged to provide comments at least three days before meetings to allow members time to review and reflect on comments.
- As a committee, we agree to approach this work with honesty, openness and willingness to work together.
- This includes building trust and assuming good intentions in others and ensuring that our behavior supports a successful process. We will work with each other and staff to address issues as they arise, utilize tools to ensure clear communication and robust participation, and meet the communication needs of members.

Decision-Making

- **PAC** = Round table discussions and collection of committee member opinions at decision points. All opinions will be included in the meeting summary.
- **ODAV** = as the airport sponsor, will be the final decision-making authority. They will decide what is included in the Master Plan.
- **FAA** = reviews chapters of the Master Plan and has approval authority for the Aviation Activity Forecasts and the Airport Layout Plan.




Review of Draft Working Paper #1

Aurora Airport Property – ODAV Owned



Existing Conditions Overview



Existing Based Aircraft / Operations

	Based Aircraft	Operations
Total	**281**	**76,028**

Source: Based Aircraft Data - National Based Aircraft Inventory – January 2022
Operations Data - Historic ATCT Data (Adjusted) – Calendar Year 2021

Forecast Based Aircraft / Operations

	CAGR	2021	2026	2031	2036	2041
Based Aircraft Forecast - Recommended						
Federal Contract Tower (Oregon) TAF Model	**1.1%**	**281**	**300**	**317**	**333**	**350**
Operations Forecast - Recommended						
TFMSC Historic Trend (20-Year)	**2.3%**	**76,028**	**85,201**	**95,480**	**107,000**	**119,909**

Source: Century West Engineering
CAGR: Compound Annual Growth Rate

FAA Design Standards

The design standards for an airport are determined by the current and future **Design Aircraft;**

The Design Aircraft is defined as the most demanding aircraft or grouping of aircraft that make **regular use** of the airport; and

Regular use is 500 annual operations (takeoffs and landings), including both itinerant and local operations, but excluding touch-and-go operations.

Current and Future Design Aircraft

The existing and future design aircraft identified in the aviation activity forecasts corresponds to Airport Reference Code C-II (ARC C-II)



AIRPORT REFERENCE CODE (ARC)


Aircraft Approach Category	Aircraft Approach Speed	Airplane Design Group	Aircraft Wingspan
A	less than or equal to 91	I	less than or equal to 49′
B	92 to 121	II	50′ to 79′
C	122 to 141	III	80′ to 118′
D	142 to 166	IV	119′ to 171′



Source: Century West Engineering

Land Use

- Marion County has land use authority over the Airport and the adjacent privately-owned properties accommodating aviation activity. This includes through-the-fence airport users and two private off-airport heliports.
- Airport overlay zoning is the responsibility of each local jurisdiction based on the requirements of Oregon land use law.



Utilities



Water and sewer services at the Airport are accommodated through wells and septic systems. The systems are privately-owned or ODAV-owned. All systems are permitted through Marion County.

- Water
  - Two ODAV-owned wells service ODAV-facilities; privately-owned wells service TTF areas.
- Sanitary Sewer
  - There are at least nine individual drain fields located on ODAV-owned property that are shared for aviation related uses on both private and publicly owned land.

Clarifying Questions?

PAC Comments

Poll Questions

Survey Snapshot

Who took the survey?

Approximately 450 people

- Residential neighbors
- Local pilots
- Businesses that are at/interact with the airport

When planning for the future of the Airport, which three topics do you believe are most important?

- Airport impact on the rural environment
- Runway extension that would remove operational constraints for the airport
- Impacts of nearby roads and highways
- Area land uses
- Lack of available hangar space

Public Comments


Next Steps

Next Steps

- Deadline **April 12th** for PAC review of draft Working Paper #1.
  - Comments and questions may be submitted on the project website: https://publicproject.net/AuroraAirport#
- FAA will review draft Working Paper #1 and any input provided from the PAC.
- After review, FAA will provide a formal approval of the recommended forecast.

Common Themes from PAC Meeting #2

Off-Airport Aircraft Activity




Flight Activity

- Aircraft in flight are regulated solely by FAA.
- Pilots are responsible for the safe operation of their aircraft.
- Aircraft movements within the local controlled airspace associated with an operational air traffic control tower (ATCT) are under the control of the ATCT.

Noise

- FAA has indicated that since the off-airport helicopter bases (HTS and Columbia) do not use airport facilities, the noise modeling should not include HTS and Columbia activity for the Airport Master Plan.

Aircraft Activity



Where to report noise concerns?

- Off-airport operators **daytime noise** related issues can be reported to Code Enforcement at **(503) 373-4333.**
- Off-airport operators **nighttime noise** related issues can be reported to the Marion County Sheriff's non-emergency number **(503) 588-5032.**
- Marion County has a noise complaint website with additional information that can be found here:

  https://www.co.marion.or.us/SO/Operations/CodeEnforcement/Pages/NoiseComplaints.
- FAA Flight Standards District Office (FSDO) oversees pilots for in-flight activity concerns/safety. Portland FSDO **(503) 615-3200.**
- On-airport noise related concerns, contact ODAV at (**503) 378-4880.**

Surface Transportation

Future highway or local roadway improvements surrounding the airport are the responsibility of the jurisdiction that owns and maintains the road.

- Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT)
  - Interstate 5 (I-5)
  - Hubbard Highway (OR-551)
- Marion County
  - Airport Road NE
  - Arndt Road
  - Keil Road

Development projects at the Airport may require transportation studies for permit approval based on Marion County code.

Funding

- ODAV Agency Funding
  - Airport User Fees
  - Aviation Fuel Taxes
  - No state general funds received for ODAV operations.
- FAA Funding - Airport Improvement Program (AIP)
  - Aviation Trust Fund is funded through taxes on airline tickets and aviation fuel.
- How can these funds be used?
  - FAA funding is limited to FAA-approved projects/uses
  - Oregon Aviation funding can only be used for on-airport eligible projects.

Environmental Concerns – Leaded Aviation Fuel



Addressing leaded aviation fuel concerns is not within the scope of the Airport Master Plan project or ODAV authority.

- Under the Clean Air Act (CAA), the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has the authority (in consultation with the FAA) to regulate emissions from aircraft.
  - Currently there are no regulations that apply to emissions from aircraft that use leaded fuel.
  - There are ongoing nationwide efforts to address leaded fuel use in aviation and also emissions from jet exhaust. The purpose of these efforts is to investigate fuel alternatives to reduce emissions and the presence of lead in aviation fuel.
  - More information is available at: **https://www.faa.gov/airports/environmental/air_quality** and **https://www.faa.gov/newsroom/leaded-aviation-fuel-and-environment**

Thank You

Heather Peck – ODAV

Sarah Lucas – ODAV

Brandy Steffen – JLA Public Involvement

David Miller – Century West Engineering

Project Website: https://publicproject.net/AuroraAirport

PAC Meeting #3 – May 3, 2022

Aurora State Airport

AIRPORT MASTER PLAN PUBLIC MEETING



Planning Advisory Committee (PAC) Meeting #3

Tuesday, May 3, 2022
PAC Meeting #3 from 3:00pm – 5:00pm

Due to social distancing measures and the inability to meet in person, this PAC Meeting will be held via telephone and internet through Zoom. These meetings will provide an opportunity for the PAC, community, neighbors, and other project stakeholders to learn about the Airport Master Plan project.

Airport planning work products and registration links for the virtual **PAC Meeting** at: **https://publicproject.net/AuroraAirport**

For Additional Information Contact:
Sarah Lucas, ODAV Aviation Planner
Oregon Department of Aviation
503-378-2211
sarah.lucas@odav.oregon.gov

Special accommodations are available upon request (with 48 hours notice)

AURORA STATE AIRPORT

AIRPORT MASTER PLAN

PAC MEETING #3 AGENDA

Date/Time: May 3, 2022 from 3:00-5:00 pm
Location: Zoom Webinar

Meeting Goals: Review/address PAC comments in relation to the Draft Working Paper #1.

Time	Topic	Person	Notes
3:00-3:10 pm	**Introductions**	Brandy Steffen	• Agenda • Meeting guidelines
3:10-3:30 pm	**Overview**	David Miller	• What a typical AMP includes • Schedule and process
3:30-4:40 pm	**Review Working Paper #1 and Discussion**	David Miller	• Review Chapter 1 • Review Chapter 2 - Existing Conditions Analysis • Review Chapter 3 - preliminary Aviation Activity Forecasts • Clarifying questions and discussion
4:40-4:50 pm	**Website Review**	Brandy Steffen	
4:50-5:00 pm	**Next Steps**	Brandy Steffen	• Schedule • Next PAC meeting and public open house • We always will take comments via the website, which will be included in the meeting notes and shared with the PAC members: https://publicproject.net/AuroraAirport# • A meeting summary with all PAC and public comments will be posted to the project website within two weeks.

AURORA STATE AIRPORT

AIRPORT MASTER PLAN
PLANNING ADVISORY COMMITTEE (PAC)
MEETING #3 SUMMARY

Date: Tuesday, May 3, 2022
Time: 3:00-5:00 pm
Location: Zoom Webinar

In Attendance

PAC Members Present

Roger Kaye, *1000 Friends of Oregon*
Ted Millar, *AABC/TLM Holdings*
Bob Hala, *Atlantic Aviation*
Bruce Bennett, *Aurora Airport Improvement Association*
Ken Ivey, *Aurora Butteville Barlow Community Planning Organization*
Bill Graupp, *Aurora CTE, Inc*
Steve Switzer, *Charbonneau Country Club*
Councilor Charlotte Lehan, *City of Wilsonville*
Chris Neamtzu*, Alternate, City of Wilsonville*
Bob Buchanan, Alternate, *Columbia Helicopters*
Matt Williams, *Deer Creek Estates HOA*
Ben Williams, *Friends of French Prairie*
Matt Lawyer, Alternate, *Marion County*
Austin Barnes, *Marion County Planning Dept.*
Cathryn Stephens, *ODAV Board*
Sarah Puls, Alternate, *Oregon Office of Emergency Management*
Naomi Zwerdling, *Oregon Dept of Transportation*
Tony Helbling, *Positive Aurora Airport Management*
Rian Johnson, *Vans Aircraft*
David Waggoner, *Willamette Aviation*
Patrick Donaldson, *Wilsonville Chamber of Commerce*

PAC Members Absent

Raul Suarez, *Aurora Air Traffic Control*
Scott Archer, *City of Canby*
Brian Asher, *City of Aurora*
Commissioner Tootie Smith, *Clackamas County*
Tony Beach, Oregon Dept of Aviation (ODAV)
Matt Crall, *Oregon Dept of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD)*
Jody Christensen, *Regional Solutions*
Cheryl Pouley, *Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde Community of Oregon*
Robert Kentta, *Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians*
Christian Nauer*, Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon*
Rob Roedts, *Columbia Helicopters*
Wayne Richards, Alternate, *Friends of the French Prairie*
Robert Fournier, *Helicopter Transport Service*
Ben Clayton, *Life Flight Network*
Commissioner Danielle Bethel, *Marion County*
Brandon Reich, Alternate, *Marion County Planning Dept.*
Mary Anne Cooper, *Oregon Farm Bureau*
Nicole Mardell, Alternate, *DLCD*
Bill Martin, *Oregon Office of Emergency Management*

Greg Hughes, Alternate, *Vans Aircraft*
Kevin Ferrasci O'Malley, Alternate, *Wilsonville Chamber of Commerce*

Agency Representatives
Betty Stansbury, *ODAV*
Heather Peck, *ODAV*
Sarah Lucas, *ODAV*
Seth Thompson, *ODAV*
Cathy Clark, *ODAV*
Andria Abrahamson, *ODAV*
Benjamin Mello, *FAA*
Kate Key, *FAA*

Staff and Consultants
Matt Rogers, *Century West*
David Miller, *Century West*
Mike Dane, *Century West*
Samantha Peterson, *Century West*
Mark Steele, *Century West*
James Kirby, *Century West*
Brandy Steffen*, JLA Public Involvement*
Jen Winslow*, JLA Public Involvement*

Audience / Members of the Public
Andrew Karr, *City of Wilsonville*
Aron Faegre, *AABC/TLM Holdings*
Bruce Bergman, *Wylee Hangar Condos*
Carolyn Lee
Councilor Joann Linville, *City of Wilsonville*
Diego Archuleta
Ellen Schmidt-Devlin
Erik Krysar
Greg Drew, *Wylee Hangar Condos*
Greg Leo, *City of Wilsonville*
Jake Jacobs
Jason Paolo, *Anderson Hay & Grain*
Joseph Schaefer
Mark Ottenad, *City of Wilsonville*
Mayor Julie Fitzgerald, *City of Wilsonville*
Neal White, *Oregon Pilots Association*
Tim Warren
Two unidentified phone-in participants

Overview

The meeting goals were to continue the conversation about existing conditions and preliminary forecasts (Working Paper #1, Chapters 1 - 3) and ensure that the Committee members had time to talk and learn about the materials.

Welcome and Introductions

Brandy Steffen, JLA Public Involvement, welcomed everyone to the meeting and reviewed the agenda and basic Zoom meeting tips and etiquette. She reminded the group that there would be no public comment for this meeting, but everyone is welcome to submit comment through the website. **Heather Peck, Oregon Department of Aviation (ODAV),** introduced ODAV staff, consultant, and subconsultant team members involved with the project. Brandy briefly reviewed the Planning Advisory Committee (PAC) meeting guidelines and who makes decisions within the project. *The presentation is posted on the website.*

Presentation

David Miller, Century West, gave a broad overview of airport master planning and the contents of Working Paper #1. He noted that the project team is not presenting the facility requirements analysis until the **Federal Aviation Administration (FAA)** has completed their review of the draft aviation activity forecasts, presented at PAC Meeting #2 and subsequently revised per PAC and public review comments.

The project team is conducting an Airport Master Plan (AMP) because it is an FAA requirement, it helps ODAV plan for the future of the Airport, reflects current FAA airport design standards, and updates the Airport Layout Plan (ALP). He shared a graphic that explained the three phases of the plan: Develop Understanding; Explore Solutions; Implementation. David then shared a slide showing what an AMP is and is not. He reminded the group that after the AMP is completed there will be additional planning, funding alignments, environmental review, design, and potentially construction for individual master plan projects. *The presentation and FAQs are posted to the project website.*

Brandy gave an analogy about how an AMP is similar to a homeowner planning and saving money for future repairs and renovations for their homes. She asked if PAC members had any questions.

- **Ben Williams**, *Friends of French Prairie*: I want to know what we are doing? I've attended the PAC meetings and read the scope of work document, and this is referenced as a master plan update throughout. I've heard ODAV refer to this as an update and as a new plan. The FAA advisory circular talks about the difference between updates and new plans as a function of the scale the effort. It seems the effort is much bigger than what is normally defined as an update. If this is going to be a new master plan instead of an update, how will we do it in the existing schedule, especially when the 2012 master plan shouldn't be referenced as it as it isn't a valid master plan?
    - **David:** This is a new master plan. The contents of the documents required for new master plans and updates are largely the same. The schedule has been adjusted to allow for additional time and meetings. ODAV will be flexible in the schedule as long as we are making progress. Content is repurposed, and these are defined by the FAA. We are referencing the old plan when appropriate, but we are not using any of the old recommendations.
    - **Ben Mello,** *FAA***:** This is a full-blown new master plan. The Airport has had previous master plans and so we thought it was fair to call this an update, though we are going through all the required steps and processes for a new master plan.

David continued the presentation by giving a high-level review of Chapters 1-3 of the draft Working Paper #1, and common questions and responses heard from the PAC and the public regarding these chapters. *There was no new information shared, and the presentation and FAQs are available on the website.*

David reminded the PAC that:

- There will be continued conversations surrounding noise evaluations.
    - Helicopter facilities that are located off-airport (without through the fence – TTF - airport access agreements) are not included in the noise analysis.
- The draft Working Paper #1 chapters sent to the FAA for formal review will include the comments received from the PAC and public.
- The new master plan forecasts reflect recent activity and note significant events including Covid. New forecasts are needed to support the new airport master plan. Forecasts older than approximately three years are considered dated. Any forecast over 10 years old will be marginal, but still contain valuable historical information.

Matt Rogers, Century West, thanked people for providing comments and reminded them that responses/answers were added to each meeting summary. He noted a specific comment regarding a

discrepancy between data in the constrained operations report from 2019 and current data, and that the discrepancy had been edited and resolved.

PAC Questions and Comments

Brandy opened the PAC question and comment session, in which committee members could ask questions and comment about the information presented. *Full comments, along with responses are provided in the table at the end of the document.*

Website

Brandy provided a tour of the website, which included a new page for FAQs and an explanation of what an Airport Master Plan is, in addition to the resources already available. She also shared where the responses to comments were located in the summary documents. Heather reminded the group that the FAQs are continuously updated, and many questions could be answered by reading them.

Next Steps

Brandy reminded the PAC that FAA will be reviewing the draft Working Paper #1 soon and that the next PAC meeting will be scheduled after the FAA approves the forecasts. The technical team is drafting Chapter #4 (Facility Goals and Requirements) and the next meeting will include time to go through the draft together. Comments can be submitted for 30 days after. She added that the next open house will be scheduled after the next PAC meeting.

Brandy thanked everyone for attending and closed the meeting.

Questions/Comments and Responses from the PAC[1]

ID	Name	Affiliation	Question/Comment	Response
3.1	**Councilor Charlotte Lehan**	*City of Wilsonville*	(Regarding the data discrepancy in the constrained operations report): That was one of the issues I raised and sent. Could you send a response so we can get a document that explains the changes that were made? The bigger issue was the relationship between the waivers and constrained operations. It appears the number of waivers are driving the number of constrained operations.	That describes the data query issue. It was a relatively minor duplication of air traffic (100 operations or fewer). That was flagged and we appreciate your review so that we could remedy that. Overweight aircraft might not be a constrained operation but is one of those evaluated within the facility requirements. There are aircraft that do not exceed the runway's maximum weight capacity that are constrained. We will continue discussing this when we talk about runway lengths.

[1] Live responses are included, along with additional information/clarification, as needed.

3.2	**Steve Switzer**	*Charbonneau Country Club*	How does the FAA verify data? In the 2012 plan and appendix are constrained operations from aircraft owners survey data. Which are we going to start using for the possible runway extension? Is it both? How does the FAA verify a survey? (response) Thank you, that is what we needed. The data was confusing.	The surveys provide varying accounts of information. Our analysis for runway length will not depend on survey data. We will use the FAA's models to determine length. We have an accurate based aircraft count, and those will be categorized by the FAA. We also look at traffic flow data, which is aircraft specific.
3.3	**Tony Helbling**	*Positive Aurora Airport Management*	I wanted to reiterate that operators are trying to operate safely and respectfully. We have had little to no noise complaints. We have a new member from Charbonneau.	Thank you for your comment.
3.4	**Roger Kaye**	*1000 Friends of Oregon*	We sent a letter more than a month ago when original comments were being requested and I haven't received any feedback on that letter. I also don't know what other letters you have received and would like to know what comments and information you have received.	We received 6 letters in written form and have responded to specific questions. These will be or are posted on the website, either in the summaries or FAQs. These were also sent to the FAA for review.
3.5	**Patrick Donaldson**	*Wilsonville Chamber of Commerce*	In Task 4.3 of the existing conditions analysis, you mentioned something about relevant studies. Have any additional studies been added to that list? If so, will they be brought to our attention for review? The 2018 Oregon Aviation Plan has specific information regarding economic impacts and socioeconomic impacts of the airport. There will be new employment opportunities and income. How are these included in the socioeconomic data and impacts? I haven't seen anything about DBE or DEI in this population data. Will that be included? Additional question about tolling.	I'm not aware of any additional studies, but if there are, they would be added to the record. We look this data when considering socioeconomic activity out of the airport, which factors in population and economic output for the region. The goal is to reference the relevant information in the analysis. DBE is not a population-based program but a procurement and contracting program. UAO goals and the ODAV program are on the ODAV website and have been approved by the FAA. We would need a more specific question regarding DEI. Evaluation of surface transportation system tolling is not within the scope of the AMP, or ODAV jurisdiction.

3.6	**Tony Hebling**	*Positive Aurora Airport Management*	There was a slide that expressed concern for fuel types and the FAA just announced that they plan on having unleaded fuel in the system by 2030. **(From chat in reference to electric aircraft)** These electric aircraft are going to dramatically affect both noise and air issues in aviation!!! This is great!!! **(From chat)** It's important to note, propeller driven airplanes (both piston and turbine) are at time constrained. It's not just jets.	Thank you for your comment.
3.7	**Ted Millar**	*AABC/TLM Holdings*	There are new, exciting things in aviation. I just attended the Oregon Aviation Industry's 2022 summit, and they expressed that electric aircraft are coming. WashDOT is partnering with British Columbia and are asking neighboring states to partner. Aircraft will go 300-500 nautical miles with 1/10th the noise pattern of a piston plane. They want all rural airports to redo their master plans to accommodate these aircraft. I suggest people watch the videos from the summit, as this is an important change in aviation. Jake Jacobs (from chat): www.oravi.org/VideoSummit2022	We are seeing this come up in every master plan, and the required infrastructure is the missing components. There is some early FAA guidance, and we imagine the Airport will accommodate this activity within the next master plan.
3.8	**Bruce Bennett**	*Aurora Airport Improvement Association*	Thank you for the presentation. I've been flying out of Aurora for 50 years. Safety is critical and there is a lot of misinformation that people want larger aircraft, and that's not true. There have been accidents, and this is a serious business continues its focus. To David Miller's point on temperature. For the Paradise fire, both helicopter companies supported that and also rely on aircraft for support if something breaks. Sometimes weather can impact their ability to land.	Thank you for your comment.
3.9	**Patrick Donaldson**	*Wilsonville Chamber of Commerce*	Task number 6.3 focuses on surface transportation. Have you aligned your efforts with statewide infrastructure	Anything that has an impact on the Airport will be acknowledged and we will have to look into this more. We



			improvements, especially with the bridge work and tolling that will be in place? ODOT anticipates that up to 40% of traffic will exit to avoid tolling, putting a strain on our region.	want to make sure everything is compatible with the Airport. The footprint of the masterplan is focused within the vicinity of the Airport, so I-205 issues are for Clackamas County to address.
3.10	**Rian Johnson**	*Vans Aircraft*	I want to take the opportunity to explain what Vans aircraft is about. We help the community and have over 11k aircraft worldwide. We provide a kit aircraft as well. We have a great safety record and 138 employees, and the location is central for both employees and customers. We bring in revenue to the area. We also promote STEM and have a program called Teenflight, which focuses on diversity and underserved children. We also plan on developing electric aircraft and try to be respectful to neighbors.	Thank you for your comment.
3.11	**Steve Switzer**	*Charbonneau Country Club*	Please also make sure that the community of Charbonneau is given notice for the next survey and open house. Reach out to our staff. I still can't find anyone in Charbonneau who was aware of it. I don't see us following the FAA 15570 document very closely, but if I have questions, should that be addressed to ODAV or Brandy?	All of this is referenced in the scope of work. Every airport is different and has different needs, so the committees, round tables, and focus groups are different based upon that. We are still following the document and FAA guidelines. Yes, additional questions can be sent directly to Heather, Brandy or via the website comment form.
3.12	**Chris Neamtzu**	*City of Wilsonville*	Can Century West provide a strikethrough version of working paper #1 so that we can see the technical data revisions?	We have created a detailed memo that shows updates and changes within the working paper. We can add that to the website when it is released from the FAA. This was an easier way compared to using a strikethrough method.
3.13	**Christian Nauer**	*Cultural Resource Manager, Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon, Branch of Natural Resources*	Thank you very much for the opportunity to comment on the Aurora Airport Project. General Comment: As the technical reviewer for NHPA Section 106 and other cultural resource issues for the Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon (CTWSRO), the CTWSRO Tribal Historic Preservation Office (THPO) has concerns with the potential effects to	Thank you for the comment. We will consider the cultural resources in the area and continue to keep you involved for your review.


			historic properties or cultural resources within the Project Area of Potential Effects (APE). The Project APE is within the areas of concern for the CTWSRO. Project-specific Comment(s): I know I haven't been at your meetings but I wanted to get on the record with comments on cultural resource protection relative to this Project. This office recommends that you include a consideration of potential effects to historic properties and cultural resources within your management plan and for all parts of the Project that could affect those resources. Please consult with the State Historic Preservation Office and any other potentially affected tribal organizations. We strongly encourage appropriate survey and inventory efforts in advance of implementation. Happy to talk with you at any time. Thank you for your efforts to protect cultural resources.	

Written Public Comment[2]


ID	Name	Affiliation	Question/Comment	Response
3.14	**Anthony Helbling**	*Wilson Construction Company*	https://aviationweek.com/special-topics/sustainability/faa-industry-pledge-unleaded-avgas-2030 I'd like to submit this into the record for the Master Plan. It is vitally important we plan for the future of aviation - unleaded fuels are coming!	Thank you for the comment.
3.15	**Ben Williams**	*Friends of French Prairie*	This is the first of two [emails], countering the pure pablum assertions Tony Helbling was making yesterday about "no more noise problems over Charbonneau."	Thank you for the comment
3.16	**Pat Hickman**	*Community member*	Jet helicopter so much for Wilson Construction working to be good neighbors.. THIS WAS LOUD and LOW Follow the proper noise abate etiquette NOPE	Thank you for the comment. In the State of Oregon, Noise is regulated by the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) through Oregon Administrative Rule

[2] Emails were sent before and after the meeting.

				(OAR) 340-035-0045, Noise Control Regulations for Airports.
3.17	**Pat Hickman**	*Community member*	Jet so much for any NOISE abatement this was NASTY LOUD at 7:16 AM ! shame on TRACON, KUAO, FAA, ODOA 	Thank you for the comment. You can find more information about reporting noise complaints in our project FAQ page.
3.18	**Patrick Donaldson**	*Wilsonville Chamber of Commerce*	As a representative of the Wilsonville Area Chamber of Commerce I would like to submit the Oregon Aviation Plan v.6.0 (2019) for review and consideration by the Aurora Airport Public Advisory Committee. There is a long listing of Economic Impacts listed for the Aurora State Airport that will provide important context for our deliberations. https://www.oregon.gov/aviation/plans-and-programs/Documents/OAP/2019/0OAP-2018-Entire-Report.pdf	Thank you for your email and for your comments during yesterday's PAC meeting. I have forwarded your email to ODAV staff and the technical team.
3.19	**Pat Hickman**	*Community member*	Around 7:30 to 8:00 PM range not positive a very large jet super low and extremely loud flew completely over Charbonneau, It scared one of our grandsons. It was that loud! They were hidden on Flight Aware when went to check. They should be called out for such unsafe flying over a residential community. Just another reason we need people at FAA, TRACON, ODOA to pay attention to the deteriorating noise and pollution issues that abound with KUAO Jet, Turbo Prop aircraft overflights	Thank you for the comment. You can find more information about reporting noise complaints in our project FAQ page.

			N930YZ NORAM Aviation, RUDE N186DL ALSOP LLC. Local ? Rude overflight N80WB WB ATS LLC, Rude and a repeat offender WB ATS LLC PORTLAND , OR, US, they are based at UAO, this is not the first time in the past several days they have overflown, very loud and nasty noise and pollution N111NS Columbia Helicopters , local. This was uncalled for and they know better. Not GOOD N21TK MTK Leasing Local N853AL Metro Aviation, Repeat…SHREVEPORT , LA, US, (Corporation) 	


Are you the operator of this aircraft?
Interested in seeing when your aircraft is powered on and watching it taxi on a live surface map? FlightAware Global is the ultimate aviation toolkit for aircraft owners and operators.
Discover FlightAware Global
Show Features
Flight Times
Takeoff
02:15PM PDT
Landing
02:44PM PDT
Schurter 4301.1407 AC Power Entry Modules
FlightAware
Past Flight
Replay
Speed 16x
Loop Off
Aircraft Details
Aircraft Information
Tail Number N111NS · Registration
Owner COLUMBIA HELICOPTERS INC
Aircraft Type Beechcraft Super King Air 200 (twin-turboprop) (BE20)
Flight Data
Distance Actual: 89 mi
Are you the operator of this aircraft?
Interested in seeing when your aircraft is powered on and watching it taxi on a live surface map? FlightAware Global is the ultimate aviation toolkit for aircraft owners and operators.
Discover FlightAware Global
Show Features
Flight Times
Takeoff
12:30PM PDT
Landing
01:00PM PDT
FEED YOUR BEAR
bear naked
amazon fresh
Aircraft Details
Aircraft Information
Tail Number N186SL · Registration
Owner AEBOF LLC
Aircraft Type Cessna Citation CJ1 (twin-jet) (C525)

				
3.20	Jake Jacobs	Oregon Aviation Industries	Oregon airport master plans need to include electric aircraft charging and solar power generation plans www.ORAVI.org/VideoSummit2022	Thank you for your comment.
3.21	Pamela Weninger	Aurora Homeowner	I would like to know the regulations on providing waivers for overweight planes to use the airport runway?	Thank you for your comment.

Aurora State Airport
Master Plan Project



Planning Advisory Committee Meeting #3
Online Meeting
May 3, 2022

Agenda

Time	Topic
3:00-3:10	Introductions
3:10-3:30	Airport Master Plan Overview
3:30-4:40	Review of Draft Chapter 1 – Introduction Review of Draft Chapter 2 – Existing Conditions Review of Draft Chapter 3 – Aviation Activity Forecasts Clarifying Questions/Discussion
4:40-4:50	Project Website Overview: https://publicproject.net/AuroraAirport
4:50-5:00	Next Steps Public comments collected through the website

Introductions

Oregon Department of Aviation (ODAV)

Betty Stansbury
Director

Tony Beach
Airport Manager

John Wilson
Operations Specialist

Heather Peck
Planning & Project Manager
AMP Project Coordinator

Sarah Lucas
Aviation Planner

Cathy Clark
Planning & Projects Administrative Coordinator

Project Team

Agency Oversight & Funding

Airport Owner (Sponsor)

Planning & Engineering

Public Involvement

Cultural Resources

Archaeological Investigations Northwest, Inc.

Environmental Review

AGIS Survey

MAGYAR LAND SURVEYING LLC

PAC Members & Alternates

- Airport Users/Businesses/Organizations
- Airport Neighbors
- Local Municipalities
- Tribal Organizations
- State Agencies
- Local and Regional Non-Profit Groups
- Environmental / Land Use Groups

Organization	Name	Alternate
1000 Friends of Oregon	Roger Kaye	
AABC/TLM Holdings	Ted Millar	
Atlantic Aviation (formerly Lynx Aviation)	Bob Hala	
Aurora Air Traffic Control Tower (ATCT)	Raul Suarez	
Aurora Airport Improvement Association	Bruce Bennett	
Aurora Butteville Barlow Community Planning Organization	Ken Ivey	
Aurora CTE, Inc	Bill Graupp	
Charbonneau Country Club	Steve Switzer	
City of Aurora	Brian Asher	
City of Canby	Scott Archer	
City of Wilsonville	Charlotte Lehan	Chris Neamtzu
Clackamas County	Commissioner Tootie Smith	
Columbia Helicopters	Rob Roedts	Bob Buchanan
Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians	Robert Kentta	
Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde Community of Oregon	Cheryl Pouley	
Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon	Christian Nauer	
Deer Creek Estates HOA	Matt Williams	
Friends of French Prairie	Ben Williams	Wayne Richards
Helicopter Transport Service	Robert Fournier	
Life Flight Network	Ben Clayton	
Marion County	Commissioner Danielle Bethell	Matt Lawyer
Marion County Planning Department	Austin Barnes	Brandon Reich
Oregon Dept of Aviation	Tony Beach	
Oregon Dept of Aviation Board	Cathryn Stephens	
Oregon Dept of Transportation	Naomi Zwerdling	
Oregon Dept of Land Conservation and Development	Matt Crall	Nicole Mardell
Oregon Farm Bureau	Mary Anne Cooper	
Oregon Office of Emergency Management	Bill Martin	Sarah Puls
Positive Aurora Airport Management	Tony Helbling	
Regional Solutions	Jody Christensen	
Vans Aircraft	Rian Johnson	Greg Hughes
Willamette Aviation	David Waggoner	
Wilsonville Chamber of Commerce	Patrick Donaldson	Kevin Ferrasci O'Malley

PAC Meeting Guidelines

Meetings summaries will **include all comments along with responses/follow up**.

- Meeting **time for all committee members to speak**. **We have added more time for dialogue.**
- Comments on **non-agenda items** should be provided in writing.
- Committee members are encouraged to **provide comments at least three days before meetings** to allow members time to review and reflect on comments.


PAC Meeting Guidelines

As a committee, we agree to **approach this work with honesty, openness and willingness to work together**.

- This includes building trust and **assuming good intentions in others** and ensuring that our behavior supports a successful process.
- We will work with each other and staff to **address issues as they arise, utilize tools to ensure clear communication and robust participation, and meet the communication needs of members.**
- PAC members represent their organization, please keep your constituents informed of public meetings and project information.
- **We need all attendees to name/identify themselves.** Duplicates will be removed from the meeting.

Decision-Making

- **PAC** = Round table discussions and collection of committee member opinions at decision points. All opinions will be included in the meeting summary.
- **ODAV** = as the airport sponsor, will be the final decision-making authority. They will decide what is included in the Master Plan.
- **FAA** = reviews chapters of the Master Plan and has approval authority for the Aviation Activity Forecasts and the Airport Layout Plan.



Airport Master Plan Overview

Planning Process



Feedback Loop allows for the technical team and FAA to incorporate PAC and public comments

Project Meetings include PAC, stakeholder/focus groups, and public open houses

Project Schedule

Develop Understanding

Late 2021 – Early 2022

- Chapter 1 - Introduction
- Chapter 2 - Existing Conditions
- Chapter 3 - Aviation Activity Forecasts
  * FAA Forecast Review & Approval Point

Mid 2022 – End 2022

- AGIS Survey

Explore Solutions

Mid 2022 – End 2022

- Chapter 4 - Facility Goals and Requirements
- Chapter 5 - Airport Development Alternatives
  * To include Modification of Standards Analysis

Implementation

Early 2023

- Chapter 6 - Airport Layout Plan
  * FAA ALP Review & Approval Point
- Chapter 7 - Strategies & Actions, Capital Improvement Plan, and Financial Plan

Mid 2023

- Finalize Master Plan

Why are we doing an Airport Master Plan

The Airport Master Plan (AMP) and process is guided by the FAA and ultimately results in projections of future activity and the preparation of an Airport Layout Plan (ALP).

- FAA funding requirement
- Plan for the future
- Reflects current FAA airport design standards
- Updated ALP plans set
- Final AMP will replace prior planning



Note: AMPs are a 20-year document but are typically updated on a more frequent timeline as conditions change (often 7-10 years).

What is an Airport Master Plan?

An Airport Master Plan IS


- An existing facilities summary
- An outlook of future aviation activity
- A plan for facility improvements
- A planning-level budget for facility improvements
- A visual representation (ALP) of proposed facility improvements

An Airport Master Plan IS NOT

- A design/construction project
- Guarantee of proposed projects
- Environmental analysis
- County land use plan/action
- County transportation system plan

What Comes Following an Airport Master Plan

These are the steps to implement individual projects from the AMP:




Draft Chapter 1
Introduction

Draft Chapter 1 Includes:

- Project Funding
- Goals & Framework of the Airport Master Plan
- Project Schedule
- Public Involvement Process
- Planning Advisory Committee (PAC) Meetings



Common Questions & Responses



Question: Will a noise analysis be included in this AMP?

Response: Yes, this plan will include an analysis of noise exposure both for current traffic and forecast periods.

Question: Will the noise analysis include helicopters from off-airport properties (Columbia and HTS)?

Response: The noise analysis will not include the helicopter operations from off-airport properties.

Common Questions & Responses

Question: Will ODAV explore Part 139 Certification for Aurora State Airport?

Response: Part 139 Certification is not an objective of the AMP or ODAV.

https://www.faa.gov/airports/airport_safety/part139_cert/

Draft Chapter 2
Existing Conditions

Draft Chapter 2 Includes:

- Regional Setting
- Airside Elements
- Landside Elements
- Airport Administration



Note: Draft Working Paper #1 has been updated to reflect technical data revisions.

Common Questions & Responses



Question: Will the AMP address aviation fuel concerns (lead and chemicals)?

Response: There are ongoing nationwide efforts that the FAA, in coordination with the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), is undertaking to address leaded fuel use in aviation and also emissions from jet exhaust.

The opportunities to mitigate these issues are not within the scope of the AMP project.

More information is available at:

https://www.faa.gov/airports/environ mental/air_quality

Common Questions & Responses

Question: Can you explain the validity of the 2012 Airport Master Plan (AMP)?

Response: The 2012 AMP and Airport Layout Plan (ALP) were approved by FAA and therefore is the current planning document on record.

Draft Chapter 3
Aviation Activity Forecasts

Draft Chapter 3 Includes:

- Introduction and Overview
- Key Activity Elements
- National General Aviation Activity Trends
- Recent Events Summary
- Current Aviation Activity
- 2021-2041 Aviation Activity Forecasts
- Operational Peaks
- Design Aircraft
- Military Activity
- Air Taxi Activity
- Forecast Summary



Note: Draft Working Paper #1 has been updated to reflect technical data revisions.

Common Questions & Responses

Question: If this a “New” AMP why are you using old data?

Response: Current planning includes updated best available data with FAA approved methodology.

New forecasts reflect current conditions and include updated data that are independent of previous forecasts.

Common Questions & Responses

Question: Who approves and makes the decisions on what you can build at the airport?

Response: Marion County is the governing land use jurisdiction for the Aurora State Airport and issues building permits.

ODAV reviews and approves on-airport leases and through-the-fence access agreements.

Common Questions & Responses

Question: How many airplanes operating at Aurora State Airport require special permission to land due to heavier weight?

Response: ODAV requires an overweight waiver for aircraft that exceed the runway's weight-bearing capacity.

As an operator of public-use airports, ODAV tries to accommodate pilots and aircraft that can safely operate at our airports and are consistent with the design standards for the size and configurations of our airfields. In some cases, these aircraft exceed our published weight bearing capacities. ODAV, like all airport operators, may allow or restrict overweight aircraft operations to balance meeting the needs of our local communities and preventing excessive pavement stress or damage.

There currently is one based aircraft that has a waiver and ODAV issued five waivers to transient operators in 2021.


Common Questions & Responses

Question: How many aircraft operating out of Aurora State Airport are considered constrained?

Response: This information will be discussed as part of Chapter 4 – Facility Goals and Requirements

Clarifying Questions?
Discussion

Project Website Overview



As required by the FAA, the Airport Master Plan will provide specific guidance in making the improvements necessary to maintain a safe and efficient airport that is economically, environmentally, and socially sustainable. The Airport Master Plan will also:

- Define the current, short-term and long-term needs of the Airport through a comprehensive evaluation of facilities, conditions and FAA airport planning and design standards.
- Look at what is happening around the airport that could affect the future plans, development and operation of the airport such as land use, transportation, environmental, economic development, etc.

https://publicproject.net/AuroraAirport

Next Steps

Next Steps



- FAA will review draft Working Paper #1 and input provided from the PAC
  * Working Paper #1 has been updated to include technical revisions based on input provided by the PAC will be uploaded to the Project Website and submitted to FAA.
- FAA will provide review comments to Working Paper #1
- Planning team works to obtain FAA forecast approval
- PAC meeting #4 date will be scheduled following FAA forecast approval
- Preparation of a draft Chapter 4 – Facility Goals and Requirements
- Open house #2 will be scheduled in July/August

Thank You

Heather Peck – ODAV

Sarah Lucas – ODAV

Brandy Steffen – JLA Public Involvement

David Miller – Century West Engineering

Project Website: https://publicproject.net/AuroraAirport

PAC Working Session #2 – November 15, 2022

Link to Register

Aurora State Airport

AIRPORT MASTER PLAN PUBLIC MEETING



Planning Advisory Committee (PAC) Working Session

Tuesday, November 15, 2022
PAC Working Session from 3:00pm – 5:00pm

Webinar (via Zoom) or Join by Phone
Airport planning work products and registration links for the virtual PAC Meeting at: https://publicproject.net/AuroraAirport

In a continued effort to make these meetings available to all who are interested and for scheduling purposes, the upcoming PAC Working Session will be held virtually via telephone and internet through Zoom. These meetings provide an opportunity for the PAC, community, neighbors, and other project stakeholders to participate in the public meeting and Master Plan project and be able learn about the project and materials and working papers.

For Additional Information Contact:
Brandon Pike, Aviation Planner
Oregon Department of Aviation (ODAV)
503-378-2217
brandon.pike@odav.oregon.gov

Special accommodations are available upon request (with 48 hours notice)

AURORA STATE AIRPORT

AIRPORT MASTER PLAN

PAC WORKING SESSION 2 AGENDA

Date/Time: November 15, 2022 from 3:00-5:00 pm
Location: Zoom Webinar

Meeting Goals: *Review FAA comments on the existing conditions and preliminary forecasts (Working Paper No. 1) and the technical team's responses.*

The technical team will be answering questions about the responses. No new information will be presented during this working session.

Time	Topic	Person	Notes
3:00-3:10 pm	Introductions	Brandy Steffen and Brandon Pike	
3:10-4:30 pm	Review of FAA comments and responses	David Miller	• Comments from FAA and responses/proposed revisions for each chapter ○ Chapter 1 – no comments from FAA ○ Chapter 2 – mostly clarifying questions/comments about data collection ○ Chapter 3 – questions from FAA regarding data analysis
4:30-4:50 pm	Next Steps	Samantha Peterson	• FAA forecast approval • Timing for next PAC meeting
4:50-5:00 pm	Public Comments	Brandy Steffen	• Anyone in attendance may have up to 2 minutes to speak. • We may not be able to hear from everyone. • We always will take comments via the website, which will be included in the meeting notes and shared with the PAC members: https://publicproject.net/AuroraAirport# • A meeting summary with all PAC and public comments will be posted to the project website within two weeks.

AURORA STATE AIRPORT

AIRPORT MASTER PLAN
PLANNING ADVISORY COMMITTEE (PAC)
WORKING SESSION #2 SUMMARY

Date: Tuesday, November 15, 2022
Time: 3:00-5:00 pm
Location: Zoom Webinar

In Attendance

PAC Members Present

Ted Millar, *AABC/TLM Holdings*
Bruce Bennett, *Aurora Airport Improvement Association*
Bill Graupp, *Aurora CTE, Inc*
Chris Neamtzu, *City of Wilsonville*
Ben Williams, *Friends of French Prairie*
Austin Barnes, *Marion County Planning Dept.*
Naomi Zwerdling, *Oregon Dept of Transportation*
Sarah Lucas, *Oregon Dept of Aviation (ODAV) Board*
Matt Crall, *Oregon Dept of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD)*
Sarah Puls, *Oregon Dept. of Emergency Management (OEM)*
Tony Helbling, *Positive Aurora Airport Management*
Patrick Donaldson, *Wilsonville Chamber of Commerce*

PAC Members Absent

Roger Kaye, *1000 Friends of Oregon*
Bob Hala, *Atlantic Aviation*
Ken Ivey, *Aurora Butteville Barlow Community Planning Organization*
Raul Suarez, *Aurora Air Traffic Control*
Steve Switzer, *Charbonneau Country Club*
Brian Asher, *City of Aurora*
Scott Archer, *City of Canby*
Councilor Charlotte Lehan, *City of Wilsonville*
Commissioner Tootie Smith, *Clackamas County*
Bob Buchanan, Alternate, *Columbia Helicopters*
Cheryl Pouley, *Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde Community of Oregon*
Robert Kentta, *Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians*
Christian Nauer, *Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon*
Rob Roedts, *Columbia Helicopters*
Matt Williams, *Deer Creek Estates HOA*
Commissioner Danielle Bethel, *Marion County*
Robert Fournier, *Helicopter Transport Service*
Ben Clayton, *Life Flight Network*
Jody Christensen, *Regional Solutions*
Rian Johnson, *Vans Aircraft*
David Waggoner, *Willamette Aviation*

Agency Representatives

Heather Peck, *Oregon Dept of Aviation (ODAV)*
Brandon Pike, *Oregon Dept of Aviation (ODAV)*
Holly Herrera, *Oregon Dept of Aviation (ODAV)*
Tony Beach, *Oregon Dept of Aviation (ODAV)*
Tim House, *Federal Aviation Administration (FAA)*

Staff and Consultants

Samantha Peterson, *Century West*
David Miller, *Century West*
Mike Dane, *Century West*

Mark Steele, *Century West*
Brandy Steffen, *JLA Public Involvement*
Jen Winslow, *JLA Public Involvement*

Audience / Members of the Public
Andria Abrahamson
Melissa Ahrens
Kaelyn Cassidy
Aron Faegre
Tom Herzog
James Kirby
Shane Jundt
Greg Leo
Jeff Lewis
Lori Loen
Joe Mollahan
Peter Murphy
Theresa O'Doherty
Mark Ottenad
Brad Schuster
NC Snyder
John Wilson

Overview

The meeting goals are to review Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) comments on the existing conditions and preliminary forecasts (Working Paper No. 1) and the technical team's responses. The technical team answered questions about the responses (shown in tables at the end of the document). No new information was presented during this working session.

Welcome and Introductions

Brandy Steffen, JLA Public Involvement, welcomed everyone to the meeting and reviewed the agenda and basic Zoom meeting tips and etiquette. No new information would be discussed during the meeting. **Heather Peck, Oregon Department of Aviation (ODAV),** introduced **Brandon Pike** and **Holly Herrera** as new members of the **ODAV project team** and noted that **Sarah Lucas** joined the ODAV Board.

Brandy mentioned that there had previously been three PAC meetings and one PAC working session in addition to the current meeting and gave a brief overview of what those meetings entailed. All questions could be added to the chat or Q&A section.

Review of FAA Comments and Responses

David Miller, Century West, presented a summary of the FAA responses. The FAA review for the Airport Master Plan (AMP) occurred in three levels: through the Seattle Airport's district office, the regional office, and FAA headquarters. *The full FAA memo responses are posted on the project website.*

Draft Chapter 1

There were no FAA comments for Chapter 1.

Draft Chapter 2

David overviewed the Century West responses to the FAA comments for Draft Chapter 2.

Brandy asked if the PAC had any clarifying questions or comments about the information provided:

- **Tony Helbling**, *Positive Aurora Airport Management*: Was your overall impression that Ben Mello/FAA were satisfied?
    - **David Miller***:* We had meetings to walk through the comments and ensure we were all on the same page. We were able to acknowledge all FAA comments with no issue and are not expecting any additional issues. Most of the comments were about adding more context and information. All comments from the PAC and public were responded to by Century West and then submitted to the FAA for additional information. We have not received any indication of concurrence from the FAA on our responses to their comments but anticipate that will happen in the near future.
- **Tim House**, *FAA:* I've been trying to get caught up in my short time at the FAA. It's my priority to go through these comments and get them approved so we can move forward with the forecasts.

Draft Chapter 3

David overviewed the responses to the FAA comments for Draft Chapter 3 (available on the project website). Which included FAA agreeing that the overall detail and methodologies used meet the expectations of an Airport Master Plan of Aurora's size and complexity.

Brandy asked if the PAC had any clarifying questions or comments about the information provided:

- **Bruce Bennett,** *Aurora Airport Improvement Association*: Would it be too big of a project to count after hours operations? There are 10 hours not being recorded, but the airport is still in operation. Can we add a counting device for a week, or something like that?
    - **Heather Peck,** *ODAV:* We will need to get back to Bruce, but the FAA will have to respond to this as well.
    - **David Miller:** When we estimated the off-hour accounts, we typically don't see a lot of nighttime flight training. Instrument flight plan data distribution from time of day also gave us a sense of how much activity was occurring while the tower was closed. We factored that into our accounts. We are not sure if the FAA thinks this is significant enough.
        - **David Miller** (near the end of the meeting): I went back and wanted to put some context into this. There may be differing opinions about the volume, but based on our methodologies, we estimated a total of 6.4% off hours traffic for the airport in addition to captured traffic.
    - **Heather Peck:** This isn't new for Aurora. This happens at other towered airports that aren't operating 24 hours a day.
- **Ted Millar,** *AABC/TLM Holdings***:** My hangar is behind the Atlantic Fueling operation, and there is often after hour traffic such as business and Life Flight. Because fuel was expensive, some operators will take off after hours to go to a cheaper fuel source. These are good indications of after hour activity, but I don't know how you would count that.

Brandy reiterated that the group can always add comments on the project website. *Full comments and responses are provided at the end of the document.*

Public Comments

There were no oral public comments.

Next Steps

Samantha Peterson, Century West, explained that the project team is trying to be responsive to the PAC and public while waiting for FAA review and forecast approval to move forward. Once that is received, a schedule update will be provided to look at upcoming working papers and meeting dates.

The next PAC meeting will happen after the New Year, based on the timing of drafts preparations for the facility requirements chapter, as well as modification of standards and runway protection zone analysis. Timing for the next PAC meeting requires 30 days for public notice and advertising purposes, as well as to address transparency and requests from the public/PAC members.

Brandy thanked everyone for attending and closed the meeting. The meeting recording and summary will be posted to the project website.

Questions/Comments and Responses from the PAC[1]

ID	Name	Affiliation	Question/Comment	Response
WS2.1	**Patrick Donaldson**	*Wilsonville Chamber of Commerce*	Can you direct us to a study or studies that show a correlation between hangar construction and increased traffic at an airport?	**David Miller:** There may be some studies, but I was referring to my own observations at airports all over the country. When airports have no activity in terms of development construction (such as hangars), the flight activity tends to be relatively flat. Pilots looking for airports with hangars will go to airports with hangars.
WS2.2	**Tony Helbling**	*Positive Aurora Airport Management*	Hats off to David - details, details, details.	Thank you for your comment.
WS2.3	**Patrick Donaldson**	*Wilsonville Chamber of Commerce*	So, replacement hangars and hangars built for existing aircraft don't actually increase air traffic? So, the comment that hangar construction increases flights is not factual but rather anecdotal?	**David Miller:** Newer, larger, conventional hangars were built on the south end on private land, and the owner changed building types. Our impression is that they were focusing on particular segments of the market and there could have been some loss there due to sizes. I think the airport is at 36 jet aircraft, which is a significant increase over prior years and would typically come with construction of that conventional type of hangar. Generally, airports who do not have

[1] Live responses are included, along with additional information/clarification, as needed.

				hangar construction are not experiencing that type of growth.
WS2.4	**Tony Helbling**	*Positive Aurora Airport Management*	Was your overall impression that Ben Mello/FAA were satisfied?	**David Miller:** We had meetings to walk through the comments and ensure we were all on the same page. We were able to acknowledge all FAA comments with no issue and are not expecting any additional issues. Most of the comments were about adding more context and information. All comments from the PAC and public were responded to by Century West and then submitted to the FAA for additional information. We have not received any indication of concurrence from the FAA on our responses to their comments but anticipate that will happen in the near future.
WS2.5	**Tim House**	*FAA*	I've been trying to get caught up in my short time at the FAA. It's my priority to go through these comments and get them approved so we can move forward with the forecasts.	Thank you.
WS2.6	**Bruce Bennett**	*Aurora Airport Improvement Association*	Would it be too big of a project to count after hours operations? There are 10 hours not being recorded, but the airport is still in operation. Can we add a counting device for a week, or something like that?	**Heather Peck**: The FAA will have to respond to this as well. **David Miller:** When we estimated the off-hour accounts, we typically don't see a lot of nighttime flight training. Instrument flight plan data distribution from time of day also gave us a sense of how much activity was occurring while the tower was closed. We factored that into our accounts. We are not sure if the FAA thinks this is significant enough. **David Miller** (near the end of the meeting): I went back and wanted to put some context into this. There may be differing opinions about the volume, but based on our methodologies, we estimated a total of 6.4% off hours traffic for the airport in addition to captured traffic. **Heather Peck:** This isn't new for Aurora. This happens at other

				towered airports that aren't operating 24 hours a day.
WS2.7	**Ted Millar**	*AABC/TLM Holdings*	My hangar is behind the Atlantic Fueling operation, and there is often after hour traffic such as business and Life Flight. Because fuel was expensive, some operators will take off after hours to go to a cheaper fuel source. These are good indications of after hour activity, but I don't know how you would count that.	Thank you for your comment.

Public Comment

Verbal and written comments in the Zoom chat.

ID	Name	Affiliation	Question/Comment	Response
WS2.8	**Mark Ottenad**	*City of Wilsonville*	Are more PAC members present than are shown on the Zoom screen? 10 total participants are shown: 6 agency/consultants and 4 PAC members. No list of participants per se.	All participants should be listed though not everyone chooses to be on camera.
WS2.9	**Melissa Ahrens**	*Mid-Willamette Valley Regional Representative for DLCD*	I am attending along with Matt Crall as Mid-Willamette Valley Regional Representative for DLCD, thanks for having me.	**Heather Peck:** Thank you for being here.
WS2.10	**Jeff Lewis**		Regarding airport development (e.g., hangar construction)... is it possible to split the data, to clearly define on ODAV land vs off (through the fence, TTF)? Is there value in helping citizens and stakeholders to see this split in the data?	If this is related to the breakdown of hangar construction provided in Table 3.3, removal of older hangars has occurred. Approximately 80% of this activity occurred off airport property (TTF) and 20% on airport property.
WS2.11	**Jeff Lewis**		Why are we relying on ATC observations to guesstimate flight training ops figures? That seems incredibly inaccurate. Why are we not getting cooperation from flight schools, with precise data? Their aircraft and their students all log all flight activities; their money comes from scheduling aircraft rentals, so the data DOES exist and is sharable.	Pattern-related flight training activity at UAO is captured in (local) operations counts by the ATCT. The UAO ATCT manager confirms that recorded local operations include aircraft performing repetitive circuits in the traffic pattern and the majority of this is attributed to flight training. Beyond the "local" and "itinerant" groupings of aircraft operations recorded by ATCT, there are no addition data that define flight

				training aircraft operations at UAO. The ATCT manager estimate of overall flight training activity as a percentage of total aircraft operations is used to approximate this activity, however, the underlying data is based on actual ATCT counts and the adjustment for activity when the ATCT is closed.
WS2.12	**Jeff Lewis**		Maybe my memory fails and the data is split, but is there any reason we cannot split the data, on ODAV vs TTF, for based aircraft? Is it possible to be a lot more detailed and precise, as in earlier Master Plans, with a concise table showing land parcel ownership, number and type of aircraft on that parcel, etc.?	We are not sure what section this comment is for. Table 3-5 provides the on-airport and TTF breakdown by aircraft type for based aircraft fleet.
WS2.13	**Jeff Lewis**		Regarding 'Airport Ops ' vs Tower ops', is it not true that tower controllers count all HTS and Columbia helo departures and arrivals as 'overflights'? Thus, these counts are incorporated into the overflight statistic?	We are using the OPSNET “Airport Operations” tool to pull the operations numbers. These counts do not include overflights. Per the OPSNET documentation (https://aspm.faa.gov/aspmhelp/index/Operations_Network_%28OPSNET%29.html): “Airport Operations are arrivals and departures at an airport. The Airport Operation Count is a measure of activity at FAA-funded airports, including Federal Contract Towers (FTC). This activity reports IFR itinerant and VFR itinerant operations (arrivals and departures), and local operations at the airport as reported by Air Traffic Control Towers (ATCTs). It does not include overflights.” Furthermore, the ATCT Manager has confirmed that HTS and Columbia Helicopter operations are not counted as overflights, but instead included in UAO’s operations count. The OPSNET Airport Operations numbers were adjusted to remove HTS/Columbia activity from UAO’s total as described in Chapter 2.
WS2.14	**Jeff Lewis**		Is it true forecasts are predicated largely on actual measured data	The use of ATCT aircraft operations data, with the off-hours adjustment

			(current statistics)? With that in mind, are our actual data and forecasts going to be lots more reliable, if ODAV were to put an on-airport manager at KUAO, ASAP, at least a few days per week (preferably Sat, Sun and a couple other weekdays)?	provides adequate definition of current air traffic (far more accurate than previous plans that were developed based exclusively on estimates). The FAA-approved scope of work for this master plan does not include additional on-site air traffic data collection/monitoring. Future activity models (forecasts) are built from 2021 baseline activity using a variety of methodologies acceptable to FAA for general aviation airport master planning.
WS2.15	**Jeff Lewis**		Regarding the 'Based Aircraft' metric, how is it possible for ODAV to confidently know, when the large majority of 'parking' is Through The Fence? Is it not true that, especially with a larger TTF box hangar, all sorts of unregistered tenants could exist, unbeknownst to the good folks at ODAV?	The ODAV UAO Airport Manager conducted a thorough review and update of the FAA based aircraft inventory database for UAO, including both on-airport and TTF aircraft. All authorized TTF users operate under formal access agreements, with reporting to ODAV.
WS2.16	**Jeff Lewis**		Is it acceptable, within the Master Plan, for the contractor and ODAV to just state they have no real idea what the figures are, no confidence, and get FAA to just say 'OK' to that? Would citizens and stakeholders have a better understanding of the reality of KUAO, if this was done?	The airport master plan uses best available data. As noted in Working Paper 1, the addition of the ATCT since the last master plan was completed significantly increases the reliability of aircraft operations counts over previous estimates. Improvements in the FAA's national based aircraft inventory database and the specific changes recommended for UAO (e.g., excluding helicopters located at adjacent private heliports that were previously included in the UAO counts), has also improved the accuracy of based aircraft counts.
WS2.17	**Jeff Lewis**		Regarding CWE suggesting we find it reasonable to rely on FAA forecasts like TAF. Um, how have those forecasts worked over the past 50 years? Is it true TAF has a horrible track record? Is it also true that, on a national level, GA has dropped precipitously, even commercial ops at places like KPDX are a fraction of past TAF forecasts?	**FAA:** The TAF is one of the factors utilized in determining the overall forecast. **Century West**: The recommendation to use the FAA TAF Oregon Contract Tower Model provides an average annual growth rate of 1.1% over the 20-year forecast. This growth rate exceeds the FAA's national aerospace forecast GA fleet model's annual growth (0.2%) and is more

				consistent with historical activity and future market growth potential at UAO. The underlying assumption is that the group of (similar) Oregon airports with contract ATCTs provide a better forward-looking gauge of activity than national or individual TAF projections. The recommended annual aircraft operations forecast model is not based on the TAF.
WS2.18	**Jeff Lewis**		Re TFMSC data, two questions: (1) if a pilot files an IFR flight plan but does not activate, is that filed flight plan definitively in or out of the eventual TFMSC dataset (i.e., are unactivated IFR flight plans fully purged from the TFMS, so they do not provide false data)? And (2) can the FOIA's dataset be provided to the public, for validating analysis; perhaps as an appendix or supplement to the Master Plan or PAC process?	Our understanding is that a cancelled flight plan would not appear in the ERAM and would not be counted in the TFMSC data. Per TFMSC Manual: "TFMSC source data are created when pilots file flight plans and/or when flights are detected by the National Airspace System (NAS), usually via RADAR. TFMSC records are assembled by the FAA NAS Data Warehouse by combining electronic messages transmitted to the En Route Modernization Automation Modernization (ERAM) system for each flight into a complete record of that flight."
WS2.19	**Jeff Lewis**		Would the allegedly unsustainable ops growth rate actually be sustainable, if our data on based aircraft was flawed and seriously understating how many aircraft and pilots are now based at KUAO, a few on airport but mostly TTF where most new hangars are going in?	Not sure what section this comment is for. The aircraft operations counts are adequately captured by ATCT, with a small adjustment for off-hours and non-airport helicopter operations. The current based aircraft count has been accepted by FAA in the based aircraft inventory. However, if unreported aircraft are located off airport, their runway movements are captured by ATCT.
WS2.20	**Jeff Lewis**		Has FAA or anyone produced real data showing the possibility that flight training increased during the pandemic? Is it plausible to say social distancing was never realistically enforced within the context of flight training? ...and, if training ops went up starting a few months into 2020 (when people could not go to work, had more spare	**FAA:** We are not aware of any studies that have addressed this issue. **Century West:** The ATCT local aircraft operations counts for UAO provide the best documentation of flight training increases experienced in 2020 and 2021. Anecdotally, local flight training operators confirm that a surge occurred during this period

			time, and maybe had some stimulus cash), would we not also expect this temporary increase to normalize downward after the pandemic abates and stimulus ends?	and that flight training activity has since slowed from the 'pandemic' peaks.
WS2.21	**Jeff Lewis**		Why does it matter (if at all) that Ben Mello told David Miller he was relaying some questions from others? Isn't it true, when the questions were created, Ben Mello was the FAA point of contact for reviewing this Master Plan draft? As such, don't we all recognize the simplicity of his name on all questions, even some that others may have made to him (that he is thus relaying) without any concern the question may have originated from someone other than p.o.c. Ben Mello?	Ben Mello was the FAA Seattle Airports District Office point of contact for this project and all comments provided by FAA for Working Paper 1 are consolidated in his response.
WS2.22	**Jeff Lewis**		Is it true that tower open hours can be expanded, and that there is a methodology for collecting data to make this decision?	**FAA:** The UAO tower is a contract tower. The office of Airports is not consulted on these matters. **Century West:** An evaluation of the criteria used by FAA to define operating hours of FAA-staffed and contract ATCTs is not in the master plan scope of work.

Written Public Comment

Comments received before or after the meeting via email or letter.

ID	Name	Affiliation	Question/Comment	Response
WS2.23	**Jeff Lewis**		Email sent for public record	Thank you for your comment.

PAC Meeting #4 – March 12, 2024

Oregon Department of Aviation to host Planning Advisory Committee (PAC) Meeting about the future of the Aurora State Airport

Contact: Oregon Department of Aviation
Alex Thomas | ODAV Planning & Programs Manager
Email: Alex.R.Thomas@odav.oregon.gov

More information: Aurora State Airport Master Plan (https://publicproject.net/AuroraAirport)

(February 2, 2024)

On Tuesday, March 12, 2024, the Oregon Department of Aviation (ODAV) will hold an online Planning Advisory Committee (PAC) Meeting. These meetings provide information for stakeholders, community members, and PAC members to learn more about the Airport Master Plan Project.

The Airport Master Plan will create a blueprint for the future development of the airport. The PAC meeting will include a review of Working Paper 1 and the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) approved forecast. There will be 10 minutes for public comments at the end of the meeting.

Accessible Meeting Information

Special accommodations are available upon advanced request. Please contact Alex Thompson at least 48 hours prior to the event to discuss specific needs.

When: Tuesday, March 12, 2024 from 5 – 7 p.m.

Where: Zoom Webinar or Join by Phone

Please register and join the virtual **PAC meeting** by visiting:

https://publicproject.net/AuroraAirport on the "Public Meetings Page"

About the project

An Airport Master Plan is a facility planning study that represents an airport's "blueprint" or plan for long-term, mid-range and short-term development on the airport. As required by the Federal Aviation Administration, the Aurora State Airport Master Plan will provide specific guidance in making the improvements necessary to maintain a safe and efficient airport that is economically, environmentally, and socially sustainable. The Airport Master Plan will define the needs of the Airport through a comprehensive evaluation of facilities, conditions, and federal airport planning and design standards. It will also consider what is happening around the Airport that could affect the future plans, development, and operation of the Airport.

###

NOTICE OF A MEETING
FOR THE AURORA STATE AIRPORT
Airport Master Plan Project

Notice is hereby given that the Oregon Department of Aviation (ODAV) will hold an online (via Zoom) Public Planning Advisory Committee (PAC) meeting.

When: Tuesday, March 12, 2024
5:00 p.m. - 7:00 p.m.

Where: Join by phone or virtually (via Zoom)
Please register and join the virtual **PAC meeting** by visiting:
https://publicproject.net/AuroraAirport

This meeting will provide an opportunity for the PAC and project stakeholders to review Working Paper 1, approved forecast, and learn about the Airport Master Plan project. For copies of the airport planning work products, please visit: https://publicproject.net/AuroraAirport

Accessible Meeting Information
Special accommodations are available upon advanced request. Please contact Alex Thomas at least 48 hours prior to the event to discuss specific needs.

For airport questions or project information, please contact Alex Thomas, ODAV Planning & Programs Manager, through the following means: Email: Alex.R.Thomas@odav.oregon.gov

AURORA STATE AIRPORT

AIRPORT MASTER PLAN

PAC MEETING #4 AGENDA

Date/Time: March 12, 2024, from 5:00-7:00 pm
Location: Zoom Webinar; register at: bit.ly/UAOAMP-PAC4

Meeting Goals: Review project, Working Paper #1, and Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) approved forecast.

Time	Topic	Person
5:00-5:25 pm	**Introductions** • Agenda • Introductions • Meeting guidelines	Brandy Steffen
5:25-5:35 pm	**Overview** • What a typical AMP includes • Schedule and process	David Miller
5:35-6:05 pm	**Review Working Paper #1 and Discussion** • What was covered • Comments that were collected • ODAV/FAA responses	David Miller and Tim House (FAA)
6:05-6:45 pm	**FAA Approved Forecast** • Review the FAA Approved Forecast • Questions/clarification	David Miller
6:45-6:55 pm	**Public Comments**	Brandy Steffen
6:55-7:00 pm	**Next Steps** • Schedule • Next PAC meeting	Brandy Steffen

A meeting summary with all PAC and public comments will be posted to the project website within two weeks.

We always will take comments via the website, which will be included in the meeting notes and shared with the PAC members: https://publicproject.net/AuroraAirport#

AURORA STATE AIRPORT

PLANNING ADVISORY COMMITTEE (PAC)
MEETING #4 SUMMARY

Date: Tuesday, March 12, 2024
Time: 5:00-7:00 pm
Location: Zoom Webinar

In Attendance

PAC Members Present

Aron Faegre, *alternate, AABC/TLM Holdings*
Ben Williams, *Friends of French Prairie*
Beth Wytoski, *Regional Solutions*
Bruce Bennett, *Aurora Airport Improvement Association*
Councilor Joann Linville, *City of Wilsonville*
David Waggoner, *Willamette Aviation*
Jeff Baymor, *Charbonneau Country Club*
Ken Ivey, *Aurora Butteville Barlow Community Planning Organization*
Matt Crall, *Oregon Dept of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD)*
Matt Lawyer, *alternate, Marion County*
Melissa Ahrens*, alternate, Oregon Dept of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD)*
Naomi Zwerdling, *Oregon Dept of Transportation*
Patrick Donaldson, *Wilsonville Chamber of Commerce*
Sarah Puls, Alternate, *Oregon Office of Emergency Management*
Tony Helbling, *Positive Aurora Airport Management*

PAC Members Absent

Trent Brownlee, *Atlantic Aviation*
Austin Barnes, *Marion County Planning Dept.*
Ben Clayton, *Life Flight Network*
Bill Graupp, *Aurora CTE, Inc*
Bill Martin, *Oregon Office of Emergency Management*

PAC Members Absent Continued

Cathryn Stephens, *ODAV Board*
Bob Buchanan, Alternate, *Columbia Helicopters*
Brandon Reich, Alternate, *Marion County Planning Dept.*
Brian Asher, *City of Aurora*
Cheryl Pouley, *Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde Community of Oregon*
Commissioner Danielle Bethel, *Marion County*
Commissioner Tootie Smith, *Clackamas County*
Greg Hughes, Alternate, *Vans Aircraft*
Matt Williams, *Deer Creek Estates HOA*
Pam Barlow Lind, *Confederated Tribes of the Siletz Indians*
Raul Suarez, *Aurora Air Traffic Control Reservation of Oregon*
Rian Johnson, *Vans Aircraft*
Rob Roedts, *Columbia Helicopters*
Robert Fournier, *Helicopter Transport Service*
Roger Kaye, *1000 Friends of Oregon*
Ted Millar, *AABC/TLM Holdings*
Wayne Richards, Alternate, *Friends of the French Prairie*

Agency Representatives

Kenji Sugahara, *ODAV*
Alex Thomas, *ODAV*
Tony Beach, *ODAV*
Brandon Pike, *ODAV*

Tim House, *FAA*

Staff and Consultants

Matt Rogers, *Century West*
David Miller, *Century West*
Mike Dane, *Century West*
Samantha Peterson, *Century West*
Mark Steele, *Century West*
James Kirby*, Century West*

Brandy Steffen*, JLA Public Involvement*
Jen Winslow*, JLA Public Involvement*

Audience / Members of the Public

Bill Poehler
Bruce Bergman
Brad Schuster
Chris Neamtzu
George Van Hoomissen
Jeff Lewis
Jerry Johnson
Joseph Scheafer
Kip Morris
Krista Kroiss
Mark Ottenad
Neal White
Pam Lind
Peter Shikli
Rayna Jenks
Shannon Colebank

Overview

The meeting goals were to review the project status, Working Paper #1, Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) approved forecast, and ensure that the Committee members had time to talk and learn about the materials. *The presentation, FAQs, meeting recording and other materials are posted on the website (publicproject.net/AuroraAirport).*

Welcome and Introductions

Brandy Steffen, JLA Public Involvement, welcomed everyone to the meeting and reviewed the agenda and Zoom meeting tips and etiquette. She reminded Committee Members of their roles and responsibilities. Brandy briefly reviewed the Planning Advisory Committee (PAC) meeting guidelines, who makes decisions within the project, and current project schedule. She thanked the PAC for their time on the project. **Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation (ODAV),** introduced ODAV staff and **Kenji Sugahara, ODAV,** introduced himself and thanked the group for their participation. **Alex Thomas, ODAV** was introduced as the new Planning and Programs Manager.

Presentation

David Miller, Century West, gave a broad overview of airport master planning and the contents of Working Paper #1. He highlighted that FAA has completed their review and has approved the forecasts. He reminded the PAC that an Airport Master Plan (AMP) is an FAA requirement that helps ODAV plan for the future of the Airport, reflects current FAA airport design standards, updates the Airport Layout Plan (ALP), and replaces prior planning. After the AMP is completed there will be additional planning, funding alignments, environmental review, design, and potentially construction for individual master plan projects. David added that the Working

Paper is draft until finalized at the end of the project. Additional information can be added to the chapters as needed. An updated project schedule was shared with the PAC.

Tim House, Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), explained the process used to approve forecasts and why this process took an extended period of time. The FAA approved forecasts will be used in all subsequent analyses.

David reviewed the FAA approved forecast summary, which showed moderately increasing operations over the next 20 years. Based aircraft are projected to decline, which is comparable to other airports of a similar size and aligns with the FAA's national expectations. He shared characteristics of design aircraft used in the FAA approved forecast.

PAC Questions and Comments

Brandy opened the PAC question and comment agenda item. *Full comments, along with responses are provided in the table below.*

Public Comment

Brandy opened the public comment section of the meeting. Each person had two minutes to speak.

- There were no verbal public comments at this meeting.
- There were several written comments collected during the meeting from the meeting chat *(see table below).*

Next Steps

Brandy reminded the group that the next PAC meeting will be held April 30, 2024, when they will review Chapter 4 which defines the on-airport facility needs. Brandy thanked everyone for attending and closed the meeting.

PAC Member Questions/Comments and Responses[1]

ID	Name	Affiliation	Question/Comment	Response
4.1	**Councilor Joann Linville**	*City of Wilsonville*	I have some questions related to Chapter 2. The Working Paper reviews other airports in the Willamette Valley area, but it doesn't conduct an alternatives analysis of the capacities of these airports, such as runway lengths and emergency services. Why wasn't the alternatives analysis done? It would be helpful to see	Many questions and answers are listed on the website's FAQ page. This project is an airport master plan specific to the Aurora State Airport property. Alternatives for the Aurora State Airport property will be evaluated in Chapter 5 of the Working Paper. An alternative evaluation for other airports is outside the scope of this project.

[1] Live responses are included from David Miller (CWE), Tim House (FAA), and ODAV staff, along with additional information/clarification, as needed.

			how it relates to Aurora Airport. Has there been seismic impact analysis specific to liquefaction done south of the airport? Why was this not included in this iteration of the working documents?	
4.2	**Ben Williams**	*Friends of French Prairie*	David had statements about forecasted growth and models. I would like clarification about the selection process for the forecast models, and how one model was justified vs. the others. What data and criteria were used? Very little appears in draft Chapter 3 specific to the forecast model section.	I would refer to the Working Paper and Tim can weigh in about the recommended models. We worked through a variety of methods with the FAA to find the most reliable option. Response to Friends of French Prairie's written comments (Referenced below in item 4.13).
4.3	**Councilor Joann Linville**	*City of Wilsonville*	What is C-II and D level aircraft? Does this change where we are now in terms of size of aircraft size and weight, and what the runway can handle? Are the D level design aircraft using the airport because they have been given waivers to do so? It seems they are beyond what is approved for this (airport).	The C-II is not a change from the last FAA approved master plan and is the same type of activity. The approach category D reflects a difference in approach speed for different types of jet aircraft. Design aircraft C-II does not preclude use by those approach category D aircraft. It's a distinction in terms of volume of traffic. The airport runway is designated as C-II because it does not have enough current or forecasted D-II operations. Aircraft weight is a facility requirement evaluated in the next chapter with a recommendation to compare the current pavement strength. The C and D aircraft are referenced in the chapter because they are currently in operation at the Airport, and we expect them to continue. When FAA defines its design standards, C and D aircraft are combined into one group and the same standards are used for both. Looking at the design aircraft operations in the Working Paper, there were 500 operations (take-offs or landings) of the C or D aircraft, with the minimum level being C. There were not 500 operations of C-II aircraft. There were 500 by C and above,

				and 500 by ADG II and above. A C-I aircraft counts toward the C category. Hypothetically, a B-III would count toward the ADG II category. The D aircraft get counted into the C-II classification. There is no waiver granted for a D, but a D-II, which is just faster than a B or C aircraft, can operate at the airport when the conditions are right. Pavement condition strength is another factor. We're seeing a lot of newer jets in the B-II range that are becoming popular because of their efficient design and ability to approach at a slower speed. Not all approach category D aircraft are larger. There are several D-II's that are just faster. Newer designs have been able to bring those approach speeds down quite a bit. ODAV manages waivers for heavier aircraft.
4.4	**Bruce Bennett**	*Aurora Airport Improvement Association*	I'm surprised at the planned decrease in volume at Aurora Airport. Could that cause future challenges as the population around the airport is exploding? Use of the airport has been increasing since 1943. Assuming that it will slow down could set us up for issues.	Our forecast model for the operations was based on forecast population growth in both Clackamas and Marion County at about a 1% increase. One may wonder how take-offs and landings can increase, but based aircraft decrease. Air traffic is generated by locally based aircraft and transient aircraft based at other airports. Business aircraft activity is often related to transient aircraft based at other airports. We are seeing some decline in the locally based conventional piston engine aircraft fleet. Forecasts are just guides. If we use this as such and the fleet doesn't decline, it doesn't alter planning for the Airport.
4.5	**Jeff Baymor**	*Charbonneau Country Club*	Is the decline due to fewer people learning to fly? I have other questions and concerns regarding anti-terrorism measures, but that is probably a later discussion.	The FAA uses the National Aerospace Forecast, which is fleet-wide and updated annually. It breaks out all types of aircraft and analyzes trends within each set of aircraft in the fleet. We followed a similar method in our based aircraft modeling, which followed trends of each aircraft. One reason for the decline is fleet attrition of legacy (piston) aircraft, and the current manufacturing generating fewer new aircraft. Another reason is the aging pilot community. Efforts have been underway

				to try to encourage younger people to learn to fly, but many pilots are either flying less or not at all. Bruce Bennett, Aurora Airport Improvement Association (in the chat): I think Jeff had a great question (about fewer people learning to fly) and as David covered this is not a local change but a global change. The piston fleet is getting smaller and jets are a much bigger percentage of the fleet due to speed and safety.
4.6	**Aron Faegre**	*AABC/TLM Holdings*	The FAA never likes to look too far ahead in terms of changes of the fleet and I wonder if electric aircraft are beginning to arrive and get almost certified. Can the master plan include that in the discussion of the fleet?	Yes, but I think it's in an early development stage. It will probably take time for it to be reflected in the FAA long-term aerospace forecast. We're seeing the electrification of conventional aircraft and growth in unmanned aerial systems. We are seeing an anticipation of the need to accommodate these facilities and aircraft at airports, especially electric vehicle charging stations. They also need to consider getting the power systems into the airports. Not every airport has enough infrastructure in place. We will touch on it in later chapters. We still anticipate these aircraft being accommodated by hangars and aprons.
4.7	**Kenji Sugahara**	*ODAV*	I spoke with FAA Administrator Whitaker and he mentioned that fixed wing electric aircraft would come before the EVs mentioned before and Councilor Linville seemed excited by that as well. There are a lot of new forms of aviation coming that will change the dynamics, so I was wondering whether that conversation is happening at airports.	We're seeing a lot of exciting changes, including changing to unleaded fuel for piston aircraft.
4.8	**Councilor Joann Linville**	*City of Wilsonville*	When do you anticipate the next draft chapter will be available and will we get notice of that?	Yes, we will email it to you two weeks prior to the next meeting and we are hoping to provide a short video from David that will explain key takeaways.
4.9	**Bruce Bennett**	*Aurora Airport Improvement Association*	For the landslide review, an internal vehicle access road should keep all deliveries and	Surface transportation routes specific to the Aurora State Airport property will be

			vehicles away from the taxiway and ramp areas but have a way for them to get from hangar to hangar without going onto Airport Road Northeast.	evaluated as part of the Landside Development Alternatives Analysis.
4.10	**Jeff Baymor**	*Charbonneau Country Club*	This has been excellent, thank you so much!	Thank you for the comment.
4.11	**Jeff Baymor**	*Charbonneau Country Club*	What, if any, anti-terrorism measures have been taken at Aurora Airport? The airport is located less than 25 miles from Portland Downtown Towers and Salem.	Thank you for the question, please reach out to ODAV to discuss their airport security planning.
4.12	**Melissa Ahrens**	*Department of Land Conservation and Development*	Hi everyone, I will be attending these meetings as a backup for Matt Crall, Planning Services Division Manager at DLCD, I wanted to make sure everyone had my contact information in case anything comes up during these meetings that I can assist with as Mid-Willamette Valley Regional Representative with DLCD. Thanks!	Thank you for your participation. Your comment and contact information have been added to the record.
4.13	**Ben Williams**	*Friends of French Prairie*	03/12/24 letter from Ben Williams	Responses added to the beginning of the letter.

Attendee Questions/Comments and Responses[2]

ID	Name	Affiliation	Question/Comment	Response
4.14	**Jeff Lewis**	*Attendee*	All data is available through 2023. The 2022 and 2023 data is valuable, not just because the KUAO tower has a short history of accurate counts, but also to help us see past data alterations in 2020. Please add the data through 2023 to the Draft. If you will not, will Mr. House please explain why FAA will not press for this superior data product?	Thank you for your comment. FAA has approved the forecast as presented in Working Paper #1. 2021 was approved by FAA as the base year in the airport master plan's 20-year activity forecasts.

[2] Live responses are included, along with additional information/clarification, as needed.

4.15	**Jeff Lewis**	*Attendee*	FAA likes to impress us all with their 'NAS' concept, the National Airspace System. Clearly, KUAO is one of a set of airports for what we can view as the north Willamette Valley subsystem of the NAS. Dr. Linville raised a very good point: why is the current Draft so deficient in defining the other key players in this region, especially KPDX, KHIO, KMMV, KTTD, and KSLE? Many of those have huge runways and even 24/7 on-airport CFR to immediately handle crashes and fires. So, for safety, clearly larger fuel-laden jets should be using these other airports. Can we be sure to include a detailed analysis of precisely what is offered at these other airports, so the public can evaluate the wisdom imprudence of a KUAO runway lengthening? If this will not be included in this spendy Master Plan Update, why not??	Thank you for your comment. Nearby airports were discussed in Chapter 2 of Working Paper #1. This project is an airport master plan specific to the Aurora State Airport property. A detailed evaluation of the regional airport system is outside the scope of this project.
4.16	**Jeff Lewis**	*Attendee*	At 1738, Mr Miller discussed forecast and ops details. Why is there so little discussion about a simple reality: this airport, with a massive quantity of through-the-fence users, is effectively unmanaged, rendering all data about based aircraft utterly meaningless. What assurances does the general public have that ODAV can actually establish with accuracy, how many and what callsign aircraft are based off of Yellow Gate Rd accessed hangars, or on Millar's land holdings, etc.?	Thank you for your comments. Based aircraft counts are updated and validated by FAA routinely through the National Based Aircraft Inventory Program. The validated based aircraft fleet at Aurora State Airport is discussed in Chapters 2 and 3 of Working Paper #1.
4.17	**Jeff Lewis**	*Attendee*	In his presentation, Mr. Miller seems to be suggesting that a 0.9% growth rate equates to a C-II critical aircraft selection. Would someone please provide the FAA Order confirming this decision, and	Thank you for your comment. The Aircraft Approach Category (AAC) and Airplane Design Group (ADG) of the Design Aircraft (AAC C/ADG II) were determined based on TFMSC data. Please refer to Working Paper #1.

			also provide the definitive data (TFMSC?) that helps us see actual C-II and other usages by year?	
4.18	**Jeff Lewis**	*Attendee*	At 1749, responding to Dr. Linville's question, Mr. Miller noted that there are not enough D-II aircraft ops at KUAO to justify a higher critical aircraft. Would someone please dive into the deeper details of FAA's design standards, and confirm that arbitrary activity levels can be played by aviation individuals to 'build' a need for runway expansion? Would ODAV please confirm if excess weight aircraft have been using the KUAO runway and taxiway, and are they getting waivers, needing to get individual event pre-approvals, etc.?	Thank you for your comments. The 500 annual operations threshold for regular use is discussed in FAA Advisory Circular 150/5000-17. Please reference the Design Aircraft section in Working Paper #1 for more information regarding the selection of the design aircraft for Aurora State Airport. ODAV does receive occasional overweight operations requests. This is based on runway pavement strength and is reviewed by ODAV and their pavement engineer to determine if a waiver is warranted.
4.19	**Jeff Lewis**	*Attendee*	At ~1752, FAA's Tim House was very clear about the arbitrary 500 ops threshold for runway upgrades. He was also quite clear, at KUAO, there were 500 'C' ops but NOT 500 'C-II' ops. This sounds very sketchy; precisely what FAA design guideline (please cite Order and paragraph number) allows for conflating 'C' operations with 'II' operations to hit the 500 arbitrary threshold? At 1758 Mr. Miller again inflated local population growth estimates, i.e., he said growth projections are around 1%, but can he confirm that? Can he look at the Marion and Clackamas projections by PSU's population studies, where it looks like he will come closer to ~0.6% annual growth rate? If he cannot or will not confirm this, why not?	Thank you for your comment. Please see FAA Advisory Circular 150/5000-17, Paragraph 1.2.1, and Paragraph 3.1.1.
4.20	**Rayna Jenks**	*Attendee*	Greetings, I wonder if the PAC members who have not done so already could briefly introduce	Thank you for your comment. Please refer to the PAC Meeting #4 presentation and Chapter 1 of Working Paper #1 for a

			themselves and their role in the PAC.	summary of the PAC members and who they represent. The PAC member list is also maintained on the project website.
4.21	**Jeff Lewis**	*Attendee*	At 1804, Faegre inquired about if Miller can address future electric aircraft within the master plan. Can we also address in depth, the need to provide nonleaded fuel at KUAO? And, the needs to resolve through-the-fence issues? Electric aircraft are still far into the future and discussing them serves primarily to fool the public into thinking we have imminent technological solutions to impacts by aviation. This seems disinformational.	Thank you for your comment. It has been noted and added to the record.
4.22	**Jeff Lewis**	*Attendee*	At 6:18, Mr Miller discussed Chapter 4 process and goals. Please clarify, is it critical we get Chapters 1 thru 3 correct as they establish parameters for selecting Chapter 4 designs to comply with FAA standards? Please also clarify, if the groundwork (ch 1 thru 3) is erroneous or slipshod, it truly can enable errors in designing for assumed requirements… right?	Thank you for your comment. Working Paper #1 has been extensively reviewed and the forecasts have been approved by FAA. Your comments are noted and have been added to the record.
4.23	**Jeff Lewis**	*Attendee*	Mr Miller briefly explained the airside versus landside facilities… can he or someone please quantify what percentage of what airport services are on-airport (by whom, at what locations), and what are off airport (through the fence), by whom and at what locations? Doesn't the public deserve to know these details, to understand their airport?	Thank you for your comments. This project is an airport master plan specific to the Aurora State Airport property. An evaluation of private properties is outside the scope of this project.
4.24	**Jeff Lewis**	*Attendee*	At 6:26, Mr. Bennett advocated for roads in the plan for delivery vehicles. Isn't it true, the vast majority of hangars are OFF airport, thus not dependent on any delivery routes across a small patch of ODAV land?	Surface transportation routes specific to the Aurora State Airport property will be evaluated as part of the Development Alternatives Analysis.

U.S. Department
of Transportation
**Federal Aviation
Administration**

Northwest Mountain Region
Colorado · Idaho · Montana · Oregon · Utah
Washington · Wyoming

Seattle Airports District Office
2200 S 216th Street, Rm 1W-422
Des Moines, WA 98198

November 15, 2023
*Corrected January 23, 2024

Tony Beach
State Airports Manager
Anthony.BEACH@odav.oregon.gov
Oregon Department of Aviation

Federal Aviation Administration (FAA)
Aurora (UAO) Aviation Activity Forecast Approval
Airport Improvement Program Grant Number 3-41-0004-022-2021

The FAA Airports District Office has reviewed the aviation forecast for the Aurora (UAO) Airport Working Paper No. 1 (latest revision dated November 2023). The FAA approves these forecasts for airport planning purposes, including Airport Layout Plan (ALP) development, in addition to the existing and future critical aircraft. The FAA approval is based on the information submitted in Chapter 3, summarized as follows:

Airport Planning and TAF Forecast Comparison

	Year	Airport Forecast	TAF	AF/TAF (% Difference)
Passenger Enplanements				
Base yr.	2021	0	0	0.0%
Base yr. + 5yrs.	2026	0	0	0.0%
Base yr. + 10yrs.	2031	0	0	0.0%
Base yr. + 15yrs.	2036	0	0	0.0%
Commercial Operations				
Base yr.	2021	2,006	1,727	16.2%
Base yr. + 5yrs.	2026	2,056	1,845	11.4%
Base yr. + 10yrs.	2031	2,108	1,967	7.1%
Base yr. + 15yrs.	2036	2,160	2,097	3.0%
Total Operations				
Base yr.	2021	76,028	76,794	-1.0%
Base yr. + 5yrs.	2026	79,354	78,053	1.7%
Base yr. + 10yrs.	2031	82,825	79,109	4.7%
Base yr. + 15yrs.	2036	86,449	80,198	7.8%

Note: TAF data is on a U.S. government fiscal year basis (October through September).

*Highlighted cells corrected to correspond to values from Table 3-23 Forecast Summary.

Based on the approved forecast, the FAA also approves the C-II family of aircraft, for the existing and future critical aircraft.

Our approval is based on the following:

- The forecast is supported by reasonable planning assumptions and current data
- The forecast appears to be developed using acceptable forecasting methodologies
- The difference between the FAA Terminal Area Forecast (TAF) and the Airport's forecast for total operations is within the 10 percent and 15 percent allowance for the 5 and 10 year planning horizons.

Approval of this forecast does not automatically justify any of the capital improvements shown on the ALP or recommended in the master plan. All future projects will need to be justified by current activity levels at the time of proposed implementation. Lastly, the approved forecasts may be subject to additional analysis, or the FAA may request a sensitivity analysis if this data is to be used for environmental or Part 150 noise planning purposes.

This forecast was prepared at the same time as the evolving impacts of the COVID-19 public health emergency. Forecast approval is based on the methodology, data, and conclusions at the time the document was prepared. However, consideration of the impacts of the COVID-19 public health emergency on aviation activity is warranted to acknowledge the reduced confidence in growth projections using currently-available data.

Accordingly, FAA approval of this forecast does not constitute justification for future projects. Justification for future projects will be made based on activity levels at the time the project is requested for development. Documentation of actual activity levels meeting planning activity levels will be necessary to justify AIP funding for eligible projects.

If you have any questions about this forecast approval, please call me at (206) 231-4248.

Sincerely,
Tim House

Lead Planner
SEA Airports District Office

cc: (Samantha Peterson)

Aurora State Airport

Master Plan Project



Planning Advisory Committee Meeting #4

Online Meeting

March 12, 2024

Agenda

Time	Topic
5:00-5:20	Introductions Recap of Project
5:20-5:40	What a Typical Airport Master Plan Includes
5:40-6:10	Review of Working Paper #1
6:10-6:40	Overview of FAA Approved Forecast
6:40-6:50	Public Comments
6:50-7:00	Next Steps Public comments collected through the website **https://publicproject.net/AuroraAirport**

Introductions

Oregon Department of Aviation (ODAV)

Kenji Sugahara
Director

Alex Thomas
Planning & Project Manager

Tony Beach
State Airports Manager

Brandon Pike
Aviation Planner

Project Team

Agency Oversight & Funding

Airport Owner (Sponsor)

Planning & Engineering

Public Involvement

Cultural Resources


Archaeological Investigations Northwest, Inc.

Environmental Review

AGIS Survey

MAGYAR LAND SURVEYING LLC

Project Website Overview



As required by the FAA, the Airport Master Plan will provide specific guidance in making the improvements necessary to maintain a safe and efficient airport that is economically, environmentally, and socially sustainable. The Airport Master Plan will also:

- Define the current, short-term and long-term needs of the Airport through a comprehensive evaluation of facilities, conditions and FAA airport planning and design standards.
- Look at what is happening around the airport that could affect the future plans, development and operation of the airport such as land use, transportation, environmental, economic development, etc.

https://publicproject.net/AuroraAirport

PAC Members & Alternates

- Airport Users/Businesses/Organizations
- Airport Neighbors
- Local Municipalities
- Tribal Organizations
- State Agencies
- Local and Regional Non-Profit Groups
- Environmental / Land Use Groups

PAC Members & Alternates

Organization	Name
1000 Friends of Oregon	Roger Kaye
AABC/TLM Holdings	Ted Millar
Atlantic Aviation (formerly Lynx Aviation)	Trent Brownlee
Aurora Air Traffic Control	Raul Suarez
Aurora Airport Improvement Association	Tony Helbling
Aurora Butteville Barlow Community Planning Organization	Ken Ivey
Aurora CTE, Inc	Bill Graupp
Charbonneau Country Club	Jeff Baymor
City of Aurora	Brian Asher
City of Canby	
City of Wilsonville	Dr. Joann Linville
Clackamas County	Commissioner Tootie Smith
Columbia Helicopters	Rob Roedts
Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians	Pam Barlow Lind
Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde Community of Oregon	Cheryl Pouley
Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon	
Friends of French Prairie	Ben Williams
Helicopter Transport Service	Robert Fournier
Life Flight Network	Ben Clayton
Marion County	Commissioner Danielle Bethell
Marion County Planning Department	Austin Barnes
Oregon Dept of Aviation	Tony Beach
Oregon Dept of Aviation Board	Cathryn Stephens
Oregon Dept of Land Conservation and Development	Matt Crall
Oregon Dept of Transportation	Naomi Zwerdling
Oregon Farm Bureau	
Oregon Office of Emergency Management	Sarah Puls
Positive Aurora Airport Management	Bruce Bennett
Regional Solutions	Beth Wytoski
Vans Aircraft	Rian Johnson
Willamette Aviation	David Waggoner
Wilsonville Chamber of Commerce	Patrick Donaldson

PAC Meeting Guidelines

Meetings summaries will **include all comments along with responses/ follow up**.

- Meeting **time for all committee members to speak**. **We have added more time for dialogue.**
- Comments on **non-agenda items** should be provided in writing.
- Committee members are encouraged to **provide comments at least three days before meetings** to allow members time to review and reflect on comments.
- Come prepared for the meeting (by **reviewing materials posted on the website**). We'll let you know if materials will be reviewed in the meeting for the first time.
  - Be on the lookout for Draft Chapter 4 – Facility Goals & Requirements


PAC Meeting Guidelines

As a committee, we agree to **approach this work with honesty, openness, and willingness to work together**.

- This includes building trust and **assuming good intentions in others** and ensuring that our behavior supports a successful process.
- We will work with each other and staff to **address issues as they arise, utilize tools to ensure clear communication and robust participation, and meet the communication needs of members.**
- PAC members represent their organization, please keep your constituents informed of public meetings and project information.
- **We need all attendees to name/identify themselves.** Duplicates will be removed from the meeting.

Decision Making

- **PAC** = Round table discussions and collection of committee member opinions at decision points. All opinions will be included in the meeting summary.
- **ODAV** = as the airport sponsor, will be the final decision-making authority. They will decide what is included in the Master Plan.
- **FAA** = reviews chapters of the Master Plan and has approval authority for the Aviation Activity Forecasts and the Airport Layout Plan.



Where are we & where are we going?

Project Schedule

Develop Understanding

Late 2021 – Late 2023

- Chapter 1 - Introduction
- Chapter 2 - Existing Conditions
- Chapter 3 - Aviation Activity Forecasts

Final Draft Working Paper #1
FAA Forecast Approval 11/15/2023

Explore Solutions

Early 2024 – Mid 2024

- Chapter 4 - Facility Goals and Requirements
- Chapter 5 - Airport Development Alternatives

Implementation

Late 2024 – Early 2025

- Chapter 6 - Airport Layout Plan
- Chapter 7 - Strategies & Actions, Capital Improvement Plan, and Financial Plan


Mid 2025

- Finalize Master Plan

Project Schedule

Aurora State Airport - Airport Master Plan Project Schedule (all future dates tentative)

Updated February 2024



Airport Master Plan Overview

What is an Airport Master Plan?

An Airport Master Plan IS

- An existing facilities summary
- An outlook of future aviation activity
- A plan for facility improvements
- A planning-level budget for facility improvements
- A visual representation (ALP) of proposed facility improvements

An Airport Master Plan IS NOT

- A design/construction project
- Guarantee of proposed projects
- Environmental analysis
- County land use plan/action
- County transportation system plan

Why are we doing an Airport Master Plan

The Airport Master Plan (AMP) and process is guided by the FAA and ultimately results in projections of future activity and the preparation of an Airport Layout Plan (ALP).

- FAA funding requirement
- Plan for the future
- Reflects current FAA airport design standards
- Updated ALP plans set
- Final AMP will replace prior planning



Note: AMPs are a 20-year document but are typically updated on a more frequent timeline as conditions change (often 7-10 years).

Working Paper #1

What's included in Working Paper #1

Chapters

- Introduction
- Existing Conditions
- Aviation Activity Forecast (2021-2041)
  - Based Aircraft
  - Aircraft Operations (Takeoffs & Landings)
  - Critical (Design) Aircraft



Working Paper #1 Timeline

- **May 2022**
  - First Draft WP# 1 Submitted to FAA and PAC for review
- **August 2022 to November 2023**
  - Ongoing coordination (forecast review) with FAA
  - Several rounds of edits and responses to FAA and public review comments
  - Updates to WP#1 posted on project website
- **Final Draft WP#1 Submitted to FAA on November 2, 2023**

Clarifying Questions?

FAA Approved Forecast

U.S. Department
of Transportation
**Federal Aviation
Administration**

Northwest Mountain Region
Colorado · Idaho · Montana · Oregon · Utah
Washington · Wyoming

Seattle Airports District Office
2200 S 216th Street, Rm 1W-422
Des Moines, WA 98198

November 15, 2023
*Corrected January 23, 2024

Tony Beach
State Airports Manager
Anthony.BEACH@odav.oregon.gov
Oregon Department of Aviation

Federal Aviation Administration (FAA)
Aurora (UAO) Aviation Activity Forecast Approval
Airport Improvement Program Grant Number 3-41-0004-022-2021

The FAA Airports District Office has reviewed the aviation forecast for the Aurora (UAO) Airport Working Paper No. 1 (latest revision dated November 2023). The FAA approves these forecasts for airport planning purposes, including Airport Layout Plan (ALP) development, in addition to the existing and future critical aircraft. The FAA approval is based on the information submitted in Chapter 3, summarized as follows:

Airport Planning and TAF Forecast Comparison

	Year	Airport Forecast	TAF	AF/TAF (% Difference)
Passenger Enplanements				
Base yr.	2021	0	0	0.0%
Base yr. + 5yrs.	2026	0	0	0.0%
Base yr. + 10yrs.	2031	0	0	0.0%
Base yr. + 15yrs.	2036	0	0	0.0%
Commercial Operations				
Base yr.	2021	2,006	1,727	16.2%
Base yr. + 5yrs.	2026	2,056	1,845	11.4%
Base yr. + 10yrs.	2031	2,108	1,967	7.1%
Base yr. + 15yrs.	2036	2,160	2,097	3.0%
Total Operations				
Base yr.	2021	76,028	76,794	-1.0%
Base yr. + 5yrs.	2026	79,354	78,053	1.7%
Base yr. + 10yrs.	2031	82,825	79,109	4.7%
Base yr. + 15yrs.	2036	86,449	80,198	7.8%

Note: TAF data is on a U.S. government fiscal year basis (October through September).

*Highlighted cells corrected to correspond to values from Table 3-23 Forecast Summary.

Based on the approved forecast, the FAA also approves the C-II family of aircraft, for the existing and future critical aircraft.

Our approval is based on the following:

- The forecast is supported by reasonable planning assumptions and current data
- The forecast appears to be developed using acceptable forecasting methodologies
- The difference between the FAA Terminal Area Forecast (TAF) and the Airport's forecast for total operations is within the 10 percent and 15 percent allowance for the 5 and 10 year planning horizons.

Approval of this forecast does not automatically justify any of the capital improvements shown on the ALP or recommended in the master plan. All future projects will need to be justified by current activity levels at the time of proposed implementation. Lastly, the approved forecasts may be subject to additional analysis, or the FAA may request a sensitivity analysis if this data is to be used for environmental or Part 150 noise planning purposes.

This forecast was prepared at the same time as the evolving impacts of the COVID-19 public health emergency. Forecast approval is based on the methodology, data, and conclusions at the time the document was prepared. However, consideration of the impacts of the COVID-19 public health emergency on aviation activity is warranted to acknowledge the reduced confidence in growth projections using currently-available data.

Accordingly, FAA approval of this forecast does not constitute justification for future projects. Justification for future projects will be made based on activity levels at the time the project is requested for development. Documentation of actual activity levels meeting planning activity levels will be necessary to justify AIP funding for eligible projects.

If you have any questions about this forecast approval, please call me at (206) 231-4248.

Sincerely,
Tim House
TIMOTHY ALLEN HOUSE
Digitally signed by TIMOTHY ALLEN HOUSE
Date: 2024.01.23 14:33:42 -08'00'
Lead Planner
SEA Airports District Office

cc: (Samantha Peterson)

Key Takeaways from the FAA Forecast Approval

- FAA review and approval of the aviation activity forecasts is a critical path item in the airport master planning process
- The FAA-approved forecasts will be used in upcoming master plan analyses
- Facility requirements and proposed improvements will correspond to the FAA-approved forecast

Forecast Summary (2021-2041)

Activity	CAGR	2021	2026	2031	2036	2041
Based Aircraft						
Single Engine*	-2.0%	220	199	179	162	146
Multi Engine**	-6.1%	15	11	8	6	4
Jet	1.3%	36	38	41	43	46
Helicopter	3.2%	10	12	14	16	19
Total Based Aircraft	**-1.3%**	**281**	**260**	**242**	**227**	**215**
Aircraft Operations						
Itinerant						
Itinerant Air Taxi	2.5%	2,006	2,056	2,108	2,160	2,214
Itinerant GA	2.1%	36,390	37,154	37,934	38,731	39,544
Itinerant Military	0.0%	79	79	79	79	79
Itinerant Total	**0.4%**	**38,475**	**39,289**	**40,121**	**40,970**	**41,838**
Local						
Local GA	1.3%	37,488	40,000	42,639	45,413	48,328
Local Military	0.0%	65	65	65	65	65
Local Total	1.3%	37,553	40,065	42,704	45,478	48,393
Total Operations	**0.9%**	**76,028**	**79,354**	**82,825**	**86,449**	**90,230**

Aviation Activity Forecasts

Aircraft Operations

- Increase at an average of 0.9% annually through 2041
- Current and Future Design Aircraft:
  - Medium Business Jet (C-II)
  - Aircraft Approach Category C
  - Airplane Design Group II

Based Aircraft

- Decrease at an average of -1.3% annually through 2041
- Overall, piston aircraft decline and turbine aircraft increase

Key Takeaways from the FAA Forecast Approval

- The total number of based aircraft at Aurora State Airport is projected to decline from 281 to 215 *(average annual rate: -1.3%)*
- Annual aircraft operations (takeoffs and landings) are projected to increase from around 76,000 to 90,000 over the next 20 years *(average annual rate: +0.9%)*
- These projections are consistent with FAA national expectations for the general aviation (GA) fleet and for GA airports with air traffic control towers

Design Aircraft

The existing and future design aircraft corresponds to Aircraft Approach Category C and Airplane Design Group II.

This segment of activity represents the most demanding family of high-performance jet aircraft regularly operating at the Airport.

Aircraft Approach Category	Aircraft Approach Speed (knots)
A	less than or equal to 91
B	92 to 121
C	122 to 141
D	142 to 166

Airplane Design Group	Aircraft Wingspan
I	less than or equal to 49’
II	50’ to 79’
III	80’ to 118’
IV	119’ to 171’

A-I (small) 12,500 lbs. or less



Beech Baron 55
Beech Bonanza
Cessna 182
Piper Archer

B-I (small) 12,500 lbs. or less



Beech Baron 58
Beech King Air C90
Cessna 402
Cessna 421

A-II, B-II (small) 12,500 lbs. or less



Super King Air 200
Pilatus PC-12
DCH Twin Otter
Cessna Caravan

B-II Greater than 12,500 lbs.



Super King Air 300, 350
Beech 1900
Cessna Citation
Falcon 20, 50

A-III, B-III Greater than 12,500 lbs.



DHC Dash 7, Dash 8
Q-200, Q-300
DC-3
Convair 580

C-I, D-I



Lear 25, 35, 55, 60
Israeli Westwind
HS 125-700

C-II, D-II



Gulfstream II, III, IV
Canadair 600
Canadair Regional Jet
Lockheed JetStar

C-III, D-III



Boeing Business Jet
Gulfstream 650
B 737-300 Series
MD-80, DC-9

C-IV, D-IV



B - 757
B - 767
DC - 8-70
DC - 10

Design Aircraft Definition

The design aircraft defined in the FAA-approved forecast is used to establish the applicable design categories based on:

- Aircraft Physical Dimensions (wingspan and tail height)
- Aircraft Approach Speed
- Large or Small Aircraft (above or below 12,500 pounds takeoff weight)

Design Aircraft Criteria - *Aurora State Airport*

- Aircraft Approach Category C activity exceeded the 500 annual operations threshold required by FAA (**AAC C**)

- Airplane Design Group II or larger aircraft also exceeded the 500 annual operations threshold required by FAA (**ADG II**)

- AAC and ADG are independently justified through current and forecast activity levels, and the **C-II** designation most accurately represents this segment of aircraft activity at the Airport

Clarifying Questions?

Public Comments?

Public Comments

If you would like to speak, you have 2 minutes:



- Please “raise your hand”
- Press *9 for callers

Submit your comments via the online comment form:
publicproject.net/AuroraAirport




- All comments will be responded to in the meeting summary
- Themes from comments will be shared at the following PAC Meeting



Next Steps

Next Steps


2024
2025
Contract Begins (October 2021)
JAN
FEB
MAR
APR
MAY
JUN
JUL
AUG
SEP
OCT
NOV
DEC
JAN
FEB
MAR
APR
MAY
AGIS Survey
Existing Conditions Analysis
Aviation Activity Forecasts
FAA Review and Approval (Forecasts)
Facility Goals and Requirements
Development Alternatives
ROFA MOS & RPZ Analysis
Strategies & Actions
Financial Plan
ALP Drawing Set
FAA Review and Approval (ALP)
Project Meetings
3/12
4
4/30
5
6/11
6
7/30
12/10
7
Working Papers/Final Report
WP #2
WP #3
Final Report
Develop Understanding
Explore Solutions
Implementation
FAA Review and Approval
PAC Meetings
Public Open House
PAC Working Session Meeting

Next Steps - Facility Requirements Evaluation (Chapter 4)

- The next step in the master planning process is to define on-airport facility needs based on current and forecast aviation demand.
- The applicable FAA airfield design standards are consistent with the existing and future design aircraft defined in the FAA-approved forecasts.
- Facility needs may include conformance to established FAA design standards, other specific criteria, and activity-driven demand (e.g., hangars, aircraft parking, etc.).

Airport Facility Requirements (Aeronautical Uses)

Most airport facility requirements are classified as **Airside** or **Landside**:

- **Airside** facilities are those directly related to the arrival, departure, and movement of aircraft.
- **Landside** facilities accommodate aircraft storage and servicing needs, and support (secondary support facilities may also be classified as support).

Facility Requirements - Examples

Airside facilities:

- Runways
- Taxiways
- Airfield Instrumentation and Lighting

Landside facilities:

- Aircraft Parking Aprons
- Fueling Apron, Fuel Storage, Dispensing
- FBO Facilities
- Aircraft Hangars
- Aircraft Wash Pads

Thank You

Alex Thomas – ODAV

Tony Beach – ODAV

Brandy Steffen – JLA Public Involvement

David Miller – Century West Engineering

Project Website: https://publicproject.net/AuroraAirport

PAC Meeting #5 – April 30, 2024

Aurora State Airport

AIRPORT MASTER PLAN PUBLIC MEETING



Planning Advisory Committee (PAC) Meeting #5

Tuesday, April 30, 2024
PAC Meeting #5 from 5:00pm – 7:00pm

This PAC Meeting will be held by phone or virtually (via Zoom). The PAC meeting will review the facility goals and requirements.

Airport planning work products and registration links for the virtual **PAC Meeting** at: **https://publicproject.net/AuroraAirport**

For Additional Information Contact:
Alex Thomas, Planning & Programs Manager
Oregon Department of Aviation
Alex.R.Thomas@odav.oregon.gov

Special accommodations are available upon request (with 48 hours notice)

AURORA STATE AIRPORT

AIRPORT MASTER PLAN

PAC MEETING #5 AGENDA

Date/Time: April 30, 2024, from 5:00-7:00 pm
Location: Zoom Webinar; register at: Webinar Registration - Zoom

Meeting Goals: Review Draft Chapter 4: Draft Chapter Facility Goals and Requirements

Time	Topic	Person
5:00-5:15 pm	**Introductions** • Agenda • Introductions • Meeting guidelines	Brandy Steffen
5:15-5:45 pm	**Review Draft Chapter 4: Draft Chapter Facility Requirements** • Key Takeaways • Process	David Miller
5:45-6:35 pm	**PAC Comments** • Questions/clarification	Brandy Steffen
6:35-6:55 pm	**Public Comments**	Brandy Steffen
6:55-7:00 pm	**Next Steps** • Preliminary Alternatives • Next PAC meeting	Brandy Steffen

A meeting summary with all PAC and public comments will be posted to the project website within two weeks.

We always will take comments via the website, which will be included in the meeting notes and shared with the PAC members: https://publicproject.net/AuroraAirport#

AURORA STATE AIRPORT

PLANNING ADVISORY COMMITTEE (PAC)
MEETING #5 SUMMARY

Date: Tuesday, April 30, 2024
Time: 5:00-7:00 pm
Location: Zoom Webinar

In Attendance

PAC Members Present

Bill Graupp, *Aurora CTE, Inc*
Bruce Bennett, *Positive Aurora Airport Management*
Brian Asher, *City of Aurora*
Councilor Joann Linville, *City of Wilsonville*
Chris Neamztu, *City of Wilsonville*
David Waggoner, *Willamette Aviation*
Jeff Baymor, *Charbonneau Country Club*
Matt Crall, *Oregon Dept of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD)*
Matt Lawyer, *alternate, Marion County*
Melissa Ahrens, *alternate, Oregon Dept of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD)*
Naomi Zwerdling, *Oregon Dept of Transportation*
Patrick Donaldson, *Wilsonville Chamber of Commerce*
Whitney Stewart, *Oregon Office of Emergency Management*
Ted Millar, *AABC/TLM Holdings*
Tony Helbling, *Aurora Airport Improvement Association*
Trent Brownlee, *Atlantic Aviation*
Wayne Richards, Alternate, *Friends of the French Prairie*

PAC Members Absent

Ben Williams, *Friends of French Prairie*
Beth Wytoski, *Regional Solutions*
Austin Barnes, *Marion County Planning Dept.*
Ben Clayton, *Life Flight Network*

PAC Members Absent (Continued)

Bob Buchanan, Alternate, *Columbia Helicopters*
Brandon Reich, Alternate, *Marion County Planning Dept.*
Ken Ivey, *Aurora Butteville Barlow Community Planning Organization*
Cathryn Stephens, *ODAV Board*
Cheryl Pouley, *Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde Community of Oregon*
Commissioner Danielle Bethel, *Marion County*
Commissioner Tootie Smith, *Clackamas County*
Greg Hughes, Alternate, *Vans Aircraft*
Matt Williams, *Deer Creek Estates HOA*
Pam Barlow Lind, *Confederated Tribes of the Siletz Indians*
Raul Suarez, *Aurora Air Traffic Control*
Rian Johnson, *Vans Aircraft*
Rob Roedts, *Columbia Helicopters*
Robert Fournier, *Helicopter Transport Service*
Roger Kaye, *1000 Friends of Oregon*

Agency Representatives Present

Kenji Sugahara, *ODAV*
Alex Thomas, *ODAV*
Tony Beach, *ODAV*
Brandon Pike, *ODAV*
Tim House, *FAA*

Staff and Consultants

Matt Rogers, *Century West*
David Miller, *Century West*
Samantha Peterson, *Century West*
Mark Steele, *Century West*
James Kirby*, Century West*
Brandy Steffen*, JLA Public Involvement*
Jen Winslow*, JLA Public Involvement*
Ashley Balsom*, JLA Public Involvement*

Audience / Members of the Public
Aron Faegre, *alternate, AABC/TLM Holdings*
George Van Hoomissen
Josh Goldschmidt
Anonymous Attendee

Audience / Members of the Public (Continued)
Mark Ottenad
Julie Fitzgerald, Mayor of Wilsonville
George Buley
Brad Schuster
Bruce Bergman
Sarah Lucas
Joseph Schaefer
Kurt Wilson
Kirsten Newbury
James Kirby
Greg Leo
Shannon Colebank
Tim Warren
Glenn Lancaster

Overview

The meeting goals were to review Draft Chapter 4: Draft Chapter Facility Goals and Requirements and ensure that the members had time to talk and ask questions about the materials. *The presentation, FAQs, meeting recording and other materials are posted on the website (publicproject.net/AuroraAirport).*

Welcome and Introductions

Brandy Steffen, JLA Public Involvement, welcomed everyone to the meeting, reviewed the agenda and Zoom meeting tips and etiquette. She reminded the members of their roles and responsibilities. The next PAC meeting will be held on June 11, 2024 and will discuss the range of alternatives. There will also be a workshop in July before the decision-making process happens.

Presentation

David Miller, Century West, gave a presentation on the Draft Chapter 4 Facility requirements. He reminded the PAC that there would be opportunities to ask questions throughout the meeting; more technical or detailed questions could be answered in writing after the meeting. He reminded the group that the facility requirements evaluation is not the alternatives evaluation.

Facility requirements are defined in three-step process:

- Defining applicable standards, both current and to make sure future construction meets those standards.
- Evaluating the current or existing facilities conformance to the standards.
- Identifying potential facility improvements.

Facility requirements that are defined through this process are the inputs that are used in the next phase of the master plan to evaluate facility improvement options.

David explained the difference between landside and airside facilities. Over the 20-year planning period, the forecast indicates that there will be a demand for about 72,000 square feet of additional aprons and 19 hangar units based primarily on the needs of transient jet aircraft, turboprops and helicopters. Parking demand for small single engine and multi-engine piston aircraft is expected to decline.

Airside facilities are primarily the runway taxiway system, and things like pavement, lighting and signage. The overall goal with airside facility standards is to provide the safest possible environment for the movement of aircraft.

The Facility Requirements Chapter defines the runway length evaluation that is consistent with the FAA approved forecast. This defines the length that meets the FAA-based criteria for long range planning.

PAC Questions and Comments

Brandy opened the PAC question and comment agenda item. *Full comments, along with responses are provided in the table below.*

Public Comment

Brandy opened the public comment section of the meeting. Each person had two minutes to speak.

- There were no public comments at this meeting.

Next Steps

Brandy reminded the group that the next virtual PAC meeting will be held June 11, 2024, from 5 pm to 8 pm and will review preliminary alternatives concepts. The Public Open house will be held on June 13th, 2024, location TBD. Please submit comments through May 14. **Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation,** and David thanked everyone for their participation and engagement throughout the master planning process.

PAC Member Questions/Comments and Responses[1]

ID	Name	Affiliation	Question/Comment	Response
5.1	**Tony Helbling**	*Aurora Airport Improvement Association*	The red line along the taxiway predominantly runs along the face of two airports. One is the midfield air park at A 3 and then from there to the south down to Atlantic. It runs along SECAP in the verbiage of the document you sent out. In the document, you discuss potential reanalysis of access across this area as non-standard.	It would incorporate all of the area affected. We're looking at the side of the runway. One of our evaluation pieces is the actual runway object free area and the taxiway object free area, which are driven off the center lines. Any component of that along the side that is inside one or both of those would be evaluated. The direct access issue is essentially FAA design guidance that discourages the straight shot from the apron or hangar to the runway without some distinct turning

[1] Live responses are included, along with additional information/clarification, as needed.

			Does that refer to the frontage along the taxiway?	mechanisms for the pilot. The guidance is intended to improve a pilot's situational awareness and reduce inadvertent runway incursions.
5.2	**Tony Helbling**	*Aurora Airport Improvement Association*	Is this analysis going to consider the easements that are documented in the deeds that were granted in perpetuity to the owners of the properties adjacent to that taxiway?	This step is evaluating existing conditions. We don't yet know what the future condition of the runway-taxiway will be because we haven't gotten to the alternatives. What's there today may or may not be the same going forward. We'll make a note of the comment.
5.3	**Councilor Joann Linville**	*City of Wilsonville*	I have a question about the landside facility recommendations, in reference to the additional hangars and square footage. My understanding was in the beginning of the discussion about the master planning process, there were not going to be any recommendations for property that was outside of the ODAV-owned footprint. This seems like a recommendation for beyond the fence owners, and I'm wondering why they are included in the master plan?	We are talking about on-airport landside facilities demand. The demand projections are not a recommendation per se. The numbers are an attempt to approximate facility demands based on the forecast. In Chapter 3, the based aircraft fleet are projecting a decline in single engine piston aircraft. There is a reduction in hangar demand, and the numbers in Table 4-8 of the chapter have a reduction of almost 115,000 square feet of single engine piston hangar space. We also see a reduction in another 28,600 square feet of single engine piston hangar space. Most of these hangars are privately owned and the owners will make business decisions about potential reconfiguration. The master plan does not evaluate future changes in facilities off airport property. These numbers are just an assessment based on the forecast.
5.4	**Councilor Joann Linville**	*City of Wilsonville*	With the decline, why isn't this section repurposing the landside property that is owned by ODAV instead of talking about an additional 62,750 square feet of new space? It's confusing to show a decline and then show additional hangar space.	There seems to be limited interest in exploring uses other than landside facilities. Aircraft storage and support are considered the highest and best use. Future development will depend on opportunities within that space. The average size requirements for business aircraft, jets, and turbo props are greater than for single-engine piston airplanes, leading to the need for larger hangar spaces. These approximations are based on FAA-approved forecasts, but actual

				fulfillment of these projections can be limited by factors such as available land. That doesn't alter the projection. I would suggest looking at the tables that are in the chapter that are broken down by aircraft types, which shows the net positive/negative and how the numbers balance out. How this all materializes will depend on opportunities presented at the Airport.
5.5	**Wayne Richards**	*Friends of French Prairie*	Farmers are wondering if you are closing Keil Road. They wonder if they will be out working and have to wait on a taxiway to be cleared to cross the runway by the tower. Are you rezoning 30 acres of exclusive farmland? Can you address this in Chapter 5? It's been this way since the mid-70's with Senate Bill 100.	The facility requirements do not identify future proposed airport changes. Any proposed airport changes will be included in the alternatives analysis.
5.6	**Bruce Bennett**	*Positive Aurora Airport Management*	The hangar demand is surprising to me because there's always been a waiting list. The demand is higher than what's available, so it's hard to think about how many hangars are needed when there's a long waiting list. If there were adequate hangers now, then it would make sense to say we need 3 more or 6 more. The ramp demand also seems rather modest. I hate to see unrealistic expectations and then scramble to meet them. The population isn't getting any smaller and when visitors come, they need a place to park on the runway. One question on alpha 3. Would you strictly paint anything on it? I can't imagine moving the taxi away from alpha 3 or the airport runway	The methodology to determine hangar requirements are explained in draft Chapter 4 – Facility Requirements and is based on the FAA approved forecasts.

			to taxi away taxilane. I could see the departure from the taxiway to the ramp moved to the left a little bit. Would that make it no longer a direct access?	
5.7	**Bruce Bennett**	*Positive Aurora Airport Management*	The master plan sees the need for additional hangar space. Is that talking about growing the airport boundary for additional hangar space or is that talking about using the existing airport land? Or additional hanger space?	Neither. It's quantifying the demand that comes out of the forecast that was approved by the FAA. ODAV will control what is on their property, and they cannot control what happens on private property adjacent to the airport.
5.8	**Jeff Baymor**	*Charbonneau Country Club*	I sent an email from a resident in my community to Mayor Fitzgerald, with concerns about over jets and jet noise. It's clear that jets are going to slowly replace the piston planes and they will be flying over Charbonneau in the early morning hours or the late evening. It is concerning, and how do we address that as a community trying to make certain that we're working in a positive way with the airport, and the people that are dependent upon the Aurora airport for the businesses and their employment? We are considering doing an evaluation of the number of residents who take issue with it. I'm not sure if Wilsonville has done the same.	Thank you for your comment and email. Tony will follow up about this.
5.9	**Councilor Joann Linville**	*City of Wilsonville*	Page four of Chapter 4 talks about the FAA advisory circular. A basis for coming up with the formula for the runway length. It talks about in the in that approach and departure reference code area. There are two comments that says the AP, the approach, and the departure above from the circular indicate the following aircraft may land or depart on the runway and	Yes, based on that criteria the distinction between airplane design group (ADG) categories I and II is the wingtip clearance (wingspan). There's no distinction between an approach category C and a D aircraft when it comes to the designer wingspan for either ADG The basic method used here is that these are dimensional standards (lateral setbacks) for runways and parallel taxiways. Discussions of runway length are driven by a different advisory circular.

			taxi on the parallel taxi way without operations restrictions. Those are categories A, B, and then C and D groups I and II. This seems to be adding in D category aircraft. Does that mean that in the airport's current state, these aircraft can land and take off without operational restrictions in the current setting?	The section referred to has no bearing on runway length.
5.10	**Councilor Joann Linville**	*City of Wilsonville*	Page three of the section on runway design code discusses approach visibility. Is says "component may change with AAC -ADG C-II/ Could you explain what that means?	There are different layers of design standards that fit together. Some are driven by approach speed, approach category, the design group or wingspan. There are additional standards that are driven by the approach of visibility minimums established on the runway. Currently, there are three instrument approaches at the airport with a visibility minimum of 7/8 of a statute mile. If visibility were to change to one mile, it could impact the clearances required for the runway.
5.11	**Councilor Joann Linville**	*City of Wilsonville*	When looking at table 4-4, it shows 75% of the fleet and 100% of the fleet. Does 100% of the fleet actually represent 25% of the total? Does the FAA care about which larger aircraft have been given special waivers to use the airport?	The FAA distinguishes between different types of jets in their advisory circular, with one table representing 75% of the fleet consisting of smaller and medium-sized jets, and another representing the higher-performance aircraft making up the last 25%. Even though some higher-performance aircraft at Aurora don't meet the 500 operations threshold, the FAA guidance suggests using the 100% fleet number if any of these aircraft are present. This is why the 100% fleet number is used instead of the 75%. However, even if the 75% number were used, the runway length would be similar due to a cap on the wet and slippery length adjustment at 5,500 feet. The analysis is based on traffic, using detailed instrument flight plan data called

				TFMSC data. This data covers the last decade and is not specifically broken down by the relatively few waivers offered by ODAV. It's up to the airport to determine if these aircraft can be safely accommodated on a case-by-case basis for heavy aircraft requests.
5.12	**Tony Helbling**	*Aurora Airport Improvement Association*	Aircraft 150 might be able to leave the ground at 2600 feet, but at the point of rotation where a pilot needs to make a decision and get on the brakes. Would he be able to stop in the 2600 feet that puts him at 52? A larger aircraft can take off in 3000 feet but needs 3200 to stop. There are also differing insurance requirements. Does the Aircraft 150 analysis takes these regulations and requirements into account?	The Aircraft 150 analysis considers regulations outlined in Airport Advisory Circular 150/5325-4B, which specifically addresses runway length operations for aircraft over 12,500 pounds up to 60,000 pounds. These regulations are tailored to turbine aircraft, including jets, which are often operated under Part 135. The analysis includes factors such as accelerate-stop and accelerate-go calculations, ensuring safety in various scenarios like engine failure during takeoff.
5.13	**Bruce Bennett**	*Positive Aurora Airport Management*	Which is the regulation for carrying passengers for hire that firefighters or ambulance flights or businesses use? The FAA has a lot of different arms and for an operator, they require both the balanced field and a 40% margin for error. If you calculate the runway length, then you stop with 6 inches to spare or a little bit on the other side. That wouldn't be safer because the FAA requires an additional 40% minimum legal runway length. I want to make sure that's factored in because there are a lot of people operating under 135 charter.	Commercial aerial firefighters and air ambulance operators are typically certified under FAR Part 135 (for hire). Privately owned corporate aircraft are commonly operated under FAR Part 91. See previous comment response on the criteria used in runway length planning required by FAA in master planning. Any runway length adjustments required for FAR 135 operators are made by individual aircraft operators based on conditions at the time. This may result in constrained operation conditions that may limit operating weights and payload that can be accommodated.
5.14	**Councilor Joann Linville**	*City of Wilsonville*	On page nine, it notes that the city of Wilsonville and other jurisdictions will need to update their comprehensive plans to	This section is intended to summarize Oregon land use regulations that apply to

			remain compliant with state land use laws. The city recently updated its comprehensive plan to address airport issues, and ODAV was notified of those proceedings. What exactly is involved in the city's future comprehensive plan update? What will be required?	local governments. ORS 836.610 Local government land use plans and regulations to accommodate airport zones and uses.
5.15	**Councilor Joann Linville**	*City of Wilsonville*	I want to mention the noise concerns Jeff brought up, and the mention of noise evaluations in the master plan. When will these evaluations happen? A goal in the master plan is to coordinate with users to improve the voluntary fly-friendly program. This isn't something that should be discussed privately. This should be coordinated with the FAA Seattle Airport District, the ADO, local land use jurisdictions, airports, and neighbors. How will the analysis be conducted, who will do it, where the information will be available, and which jurisdictions will be involved in addressing the results?	The fly-friendly program involves coordinating with pilots, users, and neighbors to minimize noise over sensitive areas and there has been outreach with the goal of minimizing noise and low flying aircraft over sensitive areas. Tony Beach can have further discussion with Charbonneau and Wilsonville, and there will be upcoming noise contour discussions in the master planning process. The noise analysis for the master plan will use current runway data and traffic forecasts as a baseline, with future analyses based on the chosen runway option.

Attendee Questions/Comments and Responses[2]

ID	Name	Question/Comment	Response
5.16	**Anonymous Attendee**	This public process is a farce. Members of the public should be able to attend a public body meeting without registration in advance or at the time of the meeting. This ODAV process is about control and manipulation of the public process.	Thank you for your comment.

[2] Live responses are included, along with additional information/clarification, as needed.

5.17	**George Buley**	Does ODAV own the land to accommodate the anticipated 72.3K SF?	ODAV has about 30 acres of land within the airport, and the ability to accommodate demand depends on available land and future opportunities.
5.18	**George Buley**	Is Keil road located in the Runway Object Free Area? If yes, will there be proposed mitigation?	A portion of Keil Road is within the runway object-free area, and mitigation for its non-standard conditions will be part of the alternative's evaluation. The evaluation will focus on addressing non-standard conditions for the existing runway without considering changes to the runway itself. There are unique challenges due to non-standard conditions on both sides of the runway, which will be addressed with various scenarios in the next meeting.
5.19	**George Buley**	Does ODAV own any other drain fields in the RSA other than the ones identified on the Runway Non-Standard Drawing?	ODAV does not own any drain fields at UAO, the drain field identified in the Runway Non-Standard Drawing is the only one in the RSA.

Additional Emailed Comments

ID	Name	Affiliation	Question/Comment	Response
5.20	**Bruce Bennett**	*Positive Aurora Airport Management*	Thank you for the professional planning job! Please include an internal circulation road and consider ODAV purchasing approximately one acre of ramp space NE of taxiway A3 to allow a huge relief in taxiway congestion as well as significant improvement in ramp to taxiway flow. Also please consider the FAA requirement to land in 60% of the available runway and to always have a "balanced field".	Thank you for the comment.
5.21	**Jeff Baymor**	Charbonneau Country Club	The video is excellent and I have two others to review. I would like to provide the text of a Charbonneau resident who appears to be negatively impacted by fly-overs. I have removed their name as I have not requested nor	Thank you for the comment.

			have I received approval to share such: Good morning Mayor Fitzgerald, We met at the city's recent presentation in Charbonneau. I shared my daily round with the flight noise from Aurora airport. You asked that I send a note of follow up; I apologize for the delay. This morning a 2:00 am fly over woke me. Another took place at 2:23 and another at 5:37. Just another day in the neighborhood. Yesterday my husband heard a plane around 3:00 and small planes were a constant the entire day. Either Saturday or Sunday when home, I wrote down flights noted. They were: 2 in the 3:00 am hour, 9:17, 9:32, 2:48, 3:54, 5:21, and 6:38. I was not home all day. I have noted planes at every wee hour. This has been going on for years now and has drastically altered quality of life. Last year I did not sit out on my patio or deck one single time as the noise is nerve wracking and depressing. I am worried about quality of life, noise pollution, disregard for the supposed "Good Neighbor policy" we are told pilots are to be guided by, and frankly home values over time. Thank you for all your work with this issue and many others. Please can't quality of life be weighed in this very long debate	

			over the region's supposed benefit from the airport's increased traffic? Thank you. --- --- I would like to share this information with the PAC Meeting participants.	
5.22	**Bruce Bennett**	*Aurora Airport Improvement Association*	I believe an internal circulation road created on private airport property connected to State airport property should be made a priority at KUAO for operational and safety purposes. Also, that ODAV should expeditiously pursue purchasing the ramp property NE of taxiway A3 and connecting to the midfield State ramp for immediate and significant improvements in operational flow and airport safety.	Response was delayed; added on 06/28/24. Thank you for the comment.
5.23	**Tony Helbling**	*Positive Aurora Airport Management*	We feel the 5500' number is predicated on a "uncontaminated runway" = dry runway, and pilots perform with exact precision. It rains A LOT here in Oregon… most of the year. Add in human factors and that 5500' number is a very tight limitation. Thinking 6000' (as has historically been called out in past master plans over the past 45+ years), gives a better margin for safety. We agree the FAA may recognize the design class/category is based on specific example models of aircraft. We want it noted that most of those aircraft are aging aircraft (15 to 20 years old) and will age more before this runway is extended (5 years? So 20- to 25-year-old airframes). Most newer aircraft in the design class are up against that 5500' number and we predict future (quieter) aircraft could exceed it.	Response was delayed; added on 06/28/24. Thank you for the comment.

			As we look to the future of the airport, it only makes sense to plan the investment wisely to include a margin of safety. In the grand scheme of things, the return on investment will be human lives.	
5.24	**Chris Neamtzu and Mark Ottenad**	*City of Wilsonville*	May 14, 2024 email Questions 1-40 pertain to Working Paper No. 1 ODAV PAC Meeting #5; April 30, 2024 - Questions on DRAFT Master Plan Chapter 4: 41. The existing Runway Design Code (RDC) defines the standards used for runway construction. Page 4-3 notes that "the approach visibility component may change within AAC/ADG C-II". Can you please explain exactly what that comment means? 42. Page 4-9 notes that comments regarding environmental concerns raised by PAC members will be included in Appendix 9 in the master plan, for future consideration by FAA during the completion of any environmental assessment required by NEPA. When will that documentation will be available on the project web site? 43. Page 4-9 notes that the City of Wilsonville and other jurisdictions will need to update their comprehensive plans to "remain compliant with state land use laws". City recently updated the Comprehensive Plan to address airport issues. ODAV was notified of these proceedings. What is exactly involved in the city's future Comprehensive Plan update? What exactly will be required of the City?	Response was delayed; added on 06/28/24. Thank you for your comments. We've reviewed these with the technical team. Questions 1-40 relate to Working Paper No. 1. We will post a complete set of responses to the project website as soon as possible. 41. As noted in the chapter, approach visibility minimums are determined independently from the RDC, based on visual or instrument approach capabilities. Changes to the current approach visibility minimums (defined by FAA instrument approaches or through a separate FAA-issued "Notice to Air Missions" (NOTAM)), could be accomplished for a variety of reasons. This section notes that RPZ dimensions are determined by the approach visibility minimums for each runway end, therefore a change in minimums could change RPZ dimensions for AAC/ADG C-II. 42. A summary of comments and responses, including for environmental concerns, will be posted on the project website to document review of each draft work chapter or full working paper. Comments and responses provided during the review of Working Paper 1, are currently provided on the project website. Comments provided after individual comment periods conclude are reviewed with responses posted on the project website when available. During the ongoing development of master plan chapters, responding to current chapter review is the highest priority and responses to previous chapters will be documented in preparation of the draft master plan document. At draft final all meeting summaries, PAC and public comments,

			44. Page 4-9 notes that the city should “develop overlay zone ordinance for airspace protection”. What exactly does that mean for existing land uses? How does this overlay zone work? What is being effected? Please provide specific information regarding this comment. 45. Page 4-10 notes that noise evaluations will be conducted in the Airport MP. When will those be created? Which Chapter addresses noise impacts? 46. Page 4-16 notes a runway length of 5,500 lineal feet. Which direction, N or S will the additional runway be extended, if approved?	and responses will be summarized in Appendix 9. 43. This section is intended to summarize Oregon land use regulations that apply to local governments. ORS 836.610 Local government land use plans and regulations to accommodate airport zones and uses. 44. This section is intended to summarize Oregon land use regulations that apply to local governments. ORS 836.610 Local government land use plans and regulations to accommodate airport zones and uses. Additional technical information may be found in the Oregon Department of Aviation Airport Land Use Compatibility Handbook. 45. Noise contours will be developed for the 65 DNL noise contour identified for the current conditions as well as the twenty-year contour. Noise contour modeling will use the forecasts and fleet mix identified in the forecast chapter for each run to analyze impacts of airport modifications as it relates to noise. Noise contours will be prepared following the selection of a preferred alternative. 46. Future decisions about runway configuration will be made by ODAV at the conclusion of the airside alternatives evaluation.

Aurora State Airport
Master Plan Project



Planning Advisory Committee Meeting #5
Online Meeting
April 30, 2024

Agenda

Time	Topic
5:00-5:15	Introductions
5:15-6:00	Review Draft Chapter 4: Draft Chapter Facility Requirements
6:00-6:35	PAC Comments
6:35-6:55	Public Comments
6:55-7:00	Next Steps Public comments collected through the website **https://publicproject.net/AuroraAirport**

Introductions

Oregon Department of Aviation (ODAV)

Kenji Sugahara
Director

Alex Thomas
Planning & Project Manager

Tony Beach
State Airports Manager

Brandon Pike
Aviation Planner

Project Team

Agency Oversight & Funding

Airport Owner (Sponsor)

Planning & Engineering

Public Involvement

Cultural Resources

Archaeological Investigations Northwest, Inc.

Environmental Review

AGIS Survey

MAGYAR LAND SURVEYING LLC


Project Website Overview



https://publicproject.net/AuroraAirport

Project Schedule – Where are we?

Aurora State Airport - Airport Master Plan Project Schedule (all future dates tentative)



Review Draft Chapter 4:

Facility Goals & Requirements

Key Takeaways – Facility Requirements Evaluation

- Not an Alternatives Analysis
- A Review of Applicable FAA Standards
  - Current and Future (Aircraft Category: C-II)
  - Based on:
    - FAA-approved Forecast
    - Design Aircraft
    - FAA-defined Design Standards
- Non-standard items and demand-driven facility needs are identified

Design Aircraft

The existing and future design aircraft corresponds to Aircraft Approach Category C and Airplane Design Group II.

This segment of activity represents the most demanding type of high-performance jet aircraft regularly operating at the Airport.

Aircraft Approach Category	Aircraft Approach Speed knots	Airplane Design Group	Aircraft Wingspan
A	less than or equal to 91	I	less than or equal to 49’
B	92 to 121	II	50’ to 79’
C	122 to 141	III	80’ to 118’
D	142 to 166	IV	119’ to 171’

A-I (small) 12,500 lbs. or less



Beech Baron 55
Beech Bonanza
Cessna 182
Piper Archer

B-I (small) 12,500 lbs. or less



Beech Baron 58
Beech King Air C90
Cessna 402
Cessna 421

A-II, B-II (small) 12,500 lbs. or less



Super King Air 200
Pilatus PC-12
DCH Twin Otter
Cessna Caravan

B-II Greater than 12,500 lbs.



Super King Air 300, 350
Beech 1900
Cessna Citation
Falcon 20, 50

A-III, B-III Greater than 12,500 lbs.



DHC Dash 7, Dash 8
Q-200, Q-300
DC-3
Convair 580

C-I, D-I



Lear 25, 35, 55, 60
Israeli Westwind
HS 125-700

C-II, D-II



Gulfstream II, III, IV
Canadair 600
Canadair Regional Jet
Lockheed JetStar

C-III, D-III



Boeing Business Jet
Gulfstream 650
B 737-300 Series
MD-80, DC-9

C-IV, D-IV



B - 757
B - 767
DC - 8-70
DC - 10

Facility Requirements Evaluation Process

1. Define Applicable FAA Standards (current and future)
2. Evaluate Facility Conformance with FAA Standards
3. Define Potential Facility Improvements (by type or category)

The defined facility requirements are the inputs used in the next step of the master plan to evaluate future facility improvement options (Airport Development Alternatives)


Facility Requirements Evaluation

- Landside Facilities
  - Aircraft Parking Aprons
  - Hangars
  - Taxilanes
  - Other, Support Facilities
- Airside Facilities
  - Runway
  - Taxiways
  - Airfield Lighting, Navigational Aids, Signage

Aurora State Airport (ODAV Property)




Landside Facility Requirements



Landside - Facility Requirements

- Aircraft Storage
  - Aircraft Parking Apron
  - Aircraft Hangars
- Aircraft Access
  - Taxilanes connecting landside facilities to parallel taxiway & runway
- Other, Support
  - Vehicle parking, access, utilities, fencing/gates

Landside - Facility Requirements



Source: Century West Engineering

Landside - Facility Requirements

- Transient Aircraft Apron Requirements
  - Projected demand based on a percentage of transient aircraft operations
    - 9 additional parking positions by 2041 (turboprop, jet, helicopter)
  - Net decrease in demand for single-engine and multi-engine piston parking
  - 72,300 square feet of additional apron estimated based on aircraft types:
    - 5-year demand: +18,750 square feet
    - 10-year demand: +18,750 square feet
    - 20-year demand: +34,800 square feet

Landside - Facility Requirements

- Aircraft Hangar Requirements
  - Projected demand for additional hangar space to accommodate jets and helicopters. Demand for small aircraft hangars for single-engine and multi-engine piston aircraft projected to decline.
    - 19 additional hangar units by 2041 (turboprop, jet, helicopter)
    - Redevelopment/replacement of existing small hangars will follow market demand
  - 62,750 square feet of additional (new) hangar space for larger aircraft and helicopters:
    - 5-year demand: +13,000 square feet
    - 10-year demand: +17,250 square feet
    - 20-year demand: +32,500 square feet

Landside - Facility Requirements

- Airport Support
  - Surface Roads and Gates – maintain existing roads and gates, update as needed
  - Vehicle Parking – maintain existing parking, incorporate vehicle parking into new hangar developments
  - Fencing – maintain existing fencing, replace as needed
  - Utilities - maintain existing systems, extend service to new facilities, as needed

Clarifying Questions?

Airside - Facility Requirements

Airside Facilities

- Runway and Taxiway Evaluations
  - Runway Length
  - Pavement Width, Shoulder Width
  - Pavement Markings and Signage
  - Safety Areas, Object Free Areas
  - Runway-Taxiway Geometry
  - Lighting


The FAA design standards for the runway-taxiway system are intended to provide the safest possible environment for aircraft movement.

Airside - Facility Requirements

Runway 17/35 Evaluation


- The existing runway meets C-II standards for:
  - Pavement Width
  - Shoulder Width
  - Markings
- The existing runway pavement strength will be maintained in the near term and studied for future strengthening based on aircraft fleet mix.
- Runway length is addressed later in this section.
- Runway Protection Zones (RPZ) - compatible land use and airport control

Runway Non-Standard Conditions



Source: Century West Engineering

Runway Protection Zone (RPZ)



Airside - Facility Requirements

Airside Facilities

- Parallel Taxiway (Taxiway A)
  - Potential Facility Needs:
  - Enhanced taxiway centerline markings, surface painted direction markings, or taxiway geometry
  - North Aircraft Run Up/ AC Hold Area
  - Mitigation options for 3 direct access points (apron to runway) connections to Taxiway A (parallel taxiway)
  - ODAV coordinating with FAA on hotspot mitigation

Airside - Facility Requirements

Airside Facilities

- Additional Evaluations - Runway and Taxiway
  - Lighting
  - Visual Aids
  - Electronic Navigational Aids
  - Airfield Signage
  - Weather Observation

Runway Length Evaluation

- The purpose of this evaluation is to define the runway length required to accommodate current and future demand, consistent with the FAA-approved airport master plan forecast.
- The FAA requires a multi-step process be used to define lengths for runways that accommodate large airplanes (12,501 to 60,000 pounds).
- This definition establishes a future runway length that meets the FAA's criteria for long-term planning.
- Additional evaluations are required prior to the FAA approving funding for related improvement projects.

Runway Length Evaluation

Step 1 – Aircraft Operational Factors

Determine Fleet Mix and Aircraft Useful Load Percentages to be used

- ***Percentage of Large Airplane Fleet: 100%***
- ***Aircraft Useful Load: 60%***

These factors are used to select the appropriate aircraft performance curves, consistent with FAA runway length planning guidance.

The percentage of fleet selected is consistent with the design aircraft identified in the FAA-approved aviation activity forecasts.


Runway Length Evaluation

Operational Factors

- **Percentage of the Fleet.** For the design aircraft type at Aurora State Airport (business jets weighing 12,501-60,000 pounds), the FAA defines two fleet groupings:
  - **75%** - jets that require less than a 5,000' runway at sea level on a standard day (59°F)
  - **100%** - jets that require at least a 5,000' runway for the same conditions

Runway Length Evaluation

100% OF FLEET AT 60% USEFUL LOAD CURVES



100 Percent of Fleet at
60 Percent Useful Load

Source: FAA Advisory Circular 150/5325-4B

Runway Length Evaluation

Step 2 – Basic Site Inputs

- **Airfield Elevation**
  - Surveyed Runway Elevation 199.8' MSL (high point on runway)
- **Temperature**
  - Average (Mean) High Temperature in Hottest Month 83° F (August)

Baseline (Unadjusted) Runway Length: 5,300 feet

Runway Length Evaluation

Step 3 – Adjustment #1

- **Runway Gradient**
  - 3.3-foot difference between high and low points on Runway 17/35
  - 10 feet of length added for each 1-foot difference in elevation
  - 10 x 3.3 = 33 feet

Gradient Adjusted Runway Length: 5,333 feet

Runway Length Evaluation

Step 4 – Adjustment #2

- **Wet and Slippery Conditions** (commonly found on site)
  - 15% increase in runway length, up to 5,500 feet
  - 15% of 5,333 feet = 800 feet, which exceeds the FAA-defined limit of 5,500 feet, when added to current runway length (5,003 feet)
  - The FAA maximum adjusted length used to compensate for wet and slippery conditions in this analysis

Wet and Slippery Adjusted Runway Length: 5,500 feet

Runway Length Evaluation

The runway length required to accommodate current and future demand at Aurora State Airport, consistent with the FAA-approved airport master plan forecast.

The final (adjusted) runway length reflects existing runway conditions, applicable aircraft requirements, and common weather conditions.


Baseline Performance Curve + Gradient Adjustment + Wet & Slippery Adjustment

5,300' + 33.1' + 167' = 5,500 feet

Final Adjusted Runway Length: 5,500 feet

Facility Requirements

- **Airfield Pavement**
  - Runway 17/35 -rehabilitation in the near term (0-5 years)
  - Taxiway A – rehabilitation of the southern two-thirds during the 10 to 20-year period
  - Main Apron - rehabilitation during the 10 to 20-year period
  - Ongoing pavement maintenance is required to maximize the longevity of existing and future airfield pavements



Source: Oregon Department of Aviation – 2023 Pavement Evaluation/Maintenance Management Program

Clarifying Questions?

PAC Comments?

Public Comments?

Next Steps

Next Steps

- Prepare Preliminary Alternatives Concepts
- PAC Meeting 6 – June 11th, 2024 (5pm-8pm Virtual)
- Public Open House – June 13th, 2024 (In-Person, Location TBD)

Thank You

Alex Thomas – ODAV

Tony Beach – ODAV

Brandy Steffen – JLA Public Involvement

David Miller – Century West Engineering

Project Website: https://publicproject.net/AuroraAirport

PAC Meeting #6 – June 11, 2024

NOTICE OF A MEETING
FOR THE AURORA STATE AIRPORT
Airport Master Plan Project

Notice is hereby given that the Oregon Department of Aviation (ODAV) will hold an online (via Zoom) Public Planning Advisory Committee (PAC) meeting.

When: Tuesday, June 11, 2024
PAC Meeting from 5:00 p.m. - 8:00 p.m.

Where: Zoom or Join by Phone
Please register and join the virtual **PAC meeting** by visiting:
https://publicproject.net/AuroraAirport

This meeting will present the preliminary alternatives for the Aurora State Airport. For copies of the airport planning work products, please visit: https://publicproject.net/AuroraAirport

Accessible Meeting Information
Special accommodations are available upon advanced request. Please contact Alex Thomas at least 48 hours prior to the event to discuss specific needs.

For airport questions or project information, please contact Alex Thomas, ODAV Planning & Programs Manager, through the following means: Alex.R.Thomas@odav.oregon.gov

AURORA STATE AIRPORT

AIRPORT MASTER PLAN

PAC MEETING #6 AGENDA

Date/Time: June 11, 2024, from 5:00-8:00 pm
Location: Zoom Webinar; register at: Webinar Registration - Zoom

Meeting Goals: Review Preliminary Alternatives

Time	Topic	Person
5:00-5:15 pm	**Introductions** • Agenda • Introductions • Meeting guidelines	Brandy Steffen
5:15-6:00 pm	**Review Preliminary Alternatives** • Key Takeaways • Process	David Miller
6:00-7:35 pm	**PAC Comments** • Questions/clarification	Brandy Steffen
7:35-7:55 pm	**Public Comments** • Comments may be emailed before the meeting through the website: https://publicproject.net/AuroraAirport# • Commenters may have up to 2 minute to speak. We ask that only one representative from each organization speaks. We may not be able to hear from everyone. • *Reminder:* public comments typed into Zoom may not be answered during the meeting, but answers will be included in the written meeting summary.	Brandy Steffen
7:55-8:00 pm	**Next Steps** • Public Open House on Thursday, June 13, 2024 from 4:00-7:00 pm • PAC working session July 30, 2024 from 5:00-7:00 pm	Brandy Steffen

A meeting summary with all PAC and public comments will be posted to the project website within two weeks.

We always will take comments via the website, which will be included in the meeting notes and shared with the PAC members: https://publicproject.net/AuroraAirport#

AURORA STATE AIRPORT

PLANNING ADVISORY COMMITTEE (PAC)
MEETING #6 SUMMARY

Date: Tuesday, June 11, 2024
Time: 5:00-8:00 pm
Location: Zoom Webinar

In Attendance

PAC Members Present

Beth Wytoski, *Regional Solutions*
Bill Graupp, *Aurora CTE, Inc*
Bruce Bennett, *Positive Aurora Airport Management*
Brian Asher, *City of Aurora*
Councilor Joann Linville, *City of Wilsonville*
David Waggoner, *Willamette Aviation*
Dave Mauk, *Charbonneau Country Club*
Naomi Zwerdling, *Oregon Dept of Transportation*
Pam Barlow Lind, *Confederated Tribes of the Siletz Indians*
Patrick Donaldson, *Wilsonville Chamber of Commerce*
Rian Johnson, *Vans Aircraft*
Ted Millar, *AABC/TLM Holdings*
Tony Helbling, *Aurora Airport Improvement Association*
Trent Brownlee, *Atlantic Aviation*
Wayne Richards, Alternate, *Friends of the French Prairie*
Whitney Stewart, *Oregon Office of Emergency Management*

PAC Members Absent

Austin Barnes, *Marion County Planning Dept.*
Ben Clayton, *Life Flight Network*
Ben Williams, *Friends of French Prairie*
Bob Buchanan, Alternate, *Columbia Helicopters*
Brandon Reich, Alternate, *Marion County Planning Dept.*
Ken Ivey, *Aurora Butteville Barlow Community Planning Organization*
Cathryn Stephens, *ODAV Board*
Cheryl Pouley, *Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde Community of Oregon*
Commissioner Danielle Bethel, *Marion County*
Commissioner Tootie Smith, *Clackamas County*
Greg Hughes, Alternate, *Vans Aircraft*
Matt Crall, *Oregon Dept of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD)*
Matt Lawyer, *alternate, Marion County*
Matt Williams, *Deer Creek Estates HOA*
Raul Suarez, *Aurora Air Traffic Control*
Rob Roedts, *Columbia Helicopters*
Robert Fournier, *Helicopter Transport Service*
Roger Kaye, *1000 Friends of Oregon*

Agency Representatives Present
Kenji Sugahara, *ODAV*
Alex Thomas, *ODAV*
Tony Beach, *ODAV*
Brandon Pike, *ODAV*
Tim House, *FAA*

Staff and Consultants
Matt Rogers, *Century West*
David Miller, *Century West*
Samantha Peterson, *Century West*
Mark Steele, *Century West*
James Kirby*, Century West*
Brandy Steffen*, JLA Public Involvement*
Jen Winslow*, JLA Public Involvement*

Audience / Members of the Public
Aron Faegre, *alternate*, *AABC/TLM Holdings*
Chris Neamztu*, City of Wilsonville*
Melissa Ahrens*, alternate, Oregon Dept of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD)*
George Van Hoomissen
George Buley
Tom Herzog
Mayor Julie Fitzgerald*, City of Wilsonville*
Mark Ottenad*, City of Wilsonville*
Dave Tibbetts
Krista Kroiss
Greg Leo
Chad Robertson
Bill Poehler
Kirsten Newbury
Linette Dobbins

Overview

Planning Advisory Committee (PAC) members reviewed and asked questions about the preliminary alternatives. Staff also collected feedback on the alternatives. *The presentation, FAQs, meeting recording and other materials are posted on the website (publicproject.net/AuroraAirport). Comments collected during the meeting have been added to this meeting summary.*

Welcome and Introductions

Brandy Steffen, JLA Public Involvement, welcomed everyone to the meeting, reviewed the agenda and Zoom meeting tips and etiquette. She reminded the members of their roles and responsibilities. The meeting was extended by an hour to ensure time to discuss each airside and landside alternative and answer questions. **Kenji Sugahara and Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation (ODAV)**, thanked everyone for their time and comments. They alerted the PAC that a virtual feedback form is available to provide more lengthy comments about the preliminary alternatives.

Presentation

David Miller, Century West, reviewed the takeaways from the previous PAC meeting. He summarized how the Facility Requirements were evaluated. The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) approved aviation activity and established C-II design standards for the airport for both the current and future design aircraft. The justified runway length from the analysis, meeting FAA requirements, is 5,500 feet. He reminded the PAC that there would be opportunities to ask questions throughout the meeting, but more technical or detailed questions would be answered in writing after the meeting.

David reviewed the Preliminary Alternatives, which were developed consistent with FAA standards and the results of the aviation forecasts. As a twenty-year plan, the further out forecasts go the more uncertain they can be. The master plan evaluation process aims to identify improvements that accommodate demand-driven needs while meeting design standards. He clarified that the proposed runway and taxiway improvements are not driven by forecast activity but by the need to meet FAA standards based on current activity. The design standards identified will apply throughout the planning period, and the justified runway length meets FAA criteria currently. The forecast does not result in a change in the category for the design aircraft.

Tim House, Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), explained why B-II Alternatives are not viable and will not be considered. While maintenance and rehabilitation can continue as long as progress towards meeting standards is evident, reconstruction, which includes extensions and new construction, must adhere to the standards. The "no action alternative" allows for a temporary continuation of maintenance, but at some point, further action will be required. It is not a long-term path forward.

PAC Questions and Comments

Brandy opened the discussion for PAC questions. *Comments and responses are provided in the table below.*

Public Comment

Brandy opened the public comment section of the meeting. There were no verbal public comments at this meeting. *Written comments and responses are provided in the table below.*

Next Steps

Brandy reminded the group that there will be an in-person open house held on Thursday, June 13, from 4:00-7:00 p.m. The next virtual PAC meeting will be a virtual working session held on July 30 from 5:00-8:00 p.m., to review the refined alternatives, which incorporate feedback from the PAC and community. Feedback forms will be emailed to PAC members, and public feedback forms will also be available at the public event and online.

Tony and David thanked the PAC and public attendees for their time and input, then ended the meeting.

PAC Member Questions/Comments and Responses[1]

ID	Name	Affiliation	Question/Comment	Response
6.1	**Patrick Donaldson**	*Wilsonville Chamber of Commerce*	There are changing dynamics of the types of aircraft all over the country. Will drones be analyzed? Most aviation press has talked about this changing dynamic and how aircraft are moving. Vans, located at the Airport, has a significant role in the international unmanned flight space. There are also developments in Salem related to PGE and rapid charging for unmanned drone taxis. It is suggested that the master plan includes at least a mention of the evolution of aviation and its potential impacts.	The integration of unmanned aerial systems (UAS) with airport airspace will be necessary, but forecasting their activity is challenging due to the lack of established methodology. Previous attempts to project UAS demand have been speculative. Facility needs, such as hangars for UAS storage, similar to conventional aircraft, aircraft parking, and electric aircraft charging facilities will be considered in the master plan landside facility alternatives. UAS operations will be regulated by air traffic control, and operators must comply with regulations. Currently, the master plan cannot precisely project UAS impacts or capacities, and ongoing integration with conventional aircraft will be required.
6.2	**Tony Helbling**	*Aurora Airport Improvement Association*	I'm concerned about the runway length of 5,500 feet. Based on the Gulf Stream 450's accelerate-stop distance, it does not account for real-world conditions faced by corporate pilots. While test pilots achieve this distance under optimal conditions, corporate pilots encounter varying factors and surprises, leaving no margin for error. Why was the previously planned 6,000 feet length not addressed in the summary. The Gulf Stream 450, already at the airport, is part of the same design class category as the Challenger 350, used as a representative aircraft in the master plan. The Gulf Stream 450 should	The FAA methodology for runway length evaluations must be followed in the master plan. The future critical aircraft is the Challenger 350, not the Gulf Stream 450. While the FAA runway length analysis includes a margin of safety for balanced field lengths, meeting FAA standards for runway safety areas is crucial. These areas provide an extra margin of safety for aircraft mishaps. The Gulf Stream 450 is included in the same airport reference code as the design aircraft. The FAA methodology accounts for the mix of aircraft in the fleet, including larger aircraft like the Gulf Stream. **Tim House, FAA:** Even if an aircraft like the Gulf Stream 450 operates at the

[1] Live responses are included, along with additional information/clarification, as needed.

			be considered since it requires over 5,500 feet.	airport, it doesn't mean the runway and facilities must be modified to meet the full capacity and safety standards for every specific aircraft. If this were done for every aircraft, runways would need to be excessively long, to accommodate larger planes like the Boeing 777. Design standards and justified lengths need to be followed, as they have in this case.
6.3	**Ted Millar**	*AABC/TLM Holdings*	According to new FAA regulations for vertical takeoff aircraft, both electric and internal combustion types, master plans must consider separating these aircraft from regular airplanes due to downwash issues similar to helicopters. It should be separated. Please include this consideration in the master plan.	Similar to how helicopters are handled, there should be a method to separate vertical takeoff aircraft from fixed-wing aircraft.. It is challenging to accommodate various facilities within a finite landside area. There is demand for additional hangar space and different types of aircraft parking. Segregating vertical takeoff aircraft from other parked aircraft should be addressed in the planning, even if it means sacrificing space for other facilities like hangars or tie-downs. ODAV will make the final decision on this.
6.4	**Bruce Bennett**	*Positive Aurora Airport Management*	The runway length is recommended at 5500 ft. The former Master Plans going back to 1976 show a 6000 preferred runway length? Why has that changed?	Previous plans often included the maximum stage length of aircraft flights and other criteria that could result in a longer runway length that are no longer allowed in the runway calculations in the current FAA standards. The runway length analysis involves choosing the percentage of useful load and fleet based on FAA defined criteria, which can influence the results. We followed the applicable methodology for the airport to identify the runway length that was justified. **Tim House, FAA:** Many airports depict runways on their ALPs that they may

				never achieve or justify based on actual operations required to meet funding eligibility. The ALP may show longer runways than currently constructed to protect for future possibilities. However, what is justified is based on actual need and is what airports should work to protect through local zoning and regulatory entities. This distinction ensures that runways are not unnecessarily extended beyond what is operationally necessary. **Tony Beach:** Just a reminder that this is not a master plan update. This is a new master plan based on new data and is an independent analysis of the runway length and all the other facility requirements.
6.5	**Councilor Dr. Joann Linville**	*City of Wilsonville*	(In the chat) Question for Tim regarding the "no action alternative": In some of the Preliminary Alternatives possible downgrade to B-II is mentioned. If there was a downgrade, how would that impact the identified non-standard deficiencies that have been identified? I'm concerned about the impact of downgrading to a B-II airport on identified deficiencies and non-standard conditions. Was the airport's change from a B level to a C-II level based on an FAA decision, and was it related to waived or unapproved use during the B-II period? Can larger aircraft using the airport lead to an FAA upgrade of the airport's level, regardless of whether those aircraft were approved to use the airport?	**David Miller:** The transition from a B-II to a C-II airport occurred gradually over the years as traffic levels evolved to include more C-II aircraft. There were no rules preventing C-II aircraft from operating at the airport as long as the runway could accommodate them. The evaluation for the master plan confirms that the airport now has enough C-II operations to meet the criteria for a C-II airport. **Tim House, FAA:** Aircraft performance varies based on factors like weight and fuel load. This variation is why there are different categories for approach speeds and aircraft size. The G450 aircraft, for example, falls into the C-II category for approach speeds, meaning it can operate at the airport. The decision to classify the airport as C-II is based on the number of C-II operations observed, not a specific FAA or airport decision. Once the number of C-II operations exceeds 500, actions must

				be taken to ensure compliance with FAA standards. **David Miller:** No runway length can accommodate all aircraft under all conditions. While some B-II, C-II, and D-II aircraft might not be able to operate on a 5,500-foot runway on a very hot day with a full load, pilots can adjust by reducing weight or waiting for cooler temperatures. This scenario is common across all airports, including commercial ones. Despite meeting C-II dimensional standards, there will be times when the runway length might not be sufficient under certain conditions, requiring pilots to make adjustments or use a different airport.
6.6	**Councilor Dr. Joann Linville**	*City of Wilsonville*	All current alternatives, excluding the downgrading to B-II, suggest extending the runway by 497 feet to the justified length. There might come a point where the airport could no longer expand due to limitations from adjacent land, highways, and land configurations. Will the FAA and ODAV acknowledge that they have reached the maximum expansion capacity and cannot accommodate larger aircraft due to these constraints?	Most airports face natural development constraints. The current master plan forecasts and design standards relate to C-II aircraft with a justified runway length of 5,500 feet. For the purposes of this 20-year master plan, this is considered the outer limit of development for the runway and taxiway system. Future master plans, possibly 10-15 years down the road, will need to reevaluate these constraints and requirements.
6.7	**Councilor Dr. Joann Linville**	*City of Wilsonville*	I'm also concerned about the significant costs and feasibility of the proposed alternatives, such as moving Highway 551, relocating the control tower, and reconstructing the runway. Is it realistic to expect the state to move a highway to accommodate the airport? Are	**David Miller:** There are challenges in meeting FAA standards for airports, and they often involve expensive fixes. This issue is widespread across many airports in the country. The FAA recognizes the high costs and challenges and that the key for ODAV is to identify the most viable option for compliance. Downsizing the airport is not acceptable to the FAA. The

			more limitations in the alternatives being considered?	preliminary alternatives presented are for discussion, and feedback will help refine these concepts, but no easy decisions are expected. **Tony Beach, ODAV:** That is a good summary and it's important to get feedback from the PAC, who represent all the different organizations and groups at the airport and surrounding communities. The purpose of the meeting and discussions is to consider these preliminary alternatives.
6.8	**Bruce Bennett**	*Positive Aurora Airport Management*	Wouldn't installing an FAA approved geo fabric eliminate the drain field challenge(s)	**David Miller:** The FAA runway safety area (RSA) standard requires the surface to be graded and compacted to support aircraft or emergency vehicles. If structural components are added to the drain field, it could potentially meet these requirements. The primary goal is to bring the RSA up to standards, including grading and compaction. If viable engineering solutions can achieve this, they would be considered. Otherwise, the drain field may need to be relocated outside the RSA, likely off airport property. **Tim House, FAA:** There are no FAA standards or specifications for structurally improving the sub-grade in the safety area. The drain field's user would not be eligible for FAA funding for such improvements. **James Kirby:** The existing drain field at the airport has been a challenge due to poor soil quality, which prevents proper infiltration. The soil conditions make it impossible to bury the drain field or add structural fill over it without compromising its function. The drain field needs to be close to the surface to

				function properly, but its current location doesn't meet grading standards or allow for non-load bearing structures. The most viable solution appears to be reconstructing the drain field in a different location that meets these requirements.
6.9	**Rian Johnson**	*Vans Aircraft*	Bruce: yes, consider a GeoCell Ground Grid System	Thank you for your comment.
6.10	**Dave Mauk**	*Charbonneau Country Club*	Is there a scenario viable where the runway shifts east with taxiway on west side instead of east side?	The idea of flipping the taxiway to the west side hasn't been considered due to the current layout of adjacent landside facilities. Relocating the taxiway in this manner could lead to a constant stream of traffic crossing an active runway, which goes against good design practice aimed at minimizing such crossings.
6.10	**Dave Mauk**	*Charbonneau Country Club*	Following up Councilor Linville's question: B-II enables C-II aircraft to use airfield, so what's would be necessary to those requirements?	The C-II designation is based on the current airport traffic and forecasted airport traffic. Once you are at that level, the FAA standards are defined to accommodate C-II aircraft.
6.11	**Wayne Richards**	*Friends of French Prairie*	I was bothered by Alternative 6 and 7 being so small and not being as visible. C-II aircraft are already landing at the airport, so it's essential to analyze which option might cause more potential conflict with existing residential development, noise, and pollution. They may not specifically be FAA compliance issues, but they are significant enough to be considered in the decision-making matrix.	The refinement process will involve creating a matrix to compare the components of each alternative, which will identify their relative strengths, weaknesses, and challenges. The environmental and noise impacts analysis will be part of the master plan, but a detailed evaluation will typically occur during a separate environmental assessment study. We are using this meeting to gather feedback on the alternatives, not choose an option.
6.12	**Bruce Bennett**	*Positive Aurora Airport Management*	I think it's important to point out that 100% of any costs will be paid by FAA and or ODAV funds.	Thank you for your comment.

6.13	**Councilor Dr. Joann Linville**	*City of Wilsonville*	Costs are still paid by taxpayers. Has a runway extension of 248.5 feet both north and south been considered?	Splitting the extension between the two ends of the runway has been considered, but was not carried forward into these preliminary alternatives.
6.14	**Bruce Bennett**	*Positive Aurora Airport Management*	Yes, but I believe it is important to point out ONLY aviation taxes, no income or property taxes. Both ends should be considered. Thank you.	**Tim House, FAA**: FAA AIP funding is from taxes collected on aviation fuel sales, aviation parts, etc. not the General Fund, or other taxes. I am not exactly certain where ODAV funding comes from other than fees they charge the users.
6.15	**Patrick Donaldson**	*Wilsonville Chamber of Commerce*	When I received the preliminary alternatives, I was pleased, but would like larger pictures. If I'm understanding correctly, the Aurora State Airport is classified as a C-II airport by the FAA. The alternatives were developed with the goal of either maintaining C-II status or returning to a B status. However, a decision was made that reverting to a B-II alternative was not justified by current and forecasted usage. The current C-II status was deemed justified based on FAA determinations of current and forecasted usage, not by any other entity. When was the forecast approved?	Yes, that is correct. Thank you. The airport's designation of C-II doesn't necessarily prevent occasional use by aircraft that exceed that designation. For example, a D-II aircraft could still land at a C-II airport. Changing the designation on paper wouldn't necessarily discourage such aircraft from landing. This inconsistency between designation and actual activity is a broader issue seen at many airports around the country. **Tim House, FAA:** The airport cannot fit into a B-II standard mold and the do-nothing alternative or reverting to a B-II status is not feasible. It would be going lower than doing nothing. The airport is clearly categorized as a C-II based on existing operations and forecasts. The goal of the master plan is to look 20 years ahead and make incremental steps towards meeting FAA standards, which is why the B-II option is not acceptable for moving forward for consideration in the master plan. The forecast was approved on January 23, 2024.
6.16	**Patrick Donaldson**	*Wilsonville Chamber of Commerce*	It is important to understand the factual basis behind the current discussions about the airport's development. The process follows FAA guidelines and projections based on actual usage. There is a need for realistic expectations, and	Thank you for your comment.

			the process is not like designing a town center, as it is governed by national and federal laws and regulations.	
6.17	**Dave Mauk**	*Charbonneau Country Club*	So, the B-II alternative doesn't really exist (?)	FAA has determined that B-II alternatives are not viable. They will not be considered further.
6.18	**Whitney Stewart**	*Oregon Department of Emergency Management*	Good evening. During any of the master planning work for these airport upgrade suggestions, has emergency preparedness and response capabilities factored in? I am thinking specifically along the lines of runway hardening/seismic upgrading and storage capabilities for local resources such as material handling equipment and backup communications equipment? However, this may be outside the scope of this particular project.	Resiliency is an important factor in airport planning, especially regarding pavement and drainage work. While specific set-asides for equipment storage in emergencies haven't been identified, experience shows that in emergency scenarios, agencies like the National Guard will close the airport and use existing facilities as needed for response efforts. Emergency planning focuses on utilizing available resources rather than pre-designated storage areas.
6.19	**Councilor Dr. Joann Linville**	*City of Wilsonville*	What is the timeline for homing in on the preferred alternative? The methodology used by the FAA in determining the C-II classification for the airport did not use control tower data and used population studies when the airport doesn't have passenger service. I would like to know more about the methodology used.	The PAC will weigh in on the refined alternatives at the July 30 meeting. There will be a period for review and input, with the expectation of reaching a decision on the preferred alternative in the latter part of the summer, including a full plan on implementation. The project is expected to conclude by May of the following year. The evaluation of actual operations numbers was challenging due to limited data duration and the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on flight training activity, which led to an unsustainable growth rate in local operations.
6.20	**David Waggoner**	*Willamette Aviation*	The Aurora Airport currently has two Emergency Operations Centers located on the field. One is the Civil Air Patrol. The other is the Oregon Disaster Airlift Response Team. Both organizations are designed to support the State and local	Thank you for your comment.

			populations by responding to emergencies and natural disasters.	
6.21	**Ted Millar**	*AABC/TLM Holdings*	I'm concerned about the lack of itinerant parking for airplanes in the new master plan. When the airport was first given to the state of Oregon, there was a requirement to buy additional land for this purpose. Right now, it is being built out with hangars and all parking is left on private property. I'm also concerned about the removal of fire suppression tanks in the area and am wondering if these factors have been considered in the plan.	There are limited transient parking areas in the proposed concepts, which are mainly on ODA property. Smaller aircraft tie-downs are depicted in the south existing tie-down apron, along with some larger aircraft parking spaces. The itinerant parking, especially considering the potential location of a new FBO in the area, is a valid concern and something for ODAV to consider. The fire suppression tanks and potential relocation will need to be considered.
6.22	**Tony Helbling**	*Aurora Airport Improvement Association*	What about the easements in place for access for the through-the-fence owners to the taxiway in Figure 12? There are no restrictions for aircraft movement across that area.	Proposed improvements to meet FAA standards that impact existing easements will be coordinated between ODAV and the property owner.
6.23	**Bruce Bennett**	*Positive Aurora Airport Management*	There is property near Mid-field near Alpha 3 that ODAV could acquire. There is an issue with the diagram regarding direct access at midfield. The ramp and taxiway do not align as shown in the diagram, with the actual access being between two hangers, indicated by double yellow lines. The area might need to be repainted for clarity.	We are not at a point to make a decision on property acquisition at the moment. Any property acquisition would be a result of the master planning process and based on input from the PAC. Thank you for your comment.
6.24	**Whitney Stewart**	*Oregon Department of Emergency Management*	David Waggoner- thank you for that information and that is great to have two great resources staged/poised to operate from the airport in times of need.	Thank you for your comment.

Attendee Questions/Comments and Responses[2]

ID	Name	Question/Comment	Response
6.25	**Anonymous Attendee**	How many years has that 'developable land' been available, and why was it not developed long ago? How does this relate to the massive off-airport acreage developed beyond ODAV's control?	According to a review of historic aerial photography (Source: Google Earth), that piece of ODAV property has been undeveloped since at least 1994. Development on the airport is market driven and is primarily accomplished through private development on leased land. Up until this time, a developer with interest in leasing property in that area had not been identified. Currently, there are ongoing negotiations regarding the lease of that property for aeronautical development.
6.26	**Anonymous Attendee**	Regarding G-IV and Tony's comment... Is it true that 5,500 ft is half the length and width of the runway at PDX?	PDX has three runways that are all 150 feet wide. According to FAA Airport Master Records and Reports, Runway 3/21 is 6,000 feet long, Runway 10L/28R is 9,825 feet long, and Runway 10R/28L is 11,000 feet long.
6.27	**Anonymous Attendee**	Does a septic drainfield in the RSA conform with FAA standards, for safety in handling overruns?	The drain field located in the south end of the RSA does not meet load bearing requirements for the RSA and will require mitigation to meet compliance with standards. Additionally, there are posts and plastic pipes that penetrate ROFA standards and would require mitigation.
6.28	**Anonymous Attendee**	What design standards would make the RPZ legal by FAA standards? I.e., what aircraft group and visibility minimum standard works today?	FAA design standards, including RPZs, are simply standards meant to accommodate safe operation by aircraft that regularly use a facility. They are neither legal, nor illegal. With that being said, RPZs are meant to address land use off the ends of runways. Examples of incompatible land uses within an RPZ include places where people reside and gather (homes, parks, schools, churches, etc), and critical infrastructure (public roads, utilities). The current RPZs contain roads, residential homes,

[2] Live responses are included, along with additional information/clarification, as needed.

			and neighboring helicopter support facilities. Mitigation of incompatible land uses in RPZs may involve relocation or removal of the land use (i.e. reroute roads) or altering approach procedure visibility minimums to reduce the RPZ dimensions. In this case, raising approach procedure visibility minimums to not lower than 1-mile would reduce the width of the RPZ, which would mitigate many of the residential areas and road conflicts. See the Preliminary Alternatives Summary on the project website for more information.
6.29	**Anonymous Attendee**	Correction, previous question is about the ROFA (hard to see on this tiny graphic).	The drain field does not meet RSA load bearing requirements. However, there are posts and plastic pipes that do penetrate ROFA standards and would require mitigation.
6.30	**Anonymous Attendee**	If you shift the runway to the east, what are the rough cost, and is the actual intent to rebuild it for heavier weight bearing capacity?	The goal of these preliminary alterative concepts is to answer the big questions that will allow us to move forward with more detailed refined alternative concepts. Order-of-magnitude cost estimates and final configurations will be developed as we continue through the development alternative process. Any reconstruction of the runway will be designed to support the critical aircraft, as identified in the master plan.
6.31	**Anonymous Attendee**	Relocate the tower which was just built a few years ago... how does this reflect on how well this airport is being managed by ODAV? I.e., is it reasonable for a citizen to conclude with this proposal, all past airport master plans have just been an expensive exercise failing to help ODAV manage this airport?	Alternatives that propose shifting the runway east to deconflict Hubbard Highway and the ROFA will necessitate the relocation of the Air Traffic Control Tower (ATCT). When the existing ATCT was constructed, it was designed and built to current FAA standards.
6.32	**Anonymous Attendee**	Miller is saying FAA shot down a downgrade to B-II. Please include ALL notes and correspondence into the public record of who advocated for what, and the what and why of the need to 'reject' this otherwise good idea.	FAA reviewed the preliminary alternatives and provided an email from Tim House (FAA) dated Friday June 7, 2024 stating that the B-II concepts are not viable and requesting that they be removed from the presentation is included in the Preliminary Alternative

			Summary available on the Meetings tab of the project website.
6.33	**Chad Robertson**	Is there a preferred alternative that has been shown that the panel is leaning towards? What is the most likely outcome?	A preferred alternative has not been identified at this point in the process. Refined alternatives will be presented at future meetings as the Planning Team works toward a preferred alternative, based on input from the PAC, public, and FAA.
6.34	**Chris Neamtzu,** *City of Wilsonville Alternate*	Will there be other alternatives generated for the PAC's consideration at the July meeting, or will a decision be made on the four remaining viable alternatives?	The presented concepts are open to refinement based on the input received. We are open to ideas. Often, feedback leads to creating hybrid solutions combining elements from different alternatives. This process is part of a 20-year plan, and any improvements like runway extensions would be implemented gradually through various projects. While the planning analysis is essential to qualify for funding, the airport owner is not obligated to extend the runway. The team welcomes suggestions for alternatives and will refine the options based on feedback. In the July meeting, we will present more detailed, refined alternatives for further input, focusing on viable options based on current forecasts and facility requirements, excluding non-viable B2 options.
6.35	**Anonymous Attendee**	If an aircraft exceeds the weight capacity of the runway or taxiway, does the pilot have an obligation to get pre-approval from the airport authority, ODAV in this case? What has been the ODAV position on use by G-IV's and other larger bizjets?	ODAV requires an overweight waiver for aircraft that exceed the runway's weight-bearing capacity. Each request for a waiver is reviewed and approved at the discretion of ODAV. There are aircraft that meet the current critical design category that do exceed weight bearing capacity.
6.36	**Anonymous Attendee**	Tim House says, once the count exceeds 500.. so, does that mean an aircraft owner can base a large D-III aircraft and do lots of very short hops to PDX (using KUAO as a garage for activities centered at PDX) and thus 'build up' a D-III count to force ODAV to	Critical aircraft and Regular Use are defined in AC 150/5000-17, Section 1.2: 1.2 What is the Definition of Critical Aircraft and Regular Use?

		upgrade and extend into and over neighbors? Is this crazy or what?	1.2.1 The critical aircraft is the most demanding aircraft type, or grouping of aircraft with similar characteristics, that make regular use of the airport. Regular use is 500 annual operations, including both itinerant and local operations but excluding touch-and-go operations. An operation is either a takeoff or landing.
6.37	**Anonymous Attendee**	Why does this feel like airport neighbors are 'David' and FAA-ODAV are 'Goliath', and slingshots are nowhere to be found?	ODAV is undergoing a public process to gather input from all stakeholders of the Airport. Input from all stakeholders has been and will continue to be considered as we move through this master plan.
6.38	**Anonymous Attendee**	Bringing the drainfield to standards... how can compaction be used, when it conflicts with drainfield functionality?	Drain fields, by their characteristics necessary to function in the soils present on the airport, cannot meet RSA standards. Any additional compaction reduces absorption and limits the amount of oxygen to keep aerobic drain field bacteria alive. Existing drain field materials and structures are not designed for aircraft weight.
6.39	**Anonymous Attendee**	If the runway was SHORTENED (or never improperly extended) would that possibly resolve the drainfield confliction? Can we consider runway shortening as an engineereed solution to this problem?	Based on the critical aircraft and associated runway standards, a runway shortening is not a viable alternative. Drain fields within the RSA will require other forms of mitigation.
6.40	**Chad Robertson**	Has there been any more conversation with extending Aurora's sewage line and eliminating the drainage fields all together?	Future plans for City of Aurora's sanitary sewer network are the responsibility of the City and are outside the scope of this project.
6.41	**George Buley**	Is there a detailed analysis showing step by step how the runway length was determined using the forecast design aircraft? Providing this data may answer how FAA's design standards consider other criteria other than operating requirements.	Yes. The runway length analysis is discussed in detail in Chapter 4 – Facility Goals and Requirements.
6.42	**Anonymous Attendee**	What design standards would make the RPZ legal by FAA standards? I.e., what aircraft group and visibility minimum standard works today?	FAA design standards, including RPZs, are simply standards meant to accommodate safe operation by aircraft that regularly use a facility. They are neither legal, nor illegal. With that being said, RPZs are meant to address land

			use off the ends of runways. Examples of incompatible land uses within an RPZ include places where people reside and gather (homes, parks, schools, churches, etc.), and critical infrastructure (public roads, utilities). The current RPZs contain roads, residential homes, and neighboring helicopter support facilities. Mitigation of incompatible land uses in RPZs may involve relocation or removal of the land use (i.e. reroute roads) or altering approach procedure visibility minimums to reduce the RPZ dimensions. In this case, raising approach procedure visibility minimums to not lower than 1-mile would reduce the width of the RPZ, which would mitigate many of the residential areas and road conflicts. See the Preliminary Alternatives Summary on the project website for more information.
6.43	**Wayne Richards (response)**	The cart before the horse? So if C 2s are allowed now as a pilot choice why spend all the money to try to make Aurora a bigger airport. They're fine just as they are without extension. Do not eliminate Alt 7?	Aurora State Airport is currently a C-II airport. The alternatives presented are concepts intended to meet C-II standards, including proposed property acquisition required. The proposed runway extension is justified to support the safe operation of aircraft already using the Airport. FAA has indicated that B-II concepts, including (former) Alternative 7 are not viable and will not be considered further.
6.44	**Chris Neamtzu,** *City of Wilsonville Alternate*	Is cost a consideration for ODAV in considering the most viable alternative? If it is, then cost estimates for each alternative would appear to be warranted	While both scenarios presented would be costly, a direct cost comparison between them has not yet been conducted. Developing preliminary high-level costs for each option would be useful in the refinement process to help understand the order of magnitude of the expenses involved. While cost is a significant factor, the implementation challenges for each scenario could be equally complex. FAA funding would likely cover a large portion, if not the

			majority, of the costs, with the remaining balance being the local share. The federal share typically ranges from 90% to 95% depending on the authorization bills from Congress at the time of the project.
6.45	**George Buley**	I asked this question at the last meeting. Does ODAV own drainfields in the RSA?	ODAV does not own any drain fields on the Airport. Please see our response to your question in the PAC Meeting #5 Summary (Question 5.19) available on the project website.
6.46	**George Buley**	Per Airport Master Plan AC, runway length does include aircraft operating characteristics. My mistake. Excerpt:) Length – The length of a runway is a function of many factors, the most notable of which are the selection of an appropriate design aircraft and the longest nonstop distance to be flown by the design aircraft from the airport. Aircraft-specific runway length requirements are a function of aircraft physical characteristics at time of flight, weather conditions, and runway conditions. See FAA AC 150/5325-4, Runway Length Requirements for Airport Design, for guidance on this analysis. Other common resources for runway length assessments are the aircraft characteristics information published by aircraft manufacturers, consultation with aircraft operators at the airport, and the FAA document, Best Practices: Planning Airports for Business Jets. Aircraft manufacturers may be able to provide airport-specific runway length requirements for their aircraft, especially at airports with severe conditions...	Thank you for your comment.

Additional Emailed Comments

ID	Name	Affiliation	Question/Comment	Response
6.47	**Councilor Dr. Joanne Linville**	*City of Wilsonville*	Brandy - the supplied “Preliminary Alternatives” document is really insufficient to adequately prepare for the upcoming PAC meeting. There does not appear to be adequate and comprehensive analyses of each	Thanks so much for reaching out. Yes, you're correct that tomorrow night's PAC meeting will be focused on reviewing each of the preliminary alternatives. We've extended the meeting by an hour (5:00-8:00 pm) to give plenty of time for

			alternative including assessments of benefits and constraints of each of the alternatives based on FAA regulations, ODT constraints, land use regulations, ROFA, RSA, RPZ requirements, environmental and community impacts. Will that be provided to the PAC and the general public? Providing a matrix for each alternative including strengths and constraints would be very helpful.	committee members to ask questions and get clarity on the details before providing feedback to ODAV. I'll pass along your idea for a matrix to show the differences between the alternatives. Regarding the public information, we will have the public open house on Thursday of this week where we'll be able to walk people through those details and answer their questions. We'll also post the materials on the website, along with a comment form, for anyone that can't attend on Thursday. I hope that helps answer your questions, but please let me know if you have any other questions or concerns.
6.48	**Harmon and Janette Laurin**	*City of Wilsonville*	We are writing to express our strong objection to lengthening runways and increasing size of aircraft at Aurora Airport. Planes from this airport already take off and land over densely populated areas and this proposal will seriously adversely affect communities in and near the flight path both in terms of noise and quality of life, and also in terms of safety. In addition, the Boone Bridge section of I-5 is already a traffic nightmare and adding traffic to and from the airport is not tenable. We have a more than adequate airport in Portland and the studies do not support the need for this expansion any time in the near future Please take citizens and neighbors' concerns into consideration and stop any expansion of Aurora Airport.	Thank you for your comment. We will make sure that your comments (along with those from residents, government partners, and businesses) are included in the information that the Oregon Department of Aviation (ODAV) considers in the Aurora Airport Master Plan.

6.49	**Bruce Bennett**	*Aurora Aircraft, LLC*	Attached is an outline of the property parcel that I showed to Tony & Kenji and that is available to ODAV. As we discussed, this Aurora ramp space would facilitate a huge improvement in Aircraft and vehicle movement at UAO. This property transfer would go along with ODAV's 1995 plans to own & control ramp space as well as the FAA's 1985 directive for ODAV to increase their UAO ownership percentage Please add this to the master plan record and contact me with any questions.	Thank you for your comments. Potential property acquisitions are being evaluated through the development alternatives process.
6.50	**Chelsea Ausland**	*Metro West Realty*	I am opposed to the expansion of the Aurora Airport. As a resident in Wilsonville, OR, I already see far too many large and small planes above my house. The noise is awful and scares the wildlife. The small is also terrible and has notably affected our health.	Thank you for sending us your thoughts about the runway length and aircraft size at the Aurora State Airport. We will make sure that your comments (along with those from local residents, government partners, and businesses) are included in the information that the Oregon Department of Aviation (ODAV) considers in the Aurora Airport Master Plan. You can find more information at the project website and also submit other questions or concerns you might have: https://publicproject.net/AuroraAirport# Thank you again for taking time to send us your comments.
6.51	**Kristin Roche**	*Website Comment*	For too long Charlotte Lehan, Tim Knapp, Greg Leo and the current Wilsonville City Council have stood in the way of much needed progress of bringing the airport up to date. In fact, I would argue the City makes a big show of fighting the airport expansion to secure NIMBY (not-in-	Thank you for your comment.

			my-backyard) votes to distract from the major issues it is dealing with. These include major traffic, congestion and parking issues that have been eroding public support for current council urban renewal projects like gutting Town Center with thousands of people. It is long passed time that the airport be upgraded and expanded.	
6.52	**Trevor Conroy**	*Website Comment*	We are local residents in Butteville and we totally support the planned growth of the Aurora State airport, adding 500ft to one end of the runway to increase safety margins for larger aircraft and develop the land mid-field with hangars. UAO is a fantastic airport that has so many businesses, employing many locals.	Thank you for your comment, ODAV appreciates the support of the community and airport users.
6.53	**Leann Bennett**	*Metro-West Realty*	Good Day! I am writing of support for the Aurora airport runway extension. This airport is so critically important to our area, providing over 1200 jobs, providing fire fighting equipment and expertise (Columbia Helicopter/HTC) and life saving services (Lifeflight/ organ transport services). Adding 500’ to the runway will make the airport safer as any pilot can attest. Having lost a best friend in an airplane accident at Coos Bay/South Bend off the end of the runway, I know this is a life or death solution. Please support this extension which has been part of the master plan since the 70’s for safety reasons.	Thank you for your comment ODAV appreciates the support of the community and airport users..

			This is also ground zero for subduction earthquake disaster relief. ODART is doing a simulation soon in support of this. Look at the big picture. Airplanes fly over every corner of the United States- (except military restricted zones). They use navigational way points to travel. People near those way points are just as equally affected by airplanes as those near an airport and do they send you their complaints? I recently sold a $2,000,000 home across the street from the Newberg VOR on Chehalem Mountain. They were not concerned in the least about aircraft traffic. Thank you for your time and consideration, Leann Bennett, Principal Broker	
6.54	**Mike Walsh**	*Charbonneau Resident*	I won't be able to attend the North Marion High meeting tonight to discuss the Airport Master Plan. I would like to itemize the problems or issues with the plan from my perspective as a home owner. -I live in Charbonneau and have for the last 15 years. Over the last 4-5 years the number of aircrafts and the overflight noise has increased greatly which makes it very difficult to hear when sitting on my porch when the planes fly so close over Charbonneau. It sometimes feels like the plane is going to crash. The noise level is much more obvious at Charbonneau than downtown	Thank you for your comments. ODAV is aware of the noise concerns held by members of the Charbonneau community. Noise impacts are being considered through the development alternatives process and a noise study will be completed for the preferred alternative.

			Wilsonville because the flight plans go straight over Charbonneau. -to extend the airport runway will allow larger aircrafts to use it and increase even more the noise level. The infra structure to support increase usage is not mentioned in any of the master plans I have read. Why is that? Traffic on I-5 is already horrendous and the rural roads around the airport cannot handle more cars/trucks. -if only the flight plans to depart and arrive would be vectored away from Charbonneau. I can see the aircraft markings from my porch so they are sometimes not very high in the sky….. For example why can't the planes fly over I-5 or over the many acres of forest and farm land to access the runway. Take the planes away from the populated areas of Wilsonville. Think of options which will accomplish what both the locals and the airport want…a compromise so one side isn't the loser. -I fear the interests of our neighborhoods have taken a back seat for financial gain of the airport businesses and the ODA. The methods that the ODA has taken to push this master plan in the past is evidence of my concern. -Bigger doesn't mean better nor changing what has worked for this small airport. Put the interest of local residents as the reason to NOT implement the master plan. Consider the future of the	

			communities who have to live around the airport	
6.55	**Mark Johnson**	*City of Wilsonville*	**Aurora Airport Expansion** **Noise Mitigation** Request that if the airport is allowed to lengthen the runway for larger aircraft, that those flights be limited to the I-5 freeway corridor. That steeper take-off angles be mandated. And that Wilsonville OR be designated a Noise Abatement Zone. Today, Helicopter Transport fly directly over our home in Wilsonville. Sometimes at low altitude but always in the late and early morning hours. Our windows shake and dogs bark in the neighborhood. To be fair, you have already addressed this issue by requiring pilots of business jets to gain altitude quickly but still present noise pollution upon take-off and landing over town.. along with helicopter "red-eye" service. The I-5 corridor won't eliminate noise but will help.	Thank you for your comments. ODAV does not have any airspace authority or regulate how pilots operate their aircraft. Those are the responsibility of the FAA. However, our published noise abatement procedures do encourage traffic to turn over I-5 and avoid flying over neighboring communities such as Wilsonville. Helicopter Transport Services is not part of the Aurora State Airport, but we will pass on your message to them as well. I appreciate you sending these comments and we will continue to work with our operators to fly neighborly and avoid noise sensitive areas in our community.
6.56	**Janet Moss and Family**	*City of Wilsonville*	Please record that we strongly oppose this expansion. There are multiple alternative airports in the greater Portland/Salem area to use for larger, heavier aircraft.	Thank you for your comment.
6.57	**John Andrews and Jean Gaumer**	*Charbonneau Residents*	My wife and I are residents of Charbonneau (Wilsonville). We wish to register our strong opposition to any proposed airport expansion. Expansion of the airport, especially the lengthening of the runway, will encourage increased air	Thank you for your comments. ODAV is aware of the noise concerns held by members of the Charbonneau community. Noise impacts are being considered through the development alternatives process and a noise study will be completed for the preferred

			traffic and enable and encourage larger jets that will further increase overflight noise. The increased air traffic will also lead to increased local road traffic in the vicinity of the airport and on I-5. The city of Wilsonville has registered opposition to the airport expansion and listed many reasons that the expansion is ill advised and unnecessary. We join with the City in opposition to airport expansion. Another factor in our opposition to airport expansion is that other property owners in the vicinity of the airport will seek exceptions to the land use restrictions outside the urban development zone. Langdon Farms has already sought an exception to the land use regulations to build a truck depot. If the airport were to be expanded, that would provide more justification for Langdon Farms and other property owners to convert from recreational use and farmland to industrial uses in support of the expanded airport. We have lived in Charbonneau for twelve years and have enjoyed the relative quiet of the area and lived with the current level of noise from jet overflights. Increase in the level of aircraft noise and road traffic through expansion of the airport would degrade the area irreparably. Please do not expand the airport and especially do not lengthen the runway to enable larger jets to land and take off from the Aurora State Airport.	alternative and included in the Airport Master Plan

			I was disappointed that I was unable to speak to a senior member of the Oregon Department of Aviation at the June 13 meeting.	
6.58	**Bruce Bennett**	*Blue Sky Aurora LLC*	I request that the one-acre ramp parcel that I own abutting the SW corner of ODAV's landside parcel be considered as potential additional ODAV ramp for short term Aircraft parking and as a taxi lane to allow aircraft and vehicle access to the ODAV parcel from taxiway A. This small parcel could open up access for the tower, Pacific Coast Avionics, the CAA, and the entire ODAV ramp.	Thank you for your comment.
6.59	**Bruce Bennett**	*Blue Sky Aurora LLC*	As a PAC member, I strongly discourage any plan to move the runway due to the existing ramp constraints with a "one sided" (due to hwy 551) Airport and due to the giant cost, complexity, destruction of existing businesses, and unknowable time schedule. Thank you.	Thank you for your comment.

Preliminary Alternatives Summary

Airside Alternatives Introduction


The preliminary airside development alternatives described below are intentionally conceptual to facilitate discussions surrounding the "big questions" that will guide the Oregon Department of Aviation (ODAV) on how best to meet the facility requirements for Aurora State Airport identified in Chapter 4.

The airside concepts primarily focus on bringing the Runway 17/35 Object Free Area (ROFA) and Runway Safety Area (RSA) into compliance with Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) standards and to maintain compliance for the preferred design. Other non-conforming items such as incompatible land uses in Runway Protection Zones (RPZ) or mitigating airspace obstacles will be evaluated further once the preliminary development alternatives have been narrowed to the most viable options.

As noted in Chapter 4, RPZ dimensions are determined by the aircraft approach category and airplane design group (AAC/ADG) associated with the design aircraft and the lowest approach visibility minimums available for the runway. For each airside development alternative, two sizes of RPZs are depicted to allow direct comparison for each concept. The larger RPZ footprint corresponds to the FAA-defined RPZ visibility increment (≥ 3/4-mile) nearest to the 7/8-mile visibility minimums approved by the FAA for the runway's current non-precision instrument approaches. The smaller RPZ footprint corresponds to the next higher increment of visibility minimums (1-mile) commonly used for instrument flight procedures. FAA land use compatibility guidelines and airport control standards are applied to RPZs, including any portions that extend beyond airport property.

For instrument approaches, lower visibility minimums allow aircraft to execute an approach when measured visibility is reduced. In contrast, higher minimums may marginally reduce approach capabilities for the runway. Increasing approach visibility minimums is an option that may be considered to reduce RPZ dimensions and in turn, mitigate incompatible land uses within the RPZ. A 10-year summary of Aurora State Airport visibility data was presented in the Chapter 4 (Table 4-2), with several visibility increments documented.

FIGURE 1: AIRSIDE ALTERNATIVE 1
MAINTAIN C-II, REALIGN HUBBARD HIGHWAY AND EXTEND RUNWAY NORTH



Maintain C-II, Realign Hubbard Highway and Extend Runway North

Primary Components:

- Realigns Hubbard Highway outside of Runway Object Free Area (ROFA). As proposed, the highway is shifted approximately 30 to 35 feet west, within existing ODOT-owned highway right-of-way.
  - » Note: The roadway alignment depicted is for illustration only. Further study and coordination with ODOT will be required to identify final roadway alignment needed to clear/control ROFA.
- Maintains 100 feet runway width (C-II standard).
- Extends runway 497 feet to the north resulting in a total length of 5,500 feet.
- Extends parallel taxiway (Taxiway A) to the north with runway.
- Property acquisition is required to accommodate east sections of ROFA (northeast and southeast).
- Keil Road is realigned to the outside of the ROFA.
- Reconfigure/relocate existing TTF access taxiway connection at current north end of Taxiway A to remove direct runway access at that location.
  - » Realigned TTF access to be coordinated with adjacent property owner.
- Install painted islands between Taxiway A and the adjacent southern TTF properties to address direct runway access and V/PD issues.

Issues Addressed by Alternative:

- Extends runway to justified length of 5,500 feet.
- Clears ROFA of existing public roads.
- Airport control of ROFA achieved through property acquisition.
- Addresses direct runway access and V/PD issues through pavement removal and painted islands.


Other Issues to be Addressed:

- Septic drainfield remains in south end of RSA.
  - » Further study is required to relocate drainfield out of RSA.
- Wind cone and weather equipment (ASOS) remain in RSA and ROFA.
  - » Further study is required to identify new locations for equipment.
- Existing incompatible land uses (Hubbard Highway, Keil Road, Boones Ferry Road and residential areas) remain in RPZs.

New Issues:

- New incompatible land use (Arndt Road) in Runway 17 RPZ.
- Septic drainfield located in north end of extended RSA.
  - » Further study is required to relocate drainfield out of future RSA.

FIGURE 2: AIRSIDE ALTERNATIVE 2
MAINTAIN C-II, REALIGN HUBBARD HIGHWAY AND EXTEND RUNWAY SOUTH



Maintain C-II, Realign Hubbard Highway and Extend Runway South

Primary Components:

- Realigns Hubbard Highway outside of Runway Object Free Area (ROFA). As proposed, the highway is shifted approximately 30 to 35 feet west, within existing ODOT-owned highway right-of-way.
  - » Note: The roadway alignment depicted is for illustration only. Further study and coordination with ODOT will be required to identify the final roadway alignment needed to clear/control ROFA.
- Maintains 100-foot runway width (C-II standard).
- Extends runway 497 feet to the south resulting in a total length of 5,500 feet.
- Extends parallel taxiway (Taxiway A) to the south with runway.
- Property acquisition is required to accommodate east sections of ROFA (northeast and southeast).
- Keil Road is realigned to the outside of the existing and future ROFA.
- Reconfigure/relocate existing TTF access taxiway connection at current north end of Taxiway A to remove direct runway access at that location.
  - » Realigned TTF access to be coordinated with adjacent property owner.
- Install painted islands between Taxiway A and the adjacent southern TTF properties to address direct runway access and V/PD issues.

Issues Addressed by Alternative:

- Extends runway to justified length of 5,500 feet.
- Clears ROFA of existing public roads.
- Airport control of ROFA achieved through property acquisition.
- Addresses direct runway access and V/PD issues through pavement removal and painted islands.


Other Issues to be Addressed:

- Septic drainfield remains in south end of RSA.
  - » Further study is required to relocate drainfield out of RSA.
- Wind cone and weather equipment (ASOS) remain in RSA and ROFA.
  - » Further study is required to identify new locations for equipment.
- Existing incompatible land uses (Hubbard Highway, Keil Road, Boones Ferry Road and residential areas) remain in RPZs.

New Issues:

- Additional incompatible land uses (residential properties, and realigned Keil Road) enter Runway 35 RPZ.
- Requires relocation/replacement or decommissioning of localizer navigational aid (located at Runway 35 end).

FIGURE 3: AIRSIDE ALTERNATIVE 3
MAINTAIN C-II, SHIFT RUNWAY EAST, AND EXTEND RUNWAY NORTH



Maintain C-II, Shift Runway East, and Extend Runway North

Primary Components:

- Shifts runway 84 feet east to bring west edge of ROFA onto Airport property.
- All runway and parallel taxiway surfaces (ROFA, RSA, OFZ, RPZ, etc.) are shifted east based on the shifted runway centerline location.
- ATCT and other aviation use facilities (fuel, helicopter parking, etc.) to be relocated outside of ROFA.
  - » Further study is required to determine new locations.
- Maintains 100-foot runway width (C-II standard).
- Extends runway 497 feet to the north resulting in a total length of 5,500 feet.
- Extends parallel taxiway (Taxiway A) to the north with runway.
- All property within the shifted/extended ROFA not owned by the Airport to be acquired.
- Keil Road is realigned to the outside of the ROFA.
- Reconfigure/relocate existing TTF access taxiway connection at current north end of Taxiway A to remove direct runway access at that location.
  - » Realigned TTF access to be coordinated with adjacent property owner.
- Install painted islands between shifted Taxiway A and the adjacent southern TTF properties, where feasible to address direct runway access and V/PD issues.

Issues Addressed by Alternative:

- Extends runway to justified length of 5,500 feet.
- Clears ROFA of existing public roads.
- Airport control of ROFA achieved through property acquisition.
- Direct runway access and V/PD issues to be addressed in redesign of Taxiway A.
- Wind cone and ASOS are no longer in ROFA or RSA.


Other Issues to be Addressed:

- Septic drainfield remains in south end of RSA.
  - » Further study required to relocate drainfield out of RSA.
- Existing incompatible land uses (Hubbard Highway, Keil Road, Boones Ferry Road and residential areas) remain in RPZs; some mitigated by runway shift.

New Issues:

- ATCT must be relocated/reconstructed outside of ROFA.
- Atlantic Aviation fuel equipment to be relocated outside of ROFA.
- ROFA directly abuts hangar doors for south TTF properties.
- The septic drainfield is located in the north end of (extended) RSA.
  - » Further study required to relocate drainfield out of future RSA.
- New incompatible land use (Arndt Road) in Runway 17 RPZ.
- Requires relocation/replacement or decommissioning of localizer navigational aid.

FIGURE 4: AIRSIDE ALTERNATIVE 4
MAINTAIN C-II, SHIFT RUNWAY EAST, AND EXTEND RUNWAY SOUTH



Maintain C-II, Shift Runway East, and Extend Runway South

Primary Components:

- Shift runway 84 feet east to bring west edge of ROFA onto Airport property.
- Extends runway 497 feet to the south resulting in a total length of 5,500 feet.
- Maintains 100-foot runway width (C-II standard).
- Extends parallel taxiway (Taxiway A) to the south with runway.
- All runway and parallel taxiway surfaces (ROFA, RSA, OFZ, RPZ, etc.) are shifted east with shifted runway centerline.
- ATCT and other aviation use facilities (fuel, helicopter parking, etc.) to be relocated outside of ROFA.
  - » Further study is required to determine new locations.
- All property within the shifted/extended ROFA not owned by the Airport to be acquired.
- Keil Road is realigned to the outside of the existing and future ROFA.
- Reconfigure/relocate existing TTF access taxiway connection at current north end of Taxiway A to remove direct runway access at that location.
  - » Realigned TTF access to be coordinated with adjacent property owner.
- Install painted islands between shifted Taxiway A and the adjacent southern TTF properties, where feasible to address direct runway access and V/PD issues.

Issues Addressed by Alternative:

- Extends runway to justified length of 5,500 feet.
- Clears ROFA of existing public roads.
- Airport control of ROFA achieved through property acquisition.
- Direct runway access and V/PD issues to be addressed in redesign of Taxiway A.
- Wind cone and ASOS are no longer in ROFA or RSA.

Other Issues to be Addressed:

- Septic drainfield remains in south end of RSA.
  - » Further study required to relocate drainfield out of RSA.
- Existing incompatible land uses (Hubbard Highway, Keil Road, Boones Ferry Road and residential areas) remain in RPZs; some mitigated by runway shift.

New Issues:

- ATCT must be relocated/reconstructed outside of ROFA.
- Atlantic Aviation fuel equipment to be relocated outside of ROFA.
- ROFA directly abuts hangar doors for south TTF properties.
- Additional incompatible land uses (residential properties, and realigned Keil Road) enter Runway 35 RPZ.
- Requires relocation/replacement or decommissioning of localizer navigational aid (located at Runway 35 end).

From: House, Timothy A (FAA) <Timothy.A.House@faa.gov>
Sent: Friday, June 7, 2024 1:08 PM
To: Tony Beach; David Miller; Samantha Peterson
Cc: Thorsen, Valerie (FAA)
Subject: Summary Presentation for PAC Meeting #6

As I was reviewing the material for the upcoming PAC meeting I shared the alternatives that were included in the Preliminary Alternatives Summary with other FAA staff. Based on the fact that the approved critical aircraft is C-II we do not see that the B-II alternatives have a path forward. Operations would have to reduce to below C-II normal use in order for the B-II alternatives to be considered. The approved forecast does not indicate that is likely to occur.

It is our recommendation that they be removed from the presentation since they do not present a solution that meets current standards. This will allow more time to discuss and further develop alternatives that meet current standards.

Tim A. House
Lead Planner, SEA Airports District Office
FAA Northwest Mountain Region
206-231-4248
405-607-9949 (mobile)




World leaders in creating a safe and efficient system of airports!
We value Integrity, Collaboration and Innovation

Note: No changes to the originally published (5.28.24) preliminary alternatives summary were made. The attached letter was received on 6.7.24 from FAA and notes were added to Airside Alternatives 5, 6, & 7 to indicate that these B-II alternatives would not be considered further.

AFTER COORDINATION WITH FAA, B-II ALTERNATIVES ARE NOT VIABLE AND WILL NOT BE CONSIDERED FURTHER

FIGURE 5: AIRSIDE ALTERNATIVE 5
CHANGE TO B-II, SHIFT AND EXTEND RUNWAY NORTH



Change to B-II, Shift and Extend Runway North

Primary Components:

- Downgrades runway to AAC/ADG B-II.
  - » Operational changes to realize B-II use criteria requires further study.
- Narrows runway to 75 feet (B-II standard).
- Extends runway to justified length of 5,500 feet.
  - » Relocate Runway 35 end 150 feet north to bring RPZ (≥1-mile) onto existing property.
  - » Extend Runway 17 end 647 feet north.
- Extends parallel taxiway (Taxiway A) to the north with runway.
- Acquire property in extended Taxiway Object Free Area (TOFA) at north end of future parallel taxiway.
- Remove connector taxiway A1 at north end of Taxiway A to eliminate direct runway access at that location.
- Install painted islands between Taxiway A and the adjacent southern TTF properties to address direct runway access and V/PD issues.

Issues Addressed by Alternative:

- Extends runway to justified length of 5,500 feet.
- ROFA is clear of existing public roads.
- Airport control of ROFA is achieved through reduction in surface dimension.
- Addresses direct runway access and V/PD issues through pavement removal and painted islands.
- Keil Road is outside of ROFA.
- Septic drainfields, wind cones, and weather equipment do not conflict with smaller RSA or OFA.
- Reduces incompatible land uses - Hubbard Highway, Keil Road, Boones Ferry Road and residential areas do not conflict with smaller > 1-mile RPZ.

Other Issues to be Addressed:


- Existing incompatible land uses (Hubbard Highway, Keil Road, Boones Ferry Road and residential areas) remain in larger > 3/4-mile RPZs.

New Issues:

- Operational changes required to maintain B-II standards (<500 C-II or larger annual operations).

AFTER COORDINATION WITH FAA, B-II ALTERNATIVES ARE NOT VIABLE AND WILL NOT BE CONSIDERED FURTHER

FIGURE 6: AIRSIDE ALTERNATIVE 6
CHANGE TO B-II, EXTEND RUNWAY SOUTH



Change to B-II, Extend Runway South

Primary Components:

- Downgrades runway to AAC/ADG B-II.
  - » Operational changes to realize B-II use criteria requires further study.
- Narrows runway to 75 feet (B-II standard).
- Extends runway 497 feet to the south resulting in a total length of 5,500 feet.
- Extends parallel taxiway (Taxiway A) to the south with runway.
- Acquire property in extended Taxiway Object Free Area (TOFA) at south end of future parallel taxiway.
- Realign Keil Road outside TOFA.
- Install painted islands between Taxiway A and the adjacent southern TTF properties to address direct runway access and V/PD issues.
- Pavement removed at TTF access taxiway at the north end of Taxiway A to remove direct runway access at that location.
  - » Realigned TTF access to be coordinated with adjacent property owner.

Issues Addressed by Alternative:

- Extends runway to justified length of 5,500 feet.
- ROFA is clear of existing public roads.
- Airport control of ROFA is achieved through reduction in surface dimension.
- Addresses direct runway access and V/PD issues through pavement removal and painted islands.
- Keil Road is outside of ROFA.
- Septic drainfields, wind cones, and weather equipment do not conflict with smaller RSA or OFA.
- Reduces incompatible land uses - Hubbard Highway, Keil Road, Boones Ferry Road and residential areas do not conflict with smaller > 1-mile RPZ.

Other Issues to be Addressed:


- Existing incompatible land uses (Hubbard Highway, Keil Road, Boones Ferry Road and residential areas) remain in larger > 3/4-mile RPZs.

New Issues:

- Operational changes required to maintain B-II standards (<500 C-II or larger annual operations).
- Requires relocation/replacement or decommissioning of localizer navigational aid (located at Runway 35 end).

AFTER COORDINATION WITH FAA, B-II ALTERNATIVES ARE NOT VIABLE AND WILL NOT BE CONSIDERED FURTHER

FIGURE 7: AIRSIDE ALTERNATIVE 7
-II, SHIFT RUNWAY NORTH, AND MAINTAIN CURRENT LENGTH



Change to B-II, Shift Runway North, and Maintain Current Length

Primary Components:

- Downgrades runway to ADG/AAC B-II.
  - » Operational changes to realize B-II use criteria requires further study.
- Narrows runway to 75 feet (B-II standard).
- Maintains current runway length (5,003 feet).
  - » Shift entire runway 150 feet north to bring Runway 35 RPZ (≥ 1-mile) onto Airport property.
- Extends parallel taxiway (Taxiway A) to the north with runway.
- Remove/relocate existing Taxiway A1 connector at north end of Taxiway A in conjunction with runway-parallel taxiway shift; eliminates existing direct runway access at that location.
- Acquire property in extended Taxiway Object Free Area (TOFA) at north end of future parallel taxiway.
- Install painted islands between Taxiway A and the adjacent southern TTF properties to address direct runway access and V/PD issues.

Issues Addressed by Alternative:

- ROFA is clear of existing public roads.
- Airport control of ROFA is achieved through reduction in surface dimension.
- Addresses direct runway access and V/PD issues through pavement removal and painted islands.
- Keil Road is outside of ROFA.
- Septic drainfields, wind cones, and weather equipment do not conflict with smaller RSA or OFA.
- Reduces incompatible land uses - Hubbard Highway, Keil Road, Boones Ferry Road and residential areas do not conflict with smaller > 1-mile RPZ.
- Direct runway access and V/PD issues addressed through painted islands and pavement removal.

Other Issues to be Addressed:

- Existing incompatible land uses (Hubbard Highway, Keil Road, Boones Ferry Road and residential areas) remain in larger > 3/4-mile RPZs.

New Issues:

- Operational changes required to maintain B-II standards (<500 C-II or larger annual operations).

Landside Alternatives Introduction


The landside development alternatives concepts presented below depict proposed improvements capable of meeting the facility requirements identified in Chapter 4. The proposed improvements are limited to the defined landside area on existing ODAV-owned property.

The proposed facility configurations are compatible with the options presented in the preliminary airside concepts that maintain the current runway-taxiway location. A reduction of usable landside facilities would occur with the airside options shifting the runway-taxiway system east.

Aurora State Airport is located on a constrained site and as such, it may not be possible to fully address every facility requirement. The focus of the landside evaluation is to identify the most efficient use of limited space, with aeronautical uses (aircraft storage) considered the highest and best use. This analysis will guide ODAV on the development of landside facilities during the current 20-year planning period, or until additional evaluations may be required.

The concepts are meant to be modular in nature. A selected preferred alternative may be as presented below, it may be a combination of components from different concepts, or it may be an entirely different concept identified in discussions stemming from these concepts.

FIGURE 8: LANDSIDE ALTERNATIVE 1A
COMMERCIAL HANGAR AND FBO DEVELOPMENT WITH RECONFIGURED FLIGHT SCHOOL APRON




Commercial Hangar and FBO Development with Reconfigured Flight School Apron

Primary Components:

- Commercial hangar development with ADG II taxilane access, large FBO hangar, vehicle access and parking.
- The existing apron south of proposed FBO hangar proposed as tenant lease in conjunction with main ADG II access taxilane shift .
- Reconfigured small airplane tiedown apron adjacent to ATCT to provide appropriate wingtip and meet ADG I taxilane object free area (TOFA) clearances.
- Proposed apron reconfiguration to meet FAA standards results in a net decrease of four small airplane tiedowns and one large aircraft drive through parking position compared to the current aircraft parking configuration.
- Two large helicopter (35-foot rotor) parking positions and one small helicopter (25-foot rotor) parking positions are added.
- Realigned taxilane west of current Aurora Flight School facility to accommodate five additional small airplane tiedowns.
- New apron at current flight school area.
- Reconfigured fence and vehicle access road (outside the fence access provided to Aurora Flight School facility).
- Additional hangar infill is proposed for all available lots on the Airport.
- Approximately 154,000 square feet of additional hangar space, as depicted.
- Storm water retention area is identified east of ATCT apron.

FIGURE 9: LANDSIDE ALTERNATIVE 1B
COMMERCIAL HANGAR AND FBO DEVELOPMENT WITH RECONFIGURED FLIGHT SCHOOL APRON AND VEHICLE SERVICE ROAD




Commercial Hangar and FBO Development with Reconfigured Flight School Apron and Vehicle Service Road

Primary Components:

- Identical to Landside Alternative 1A with the following exceptions:
  - » A north/south vehicle service road (VSR) is proposed to provide dedicated vehicle access from the north boundary of the landside area to the south boundary of the landside area.
  - » The proposed five tiedowns west of Aurora Flight School, the three proposed helicopter parking positions, and six proposed tiedowns on the ATCT apron are omitted to create space for VSR.
  - » Two additional tiedowns are proposed west of the large FBO hangar, on the west side of the VSR.
  - » This configuration results in a net decrease of 13 tiedowns compared to the existing aircraft parking configuration.

FIGURE 10: LANDSIDE ALTERNATIVE 2
COMMERCIAL HANGAR AND FBO DEVELOPMENT WITH IN-FILL HANGAR DEVELOPMENT



Commercial Hangar and FBO Development with In-fill Hangar Development

Primary Components:

- Commercial development with ADG II taxilane access, large FBO hangar, and vehicle access and parking.
- The apron adjacent to the ATCT is reconfigured to include two drive through large aircraft parking positions on the south end of the apron.
  - » Approximately three feet of the south edge of the taxilane object free area (TLOFA) for the drive through parking encroaches upon private property to the south. Coordination with adjacent property owner and/or an easement may be necessary for development .
- Remaining ATCT apron is reconfigured to provide small aircraft tiedown parking with ADG I wingtip spacing.
- Realigned taxilane west of current Aurora Flight School facility to allow additional small aircraft tiedown parking.
- Proposed apron reconfiguration to meet FAA standards results in a net decrease of five tiedowns compared to the current aircraft parking configuration.
- Two large helicopter (35-foot rotor) parking positions and one small helicopter (25-foot rotor) parking positions are added.
- Storage building east of Aurora Flight School is removed to accommodate additional hangars on north side of existing ADG I hangar taxilane.
- One multi-unit T-hangar is replaced with small condo-style box hangars.
- Reconfigured fence and vehicle access road (outside the fence access provided to Aurora Flight School facility).
- Additional hangars infill is proposed for all available lots on the Airport.
- Approximately 154,000 square feet of additional hangar space is proposed.
- Storm water retention area is identified east of ATCT apron.

The figures below provide additional details on proposed pavement configurations and markings that are referenced in the airside and landside concepts.

FIGURE 11: REMOVE DIRECT ACCESS - NORTH END




Figure 11 depicts a proposed reconfiguration of the existing TTF taxilane connection to Taxiway A1. The change in configuration would create a new taxi route between the adjacent apron and the runway, including a 90-degree turn to access Taxiway A and a second 90-degree turn to access Taxiway A1. This would eliminate the direct aircraft access configuration on Taxiway A1. The proposed changes require a new taxiway section and coordination with the adjacent private property owner. It is noted that a portion of this private property is also located in the ROFA for the existing Runway 17/35, which is recommended for property acquisition to meet FAA standards.

FIGURE 12: PARALLEL TAXIWAY ISLANDS - SOUTH END



Figure 12 depicts proposed painted islands in the large expanse of airfield pavement to differentiate the apron and parallel taxiway. Limiting the number of direct access points from adjacent aircraft aprons to parallel taxiways is consistent with FAA design guidance. Aircraft movement and hangar access on the apron would be consolidated for the existing TTF users. Longer-term improvements may replace the painted markings with pavement removal as part of a major taxiway reconstruction project that may require additional stormwater drainage improvements.

Aurora State Airport
Master Plan Project



Planning Advisory Committee Meeting #6
Online Meeting
June 11, 2024

Agenda

Time	Topic
5:00-5:15	Introductions
5:15-5:45	Facility Requirements Summary & Comment Themes
5:45-6:30	Review Preliminary Alternatives
6:30-7:35	PAC Comments
7:35-7:55	Public Comments
7:55-8:00	Next Steps Public comments collected through the website **https://publicproject.net/AuroraAirport**

Introductions

Oregon Department of Aviation (ODAV)

Kenji Sugahara
Director

Alex Thomas
Planning & Project Manager

Tony Beach
State Airports Manager

Brandon Pike
Aviation Planner

Project Team

Agency Oversight & Funding

Airport Owner (Sponsor)

Planning & Engineering

Public Involvement

Cultural Resources


Archaeological Investigations Northwest, Inc.

Environmental Review

AGIS Survey

MAGYAR LAND SURVEYING LLC

Project Website Overview



As required by the FAA, the Airport Master Plan will provide specific guidance in making the improvements necessary to maintain a safe and efficient airport that is economically, environmentally, and socially sustainable. The Airport Master Plan will also:

- Define the current, short-term and long-term needs of the Airport through a comprehensive evaluation of facilities, conditions and FAA airport planning and design standards.
- Look at what is happening around the airport that could affect the future plans, development and operation of the airport such as land use, transportation, environmental, economic development, etc.

https://publicproject.net/AuroraAirport

PAC Members & Alternates

- Airport Users/Businesses/Organizations
- Airport Neighbors
- Local Municipalities
- Tribal Organizations
- State Agencies
- Local and Regional Non-Profit Groups
- Environmental / Land Use Groups

PAC Meeting Guidelines

Meetings summaries will **include all comments along with responses/ follow up.**

- Meeting **time for all committee members to speak.** **We have added more time for dialogue.**
- Comments on **non-agenda items** should be provided in writing.
- Committee members are encouraged to **provide comments at least three days before meetings** to allow members time to review and reflect on comments.


PAC Meeting Guidelines

As a committee, we agree to **approach this work with honesty, openness, and willingness to work together.**

- This includes building trust and **assuming good intentions in others** and ensuring that our behavior supports a successful process.
- We will work with each other and staff to **address issues as they arise, utilize tools to ensure clear communication and robust participation, and meet the communication needs of members.**
- PAC members represent their organization, please keep your constituents informed of public meetings and project information.
- **We need all attendees to name/identify themselves.** Duplicates will be removed from the meeting.

Project Schedule – Where are we?

Aurora State Airport - Airport Master Plan Project Schedule (all future dates tentative)



Review:

Facility Requirements Summary

Facility Requirements – Summary of Evaluation

- Existing & Future Design Aircraft – Medium/Large Business Jet
  - C-II standards for runway-taxiway system
- Runway Length Evaluation: Justified Length: 5,500 feet
- Addressed Non-Standard Conditions
  - Runway Safety Area
  - Runway Object Free Area
  - Runway Protection Zones
- Pavement Conditions (Predicted 2033)
  - Runway, Parallel Taxiway, and Aprons will require rehabilitation


Facility Requirements – Summary of Evaluation

- Landside Facilities (projected demand)
  - Additional Hangar Space
    - +62,750 SF (jet and helicopter)
    - -143,300 SF (small single and multi-engine aircraft)

The net balance of supply and demand will be determined by existing hangar owners and new hangar construction in currently undeveloped areas.


- Aircraft Parking
  - 20-year demand: 9 net additional aircraft parking positions
  - +5 jet/4 turboprop/3 helicopter; -3 single and multi-piston

Facility Requirements Summary – Airside



Source: Century West Engineering

Facility Requirements Summary – Landside



Source: Century West Engineering

PAC Meeting #5

Summary of Comments

PAC Meeting #5
Summary of Questions/Comments

- **Will the analysis of access between the parallel taxiway and adjacent aprons to address non-standard configurations include the hangar frontage associated with adjacent privately owned properties? Will existing easements be considered**?
    - It will include all areas that do not meet FAA standards. Existing easements will be considered if applicable. An acceptable solution will be identified in the development alternatives analysis process.
- **Can the existing airport property accommodate the projected need for landside facilities? Will property acquisition be necessary to meet projected need?**
    - The facility requirements evaluation approximated the 20-year demand for new hangar space and aircraft parking, indicating that the available landside areas on the Airport are sufficient to accommodate the projected demand. The development alternatives analysis will determine how these future facility needs could be met. Since the landside area is limited in size, the alternatives will depict full build out scenarios, some of which may show net increases above projected 20-year demand. These areas would be identified as long-term development reserves if demand exceeds projections.
- **The forecasts show a decrease in based aircraft. Why is an increase in hangar storage projected?**
    - The forecasts project a decrease in single-engine aircraft which typically are stored in small hangars. The increase in projected hangar storage demand is based on the projected increase in jets and turboprops which typically require larger hangars.

PAC Meeting #5
Summary of Questions/Comments Continued

- **Does the runway length analysis consider Part 135 operating requirements?**
  - The runway length analysis follows FAA guidance outlined in AC 150/5325-4B. Meeting operating requirements of Part 135 is the responsibility of the pilot in command of the aircraft based on the conditions of the field at the time of the operation.
- **Are you closing roads as part of this plan?**
  - The facility requirements analysis does not identify future configurations. Any proposed changes to airfield facilities or existing roads will be included in the alternatives analysis.
- **How and when will the noise analysis be conducted?**
  - Development of noise contours will take place after the selection of a preferred airside alternative. It will evaluate the existing and future (based on a preferred alternative TBD) runway/taxiway configurations, and FAA-approved forecast fleet mixes for the base year, 5-year, and 20-year time points.


Review:

Preliminary Alternatives

AIRPORT PROPERTY BOUNDARY (NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE)




NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE



Source: Century West Engineering

AIRSIDE ALTERNATIVE 1

Maintain C-II, Realign Hubbard Highway and Extend Runway North




Primary Components:

- Realigns Hubbard Highway outside of Runway Object Free Area (ROFA). As proposed, the highway is shifted approximately 30 to 35 feet west, within existing ODOT-owned highway right-of-way.
  - Note: The roadway alignment depicted is for illustration only. Further study and coordination with ODOT will be required to identify final roadway alignment needed to clear/control ROFA.
- Maintains 100 feet runway width (C-II standard).
- Extends runway 497 feet to the north resulting in a total length of 5,500 feet.
- Extends parallel taxiway (Taxiway A) to the north with runway.
- Property acquisition is required to accommodate east sections of ROFA (northeast and southeast).
- Keil Road is realigned to the outside of the ROFA.
- Reconfigure/relocate existing TTF access taxiway connection at current north end of Taxiway A to remove direct runway access at that location.
  - Realigned TTF access to be coordinated with adjacent property owner.
- Install painted islands between Taxiway A and the adjacent southern TTF properties to address direct runway access and V/PD issues.

AIRSIDE ALTERNATIVE 1

Maintain C-II, Realign Hubbard Highway and Extend Runway North



Issues Addressed by Alternative:

- Extends runway to justified length of 5,500 feet.
- Clears ROFA of existing public roads.
- Airport control of ROFA achieved through property acquisition.
- Addresses direct runway access and V/PD issues through pavement removal and painted islands.

Other Issues to be Addressed:


- Septic drainfield remains in south end of RSA.
  - Further study is required to relocate drainfield out of RSA.
- Wind cone and weather equipment (ASOS) remain in RSA and ROFA.
  - Further study is required to identify new locations for equipment.
- Existing incompatible land uses (Hubbard Highway, Keil Road, Boones Ferry Road and residential areas) remain in RPZs.

New Issues:

- New incompatible land use (Arndt Road) in Runway 17 RPZ.
- Septic drainfield located in north end of extended RSA.
  - Further study is required to relocate drainfield out of future RSA.

AIRSIDE ALTERNATIVE 2

Maintain C-II, Realign Hubbard Highway and Extend Runway South




Primary Components:

- Realigns Hubbard Highway outside of Runway Object Free Area (ROFA). As proposed, the highway is shifted approximately 30 to 35 feet west, within existing ODOT-owned highway right-of-way.
  - Note: The roadway alignment depicted is for illustration only. Further study and coordination with ODOT will be required to identify the final roadway alignment needed to clear/control ROFA.
- Maintains 100-foot runway width (C-II standard).
- Extends runway 497 feet to the south resulting in a total length of 5,500 feet.
- Extends parallel taxiway (Taxiway A) to the south with runway.
- Property acquisition is required to accommodate east sections of ROFA (northeast and southeast).
- Keil Road is realigned to the outside of the existing and future ROFA.
- Reconfigure/relocate existing TTF access taxiway connection at current north end of Taxiway A to remove direct runway access at that location.
  - Realigned TTF access to be coordinated with adjacent property owner.
- Install painted islands between Taxiway A and the adjacent southern TTF properties to address direct runway access and V/PD issues.

AIRSIDE ALTERNATIVE 2

Maintain C-II, Realign Hubbard Highway and Extend Runway South



Issues Addressed by Alternative:

- Extends runway to justified length of 5,500 feet.
- Clears ROFA of existing public roads.
- Airport control of ROFA achieved through property acquisition.
- Addresses direct runway access and V/PD issues through pavement removal and painted islands.

Other Issues to be Addressed:


- Septic drainfield remains in south end of RSA.
  - Further study is required to relocate drainfield out of RSA.
- Wind cone and weather equipment (ASOS) remain in RSA and ROFA.
  - Further study is required to identify new locations for equipment.
- Existing incompatible land uses (Hubbard Highway, Keil Road, Boones Ferry Road and residential areas) remain in RPZs.

New Issues:

- Additional incompatible land uses (residential properties, and realigned Keil Road) enter Runway 35 RPZ.
- Requires relocation/replacement or decommissioning of localizer navigational aid (located at Runway 35 end).

AIRSIDE ALTERNATIVE 3

Maintain C-II, Shift Runway East, and Extend Runway North




Primary Components:

- Shifts runway 84 feet east to bring west edge of ROFA onto Airport property.
- All runway and parallel taxiway surfaces (ROFA, RSA, OFZ, RPZ, etc.) are shifted east based on the shifted runway centerline location.
- ATCT and other aviation use facilities (fuel, helicopter parking, etc.) to be relocated outside of ROFA.
  - Further study is required to determine new locations.
- Maintains 100-foot runway width (C-II standard).
- Extends runway 497 feet to the north resulting in a total length of 5,500 feet.
- Extends parallel taxiway (Taxiway A) to the north with runway.
- All property within the shifted/extended ROFA not owned by the Airport to be acquired.
- Keil Road is realigned to the outside of the ROFA.
- Reconfigure/relocate existing TTF access taxiway connection at current north end of Taxiway A to remove direct runway access at that location.
  - Realigned TTF access to be coordinated with adjacent property owner.
- Install painted islands between shifted Taxiway A and the adjacent southern TTF properties, where feasible to address direct runway access and V/PD issues.

AIRSIDE ALTERNATIVE 3

Maintain C-II, Shift Runway East, and Extend Runway North



Issues Addressed by Alternative:

- Extends runway to justified length of 5,500 feet.
- Clears ROFA of existing public roads.
- Airport control of ROFA achieved through property acquisition.
- Direct runway access and V/PD issues to be addressed in redesign of Taxiway A.
- Wind cone and ASOS are no longer in ROFA or RSA.

Other Issues to be Addressed:


- Septic drainfield remains in south end of RSA.
  - Further study required to relocate drainfield out of RSA.
- Existing incompatible land uses (Hubbard Highway, Keil Road, Boones Ferry Road and residential areas) remain in RPZs; some mitigated by runway shift.

New Issues:

- ATCT must be relocated/reconstructed outside of ROFA.
- Atlantic Aviation fuel equipment to be relocated outside of ROFA.
- ROFA directly abuts hangar doors for south TTF properties.
- The septic drainfield is located in the north end of (extended) RSA.
  - Further study required to relocate drainfield out of future RSA.
- New incompatible land use (Arndt Road) in Runway 17 RPZ.
- Requires relocation/replacement or decommissioning of localizer navigational aid.

AIRSIDE ALTERNATIVE 4

Maintain C-II, Shift Runway East, and Extend Runway South




Primary Components:

- Shift runway 84 feet east to bring west edge of ROFA onto Airport property.
- Extends runway 497 feet to the south resulting in a total length of 5,500 feet.
- Maintains 100-foot runway width (C-II standard).
- Extends parallel taxiway (Taxiway A) to the south with runway.
- All runway and parallel taxiway surfaces (ROFA, RSA, OFZ, RPZ, etc.) are shifted east with shifted runway centerline.
- ATCT and other aviation use facilities (fuel, helicopter parking, etc.) to be relocated outside of ROFA.
  - Further study is required to determine new locations.
- All property within the shifted/extended ROFA not owned by the Airport to be acquired.
- Keil Road is realigned to the outside of the existing and future ROFA.
- Reconfigure/relocate existing TTF access taxiway connection at current north end of Taxiway A to remove direct runway access at that location.
  - Realigned TTF access to be coordinated with adjacent property owner.
- Install painted islands between shifted Taxiway A and the adjacent southern TTF properties, where feasible to address direct runway access and V/PD issues.

AIRSIDE ALTERNATIVE 4

Maintain C-II, Shift Runway East, and Extend Runway South



Issues Addressed by Alternative:

- Extends runway to justified length of 5,500 feet.
- Clears ROFA of existing public roads.
- Airport control of ROFA achieved through property acquisition.
- Direct runway access and V/PD issues to be addressed in redesign of Taxiway A.
- Wind cone and ASOS are no longer in ROFA or RSA.

Other Issues to be Addressed:


- Septic drainfield remains in south end of RSA.
  - Further study required to relocate drainfield out of RSA.
- Existing incompatible land uses (Hubbard Highway, Keil Road, Boones Ferry Road and residential areas) remain in RPZs; some mitigated by runway shift.

New Issues:

- ATCT must be relocated/reconstructed outside of ROFA.
- Atlantic Aviation fuel equipment to be relocated outside of ROFA.
- ROFA directly abuts hangar doors for south TTF properties.
- Additional incompatible land uses (residential properties, and realigned Keil Road) enter Runway 35 RPZ.
- Requires relocation/replacement or decommissioning of localizer navigational aid (located at Runway 35 end).

AIRSIDE ALTERNATIVES 5, 6, & 7

Change to B-II Scenarios



AFTER COORDINATION WITH FAA, B-II ALTERNATIVES ARE NOT VIABLE AND WILL NOT BE CONSIDERED FURTHER

Clarifying Questions?

LANDSIDE ALTERNATIVE 1A

Commercial Hangar and FBO Development with Reconfigured Flight School Apron



Primary Components:

- Commercial hangar development with ADG II taxilane access, large FBO hangar, vehicle access and parking.
- The existing apron south of proposed FBO hangar proposed as tenant lease in conjunction with main ADG II access taxilane shift.
- Reconfigured small airplane tiedown apron adjacent to ATCT to provide appropriate wingtip and meet ADG I taxilane object free area (TOFA) clearances.
- Proposed apron reconfiguration to meet FAA standards results in a net decrease of four small airplane tiedowns and one large aircraft drive through parking position compared to the current aircraft parking configuration.
- Two large helicopter (35-foot rotor) parking positions and one small helicopter (25-foot rotor) parking positions are added.
- Realigned taxilane west of current Aurora Flight School facility to accommodate five additional small airplane tiedowns.
- New apron at current flight school area.
- Reconfigured fence and vehicle access road (outside the fence access provided to Aurora Flight School facility).
- Additional hangar infill is proposed for all available lots on the Airport.
- Approximately 154,000 square feet of additional hangar space, as depicted.
- Storm water retention area is identified east of ATCT apron.

LANDSIDE ALTERNATIVE 1B

Commercial Hangar and FBO Development with Reconfigured Flight School Apron and Vehicle Service Road




Primary Components:

- Identical to Landside Alternative 1A with the following exceptions:
  - A north/south vehicle service road (VSR) is proposed to provide dedicated vehicle access from the north boundary of the landside area to the south boundary of the landside area.
  - The proposed five tiedowns west of Aurora Flight School, the three proposed helicopter parking positions, and six proposed tiedowns on the ATCT apron are omitted to create space for VSR.
  - Two additional tiedowns are proposed west of the large FBO hangar, on the west side of the VSR.
  - This configuration results in a net decrease of 13 tiedowns compared to the existing aircraft parking configuration.

LANDSIDE ALTERNATIVE 2


Commercial Hangar and FBO Development with Reconfigured Flight School Apron and Vehicle Service Road



Primary Components:

- Commercial development with ADG II taxilane access, large FBO hangar, and vehicle access and parking.
- The apron adjacent to the ATCT is reconfigured to include two drive through large aircraft parking positions on the south end of the apron.
  - Approximately three feet of the south edge of the taxilane object free area (TLOFA) for the drive through parking encroaches upon private property to the south. Coordination with adjacent property owner and/or an easement may be necessary for development.
- Remaining ATCT apron is reconfigured to provide small aircraft tiedown parking with ADG I wingtip spacing.
- Realigned taxilane west of current Aurora Flight School facility to allow additional small aircraft tiedown parking.
- Proposed apron reconfiguration to meet FAA standards results in a net decrease of five tiedowns compared to the current aircraft parking configuration.
- Two large helicopter (35-foot rotor) parking positions and one small helicopter (25-foot rotor) parking positions are added.
- Storage building east of Aurora Flight School is removed to accommodate additional hangars on north side of existing ADG I hangar taxilane.
- One multi-unit T-hangar is replaced with small condo-style box hangars.
- Reconfigured fence and vehicle access road (outside the fence access provided to Aurora Flight School facility).
- Additional hangars infill is proposed for all available lots on the Airport.
- Approximately 145,000 square feet of additional hangar space is proposed.
  - Includes removal of 15,000 square feet of existing space and construction of 160,000 square feet of new space.
- Storm water retention area is identified east of ATCT apron.

Remove Direct Access - North End



This Figure depicts a proposed reconfiguration of the existing TTF taxilane connection to Taxiway A1. The change in configuration would create a new taxi route between the adjacent apron and the runway, including a 90-degree turn to access Taxiway A and a second 90-degree turn to access Taxiway A1. This would eliminate the direct aircraft access configuration on Taxiway A1. The proposed changes require a new taxiway section and coordination with the adjacent private property owner. It is noted that a portion of this private property is also located in the ROFA for the existing Runway 17/35, which is recommended for property acquisition to meet FAA standards.

Parallel Taxiway Islands - South End



This Figure depicts proposed painted islands in the large expanse of airfield pavement to differentiate the apron and parallel taxiway. Limiting the number of direct access points from adjacent aircraft aprons to parallel taxiways is consistent with FAA design guidance. Aircraft movement and hangar access on the apron would be consolidated for the existing TTF users. Longer-term improvements may replace the painted markings with pavement removal as part of a major taxiway reconstruction project that may require additional stormwater drainage improvements.

Clarifying Questions?

PAC Comments?

Public Comments?

Next Steps

Next Steps

- Public Open House – June 13th, 2024 (4-7pm)
  - North Marion High School – Commons Room (20167 Grim Rd NE, Aurora, OR 97002)
- Review PAC/Public Input into Preliminary Alternatives
  - PAC feedback form will be emailed to members (1 form per member)
  - Public feedback form will be posted on the website
    - Feedback forms are due to ODAV & Planning Team by Sunday, June 23rd.
- Refine Preliminary Alternatives & Narrow to Top Options
- Present Refined Preliminary Alternatives at - July 30th Working Session

Thank You

Alex Thomas – ODAV

Tony Beach – ODAV

Brandy Steffen – JLA Public Involvement

David Miller – Century West Engineering

Project Website: https://publicproject.net/AuroraAirport

PAC Working Session #3 – July 30, 2024

NOTICE OF A MEETING
FOR THE AURORA STATE AIRPORT
Airport Master Plan Project

Notice is hereby given that the Oregon Department of Aviation (ODAV) will hold an online (via Zoom) Public Planning Advisory Committee (PAC) Working Session meeting.

When: Tuesday, July 30, 2024
PAC Working Session Meeting from 5:00 p.m. - 8:00 p.m.

Where: Zoom or Join by Phone
Please join the virtual **PAC meeting** by visiting:
https://us02web.zoom.us/j/89718328792

This meeting will allow the PAC to review and discuss the preliminary alternatives for the Aurora State Airport master plan. For copies of the airport planning work products, please visit: https://publicproject.net/AuroraAirport

Accessible Meeting Information
Special accommodations are available upon advanced request. Please contact Alex Thomas at least 48 hours prior to the event to discuss specific needs.

For airport questions or project information, please contact Alex Thomas, ODAV Planning & Programs Manager, through the following means: Alex.R.Thomas@odav.oregon.gov

AURORA STATE AIRPORT

AIRPORT MASTER PLAN - PAC WORKING SESSION

AGENDA

Date/Time: July 30, 2024, from 5:00-8:00 pm
Location: Zoom Webinar
Meeting Goals: Review Preliminary Alternatives, answer questions about previous topics and provide feedback to help ODAV make their decision on a preferred alternative.

Time	Topic	Person
5:00-5:15 pm	Introductions	Brandy Steffen
5:10-5:20 pm	Review Approved Forecast (Draft Chapter 3 – Working Paper 1)	David Miller and Tim House
5:20-5:30 pm	PAC Clarifying Questions	Brandy Steffen
5:30-5:40 pm	Review Facility Requirements (Draft Chapter 4)	David Miller
5:40-5:50 pm	PAC Clarifying Questions	Brandy Steffen
5:50-6:10 pm	Comment Themes	Brandy Steffen
6:10-6:40 pm	Review Refined Preliminary Alternatives	David Miller
6:40-7:40 pm	PAC Comments	Brandy Steffen
7:40-7:55 pm	Public Comments • Anyone in attendance may have up to 2 minutes to speak. • We ask that only one representative from each organization speaks. • We always will take comments via the website and these will be included in the meeting notes, shared with the PAC members, as well as posted in the meeting summary.	Brandy Steffen
7:55-8:00 pm	Next steps / Key themes	Brandy Steffen

AURORA STATE AIRPORT

PLANNING ADVISORY COMMITTEE (PAC)
WORKING SESSION #3 SUMMARY

Date: Tuesday, July 30, 2024
Time: 5:00-8:00 pm
Location: Zoom Webinar

In Attendance

PAC Members Present

Ben Williams, *Friends of French Prairie*
Bill Graupp, *Aurora CTE, Inc*
Bruce Bennett, *Positive Aurora Airport Management*
Cathryn Stephens, *ODAV Board*
Alvin Klassen, *Marion County*
Councilor Joann Linville, *City of Wilsonville*
David Waggoner, *Willamette Aviation*
Dave Mauk, *Charbonneau Country Club*
Ken Ivey, *Aurora Butteville Barlow Community Planning Organization*
Melissa Ahrens*, alternate, Oregon Dept of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD)*
Naomi Zwerdling, *Oregon Dept of Transportation*
Pam Barlow Lind, *Confederated Tribes of the Siletz Indians*
Patrick Donaldson, *Wilsonville Chamber of Commerce*
Ted Millar, *AABC/TLM Holdings*
Tony Helbling, *Aurora Airport Improvement Association*

PAC Members Absent

Austin Barnes, *Marion County Planning Dept.*
Beth Wytoski, *Regional Solutions*
Ben Clayton, *Life Flight Network*
Bob Buchanan, Alternate, *Columbia Helicopters*
Brandon Reich, Alternate, *Marion County Planning Dept.*
Brian Asher, *City of Aurora*
Cheryl Pouley, *Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde Community of Oregon*
Commissioner Tootie Smith, *Clackamas County*
Greg Hughes, Alternate, *Vans Aircraft*
Matt Crall, *Oregon Dept of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD)*
Matt Lawyer, *alternate, Marion County*
Matt Williams, *Deer Creek Estates HOA*
Raul Suarez, *Aurora Air Traffic Control*
Rian Johnson, *Vans Aircraft*
Rob Roedts, *Columbia Helicopters*
Robert Fournier, *Helicopter Transport Service*
Roger Kaye, *1000 Friends of Oregon*
Trent Brownlee, *Atlantic Aviation*
Wayne Richards, Alternate, *Friends of the French Prairie*
Whitney Stewart, *Oregon Office of Emergency Management*

Agency Representatives Present
Brandon Pike, *ODAV*
Tony Beach, *ODAV*

Staff and Consultants
Matt Rogers, *Century West*
David Miller, *Century West*
Samantha Peterson, *Century West*
Mark Steele, *Century West*
James Kirby, *Century West*
Brandy Steffen, *JLA Public Involvement*
Ashley Balsom, *JLA Public Involvement*

Audience / Members of the Public
Dave Tibbetts
George Van Hoomissen
George Buley
Greg Leo
Joseph Schaefer
Jennifer Redding
Mayor Julie Fitzgerald, *City of Wilsonville*
Mark Ottenad, *City of Wilsonville/SMART*
Tess Chadil
Tom Herzog
4785t
Aleta Best

Overview

CWE reviewed common questions regarding the FAA approved forecast and answered clarifying questions from the Planning Advisory Committee (PAC). CWE reviewed common questions and key considerations from Draft Chapter 4 Facility Requirements and answered clarifying questions from the PAC. CWE reviewed comment themes from the PAC and public on the Preliminary Alternatives shared in the June PAC meeting and Open House. CWE presented Refined Preliminary Alternatives based on PAC and public feedback. PAC members reviewed, asked questions about, and provided feedback on the refined preliminary alternatives. *The presentation, FAQs, meeting recording and other materials are posted on the website (publicproject.net/AuroraAirport). Comments collected during the meeting have been added to this meeting summary.*

Welcome and Introductions

Brandy Steffen, JLA Public Involvement, welcomed everyone to the meeting, reviewed the agenda and Zoom meeting tips and etiquette. She reminded the members of their roles and responsibilities. The meeting was extended by an hour to ensure time to discuss each airside and landside alternative and answer questions. Brandy also alerted the PAC that a virtual feedback form will be available for them to provide more lengthy comments about the preliminary alternatives over the next three weeks. She added that ODAV would like to hear from every member to ensure all viewpoints are collected before moving forward to more refined options.

Presentation

David Miller, Century West, presented on the Airport Master Plan to ensure that the entire group was working with the same information and data. The first two topics were repetitive from previous meetings and materials; only the Meeting #6 themes and Refined Preliminary Alternatives section included new information.

Forecasting Methodology

David addressed forecast modeling methodology and selection questions posed by the group. He summarized how the Facility Requirements were evaluated, including the reasoning behind the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) approved forecast model. The FAA approved aviation activity and established C-II design standards for the airport for both current and future design aircraft. This was based on Portland State University (PSU) 2021-2041 Population Forecast; this methodology was approved by FAA in lieu of Air Traffic Control (ATC) data due to the COVID-19 pandemic affecting ATC data collection.

David then opened the floor to clarifying questions from PAC members. **Dave Mauk, *Charbonneau Country Club*** and **Ted Millar, *AABC/TLM Holdings*** both asked questions, which are included in the table below (WS.1; WS.2). David then summarized that the ATC data existed for a limited period and a number of events occurred during that period which affected the ability to forecast growth.

There were no more clarifying questions. Brandy closed the floor to questions but noted that there would be a longer opportunity later for comments and discussion.

Facility Requirements Summary

David then reminded the group that during previous meetings the justified runway length from the analysis, which meets FAA requirements, is 5,500 feet. David also summarized the design standards and opened the floor to clarifying questions from PAC members. **Ben Williams, *Friends of French Prairie*** asked a question which is included in the table below (WS.3)

PAC Meeting #6 Input Themes

The project team received limited input from PAC members following meeting #6, but the themes were on **noise concerns**, **EFU land impacts**, **property acquisition needs**, **increase in traffic/operations**, and **impacts to existing roads**.

Brandy asked if anyone had additional comments to add; **Patrick Donaldson, *Wilsonville Chamber of Commerce*** and **Ben Williams, *Friends of French Prairie*** each raised their hands. Their questions are included in the table below (WS.4-WS.6)

Refined Preliminary Alternatives

David then reviewed the refined preliminary alternatives that included feedback from PAC members and the community via the online survey and in-person event in June. He reiterated the following information that will further shape the refined preliminary alternatives.

- Maintaining current non-standard conditions is not acceptable to FAA
- FAA requires airfield facilities to be consistent with forecast demand and the associated design standards
- The runway may be placed in maintenance-only mode by FAA until progress is made towards meeting design standards
- Failure to make measurable progress may jeopardize future FAA funding

- All airside alternatives will include a parallel taxi lane adjacent to the east parallel taxiway to accommodate aircraft movement and access from landside facilities to the taxiway
- A Vehicle Service Road (VSR) will be provided along the frontage of the east landside areas
- East Side Property Acquisition - lands currently in aeronautical use in the vicinity of the Aurora State Airport are identified as reserve for future property acquisition from willing sellers to insure continued long-term aeronautical use
- The South Runway Extension Option was eliminated from further consideration due to its greater need for property acquisition and impact on EFU land when ODAV has sufficient land available on the north end of their property to accommodate the proposed extension.
- The existing ODOT Hubbard Highway right-of-way width (200' +/-) will be maintained for all airside alternatives

Brandy asked if anyone had additional comments to add; **Patrick Donaldson, *Wilsonville Chamber of Commerce*** had comments about EFU lands and concerns about the process of eliminating alternatives. **Ben Williams, *Friends of French Prairie***, also asked a question about EFU lands and acquisition. **Dave Mauk, *Charbonneau Country Club*** asked a question about exploring a hybrid of the refined alternatives as a solution. The questions and answers are included in the table below (WS.7-WS.14).
Brandy reiterated that the project team is currently in the winding-down process and thanked Patrick for bringing up questions about the elimination process. David then presented on each of the Refined Preliminary Alternatives:

Refined Option for Preliminary Alternative 1 (1A) – Impacts to both aeronautical use facilities and non-aeronautical properties

- Extends existing runway 497 feet north (5,500 feet)
- Shifts Hubbard Highway and ODOT right-of way (ROW) approximately 80 feet west to clear ROFA; assumes new highway is centered in ROW and with the same roadway configuration
- Maintains existing ODOT ROW width (200') by acquiring additional ROW on west side of highway

Refined Option for Preliminary Alternative 1 (1B) - Minimizes impacts to aeronautical facilities with greater impacts to non-aeronautical properties

- Extends Runway 497 feet north (5,500 feet)
- Shifts Runway approximately 80 feet west to accommodate parallel taxi lane and vehicle service road on east side
- Maintains existing 200' wide Hubbard Highway right-of way and shifts ROW approximately 175 feet west to clear ROFA
- Reduced impacts to existing east hangars

Refined Option for Preliminary Alternative 2

- Extends Runway 497 feet north (5,500 feet)
- Runway & Parallel Taxiway is shifted 85 feet east to clear Hubbard Highway
- No change to Hubbard Highway required
- No property acquisition required west of Hubbard Highway

- Maintains existing ODOT ROW and west airport property boundary
- Reroutes Keil Road to clear ROFA and TOFA

PAC Questions and Comments

Brandy opened the discussion for PAC questions. *Comments and responses are provided in the table below (WS.15-19).*

David reiterated that the purpose of the Master Plan process is to identify projects that are justified and that can ultimately be funded; everything comes back to meeting FAA standards. All options involve significant costs and would be a significant effort. No option would happen overnight but will require ongoing coordination.

FAA funding is not guaranteed, but the vast majority of costs associated with this project would be funded through FAA dollars (airport user trust fund dollars), including highway reconfiguration.

Public Comment

Brandy opened the public comment section of the meeting. There were no verbal public comments at this meeting. *Written comments and responses are provided in the table below (WS.20-WS.22).*

Next Steps

Brandy reminded the group that ODAV and the planning team will continue to take PAC comments and public comments for an additional three weeks, until August 20th. The presentation and recording are both on the website to review.

The next virtual PAC meeting is scheduled for September 17th, 2024. It is a working session where the PAC will continue the conversation and talk through any further refinements based on feedback. The last PAC meeting will be in December.

Tony and David thanked the PAC and public attendees for their time and input, then ended the meeting.

PAC Member Questions/Comments and Responses[1]

ID	Name	Affiliation	Question/Comment	Response
WS.1	**Dave Mauk**	*Charbonneau Country Club*	Are there some airports that you know or have looked at that would serve as a model for our general Information purposes that are roughly the same demographic, the same size in a rural, borderline metro area, like ours is? That we can use as a reference point.	I think that's a common method. And when you go back and look at the forecast models in Chapter 3 – the table that summarizes the models, including the recommended model – one of the models that we considered was the Terminal Area Forecast model for Oregon. So basically, airports with air traffic control towers in Oregon. So it's kind of comparable to what you're describing. And that growth rate was similar. All the growth rates in that category were below 1% per year, and there's some differences between them, but negligible in terms of actual growth. So that's one example. But I think the other comparison is when we look at the FAA National Aerospace Forecast, when they have both historical data and their forecast data for general aviation airports with traffic control towers, that captures the same kind of airport that Aurora is: general aviation airports, as opposed to air carrier airports. Airports like that, that have control towers, tend to be, as you pointed out, maybe larger population centers or urban areas.
WS.2	**Ted Millar**	*AABC/TLM Holdings*	I just wondered if they'd taken consideration flights that occur when the tower's not open, because I think some of the towers are open longer than Aurora.	We took into consideration the fact that the tower at Aurora is not open 24 hours a day, and in the evaluation of activity, the baseline operations and numbers, we were able to approximate activity after hours. But you're right. The majority of tower air traffic control towers at general

[1] Live responses are included, along with additional information/clarification, as needed.

				aviation airports do not operate on a 24 hour per day schedule. So there's a combination of working hours and that, of course, includes towers that are staffed by FAA personnel, and there are towers that are staffed by contract operators.
WS.3	**Ben Williams**	*Friends of French Prairie*	So specific to the Hubbard highway aspect of the different alternatives, have you been in dialogue with ODOT on realignment of highway 551? And if so, what is ODOT's position on that requirement?	The answer is that ODAV has reached out to ODOT, and they are in consultation. We are waiting to hear more on that, and Tony Beach is on the line here and can also weigh in, but that's where that stands right now. **Tony Beach, ODAV:** That's right. We've reached out to the Department of Transportation and are just trying to get their input on the feasibility of this alternative, if that one were to be the selected alternative.
WS.4	**Patrick Donaldson**	*Wilsonville Chamber of Commerce*	Is there any assessment of the economic impact positively or negatively, about any of these issues?	Not as part of the Master Plan scope of work. If you're talking about assessing the economic impacts in terms of elements like job creation or things of that, that is not part of the scope.
WS.5	**Patrick Donaldson**	*Wilsonville Chamber of Commerce*	Has it been brought to your attention about the standing that small business administration has with regards to any and all Federal assessments, airports or other things?	I think that likely falls under NEPA and environmental assessments for projects which include economic and other related issues. So yes.
WS.6	**Ben Williams**	*Friends of French Prairie*	So my questions about impacts and concerns. Actually, David, it jumps back to the airside facility requirements, which shows the drain field in the RSA at the south end of the runway protection area. Is there a reason why the Columbia septic field, which is located at the	The reason is that the drain field that's at the south end of the runway is in the existing runway safety area. The drain fields at the north end of the one way are not in the current runway safety area. So that's the reason why the North Greenfields are not called out currently as nonconforming. Or, in other words,

			north end isn't shown? It's right there in the airport at the time.	the runway is not non-conforming in that sense. Now, if you may recall from our preliminary alternatives where we looked at runway extension options north and south; The option of extending the runway to the north would bring one, or possibly both, of those drain fields into the RSA. So they would then be subject to the same requirements and they would need to be relocated if that was the preferred option for extending the runway. But as it stands right now, the drain fields of the North End are not in the RSA area.
WS.7	**Patrick Donaldson**	*Wilsonville Chamber of Commerce*	You gave, in my opinion, short shrift to the discussion about the EFU land at the south entrance. Talk in more detail about how that gets removed off the consideration of that significant impact, as you went into more detail about significant impact upon Hubbard Highway.	Okay, that's a great question. Sure. Yeah, I think with the choice between the north and south options that touched on the EFU land, it is EFU land, but it's also land that would need to be acquired. So, in addition to the EFU land, the South runway extension option would require property acquisition to accommodate the extended runway, the runway safety area, etc. The north extension option does not require property acquisition, and it does not affect the EFU land the way the south extension does. Now, that isn't to say that there would not be some effects to EFU land at the south end. We know that Keil Road is in the current object-free area for the runway, and we anticipate that that will need to be addressed at some point, and that kind of realignment of Keil Road, in whatever form it ultimately takes, would likely involve EFU land.

				But I think that was essentially those themes, the property acquisition, EFU land, and the ability to accommodate the improvements at the north end.
WS.8	**Patrick Donaldson**	*Wilsonville Chamber of Commerce*	So there's nothing legal that prevents any of these things? Because you talked about the East Side acquisition of land, and I realize that they're all different sorts of pieces of land, but it seems like it's not a legal reason to remove them from consideration. It's just that a judgment was made that the lift would be heavier on both the South and West sides because of the things you've just mentioned, whereas on the east side there are less of those encumbrances. Is that a fair summary?	Well, I would say I think the land use guidelines are fairly clear in terms of discouraging impacts on EFU lands. That's a high priority in Oregon land use law. I'll defer to Tony and ODAV, but I think as far as a judgment, I think you're absolutely right. It is an assessment of options. There's nothing barring an airport from going through a land process to convert EFU land to something else. But I think on balance, this is where the north option is more viable.
WS.9	**Patrick Donaldson**	*Wilsonville Chamber of Commerce*	Because this is the first time that I felt that a judgment has been made about the deliberations based upon the things you've just talked about. And I wonder if at the end of this process, in 2025, do we open ourselves up to criticism that a judgment was made to not go further into consideration of those things because of encumbrances? And I'm just wondering, the history has been that a process has been flawed in the past. Do we open ourselves up to, once again, that the process is flawed because of judgments that were made, not based on legal, but just the heavy lift that might be involved. It just seems that that's what the criticism has been in the past, and	**Tony Beach:** Thank you, David, for your comment. As Brandi had mentioned earlier, the PAC process is giving feedback to ODAV so we can make a decision on the preferred alternative. Back in June, in the last PAC meeting, in an open house meeting, we had shared quite a few preliminary alternatives. They were just preliminary, and with the feedback that we received from the PAC and the public from those processes we did make a decision to remove the south extension as one of the alternatives due to its greater impacts to EFU land and because the property that ODAV currently has can meet the needs for the north extension.

			this could open us up to that in the future.	
WS.10	**Patrick Donaldson**	*Wilsonville Chamber of Commerce*	Have we also added additional alternatives as a result of the June meeting and the public open house?	If you recall when we had our meetings in June, we had two preliminary alternative concepts relative to the runway, and then there were sub-alternatives. One that was called Alternative #1 involved shifting of Hubbard Highway to clear the object free area for the runway. Second option was to go in the opposite direction and shift the runway east to clear the object free area, and then we had north and south options for both of those. So those are what we call the airside alternatives. As I mentioned, we've discarded the south extension options from each of these. So we are now looking at refining the north extension on all of the options. We're looking at the highway shift option and the refined runway shift option. So they're the same concepts, But they have added significantly more detail. And that's a product of the input we've received from the PAC, but also the ongoing and the FAA. So they're not new alternatives as much as they are refined.
WS.11	**Patrick Donaldson**	*Wilsonville Chamber of Commerce*	So I want to make sure I understand this. So you brought forward alternatives, we discussed those in June. There was some reaction to that, both at that meeting as well as in the comments submitted, and then there was the open house, and there were more comments made. And as a result of that, there was modification or elimination of those alternatives (the south runway and	Sure. Yeah, I think that's fair question. I think, as Brandy mentioned earlier, the PAC input is the goal of this process. And the public process is to provide input to ODAV to make decisions, and ultimately their decision will be which of these scenarios is the one they think is the best option for the airport. That'll be their basis for making a decision, and I think that the refinement process is common to master planning. We begin with very general concepts, and the goal

			the Hubbard Highway), and then there was modification. So my question is. Some of the criticism I heard was that options were limited; both pro and con about that. And then we had the open house, and the public comments. And so now, what you're saying is that we don't have new alternatives, we have revised alternatives with the alternatives that were originally proposed in June, and then the south runway extension has been eliminated because of a judgment about the EFU and all of those things you've already mentioned. I just want to make sure I understand the process of June till now.	is to add detail and really drill down into the important, most important elements, and we start with a large number of options and they narrow it down to the most viable options. So that's common in master planning. And I think it's transparent in the fact that we present information, the PAC and the public provide input, we come back and discuss that, and we say, okay, we heard that. And we've also had other input from folks like the FAA, and that's led to a refined concept. So that is where we are, and all of the incremental steps along the way will be documented in Chapter 5 that will be produced that begins at the preliminary stage. And we'll include all of the options that were presented, including those that were discarded. And that would include, if you recall from the last meeting, there was the input provided by the FAA to eliminate the so-called B-2 options. Those were eliminated from consideration, but they are still going to appear in the chapter. So everything is documented, and that will be the case until we end up at a point where ODAV can make a decision. So you're right. I think it's a judgment situation where the sponsor, the owner of the airport, has to weigh all of the factors involved to make decisions. So you're exactly right, that is the process.
WS.12	**Patrick Donaldson**	*Wilsonville Chamber of Commerce*	And it's continued to evolve if I understand this, so that all of these options might continue to evolve and be enhanced or minimized.	Yes, often in any airport master plan, we present a slate of alternatives, and sometimes it works out that one is the clear winner, and sometimes people like parts of one and parts of another. There

				are elements that can be combined, sort of a hybrid approach. The goal is to work through all of that and get to a point where we've got to refined alternatives.
WS.13	**Ben Williams**	*Friends of French Prairie*	A comment and a question; the comment is to Patrick's concern about the removal of EFU land and the south extensions. As an echo of the past, I would remind, everybody, and particularly those that weren't around for the 2011 Master Plan process, that the preferred alternative presented in 2011 was no build, and it was specific to the complexities of EFU land acquisition and expansion onto EFU land at the south. That's a fact, 13 years ago. The question is about the property acquisitions. I'm jumping back to east side – you were just talking about west side – the east side property acquisitions, is that east side of the existing airport fence boundary, or does it include outside the existing airport boundary, outside the fence? And is this all west of Airport Road, or does it contemplate property on the east side of Airport Road?	Thank you for that, Ben, I think we'll get into more detail on this as we look at these figures on the alternatives. But I think the concept of showing future property acquisition is to essentially recognize all land that is privately owned that's currently an aeronautical use, as a potential opportunity to acquire, to become part of the airport, if you will. One, it's a goal that we would help ensure that those lands continue in aeronautical use. This is private land and can be bought and sold, so it can be converted into lots of things. So that's one. And two is that it opens the opportunity for – if property does become available and ODA is interested in acquiring it – the ability to use FAA funding is provided all the way out to Airport Road. Outside is basically from the fence over and incorporates anything that is in that in that realm. So it's a lot of area. But again, Tony can speak to the broader policy implications there. But it's a protective device, really, for the airport and the ability to guarantee long term aeronautical use for those areas.
WS.14	**Dave Mauk**	*Charbonneau Country Club*	I have 2 questions, and maybe a comment at the end of that kind of based on the answers. One is, I know that, David, you even mentioned it in your comments about a hybrid. And I know this was	Thank you Dave. I wasn't referring specifically to the runway extension as the hybrid example. I just was more referring to the fact that there can be pieces of different options that sometimes work together, and I think the north and south split was noted, but

			submitted to you in the comments, because I did it myself in my comments, and I know others did. And that is extending on both the north and south end, as opposed to just looking at one end or the other. That's one question. And the second is, are we only down now to one alternative, and that's the north extension? So, is a hybrid considered with a north and south going both ways. I know it wasn't originally, and it looks to me like an oversight. I don't know why it isn't now, and certainly in the comments that you got at the open house as well as from some PAC members. And then what are we down to alternative wise?	in evaluation it didn't appear to provide significant benefits to justify creating another runway site alternative for consideration. So that's the short answer for that. As far as down to alternatives, I would say we're still facing two choices for this airfield. In terms of air side alternatives, in order to meet the C-II standards, one is to affect a shift of the Hubbard Highway west, two is to shift the runway east. So those are the two. We know as we've looked at this sort of east and west conundrum, there are no easy or inexpensive options out there. There just aren't, and the north and south was a complication in that, if you will. But it isn't the biggest challenge in terms of the feasibility. The challenges of implementing either of the realignment lateral realignment issues. So what we're going to go through tonight is we're going to come back in and bore down into more detail on those 2 main choices, east or west. And there are clear impacts on both sides, and that's the challenge that ODAV faces in terms of trying to chart a course that is most effective for the airport.
WS.15	**Patrick Donaldson**	*Wilsonville Chamber of Commerce*	So I've already previously mentioned about the economic displacement temporarily or permanent. So, with the original alternatives we were delivered in June; we had reaction, we had a public gathering. Feedback was obtained, and based upon that some of the alternatives were eliminated, some were modified. With these new modifications and alternatives, I just have to raise the issue once again, both the temporary and permanent displacement that might take place with these options, and, as	Okay. Thank you. One thing I would add, a detail on once the preferred alternative is defined, as part of the process there will be cost estimates prepared for each of the elements. So there'd be a cost associated with each of these, whether realigning the highway or reconstructing a runway or purchasing existing hangar square footage. So there will be a cost using consistent methodology to define that. The secondary economic impact of displacement would be something that would not typically be part of the Airport

			opposed to anecdotally coming to a judgment, I think it's important to measure those displacements as a factor in determining viability of the alternatives, and those are fairly simple calculations to be obtained.	Master Plan process, but something I'm sure they'll consider. And the reality is that I mentioned earlier, there are no options that are easy or cheap. And I think the economic displacement of private residences and businesses on the highway will also have a significant cost and a measurable impact on the communities. So I think ODAV is weighing all of those factors while still recognizing that maintaining the status quo is not an option.
WS.16	**Dave Mauk**	*Charbonneau Country Club*	If you're getting that kind of funding, clearly ODAV is your client, I'm wondering what the public benefit is here. We're now talking about using ODOT funds. That's taxpayer money. You're talking about acquiring land that's outside the purview of ODAV, I mean, obviously, you have to go through a whole lot more hoops. It's sounding like a square peg in a round hole. You can move down to Salem, you can move to McMinnville. You're not going to spend $15 million of your money, not going to spend maybe $15 million of taxpayer money. I think we're looking at the wrong kind of airport here, I really, really do. And what assurance do any neighbors have that – here you're going to be acquiring 143/47 acres there, or 43 acres here – that it stops? Why would we believe that that? All this for 500 feet of runway? 50 to 100 million bucks for 500 feet of runway in a rural area. It boggles my mind that you think that this is reasonable. To be really blunt about it. I didn't expect to say this tonight, but I'll tell you, you start	I would point out, I think to Dave's point, Master Planning does deal with a lot of concepts and conceptual assumptions. As I mentioned at the beginning, there was a question about coordination with ODOT. So, to be clear, anything involving the highway would require coordination with ODOT. So you're absolutely right, making a decision to shift to a highway, a right-of-way, is not in ODAV's purview. It would be coordination and agreement with ODOT. So that ongoing agency coordination will also be reflected when we go back together in September. And I don't have anything to say on that, as far as which direction that's going, at this point it's early days in that conversation. But I would also point out, there are a lot of moving parts of this story, without a doubt, and every one of them has a million complications. What we're trying to do here is to do an Airport Master Plan that meets FAA standards. The FAA has been very clear that the requirements are there today and they're there for a reason. We're not passing judgment on it, we're just simply presenting technical information that says, "to meet the design standards that have been identified for this airport, these are options that would be viable,

			going after taxpayer money, it's a whole other ball game. And we haven't even started. I don't understand why you have to go this route. Talk to your friends at the FAA. I'm sure there are lots of exceptions. Why does every airport have to meet the exact same [standards and] fit every need? You know, one shoe does not fit all, and this is something that needs to be looked at. This is an individual situation. This is an individual airport. You've got busy roads, you have a state highway literally adjacent to it. You have an enormously busy intersection also adjacent to it, and you have a freeway that goes from Mexico to Canada. And you're really close to that. And you've got 26,000 people who live two miles away, two and a half miles away, in direct route to this airport. There's a lot of obstacles that I think somehow missed the ODAV purview here. I really believe that. It's great that you've got all these alternatives. To move a highway, to move 551? Wow. You guys have a lot of power. But if you start using our money, we have some power too. I just need to say this. I'm a little surprised at how cavalier this seems to be at this stage, and how, right away, all the other options are off the table, and it's expand property, expand runways, expand the highways. I vented. I apologize for that, and I'm not picking on you, David, but you happen to be the guy that's so calmly presenting all this. And it just isn't sitting well with me, and I know	that could be considered." So I just want to make that clear, we're just trying to identify possibilities while acknowledging there are no easy options here.

			the people I represent won't be happy about hearing any of this, and that's all I have to say. Thank you for listening.	
WS.17	**Ben Williams**	*Friends of French Prairie*	So David, I think you just summed up the dynamic in master planning processes and many other processes. There's usually no simple solution. The process isn't simple, the iterative process can be painful, and you've got multiple variables to consider, etc, etc. That's all true. All of that said, while I, as a representative of farmers and local farmland, am happy to hear that expanding to the south onto farmland is off the table, I've still got to ask the same question I asked in an email a week ago to Tony Beach, which derived from a statement in your own master plan, page nine of [draft?], chapter five, on the Landside Alternatives and Introduction: Aurora State Airport is located on a constrained site. That was one of the opposition themes in 2011. At what point is common sense going to prevail here and say, we're trying to shoehorn something that's not just a square peg in a round hole, it's like an oversized peg in a round hole. And I'm not looking for an answer, David, you don't have to respond to that question. It was hypothetical. Thank you, though.	Thank you for your comment.
WS.18	**Councilor Joann Linville**	*City of Wilsonville*	Thank you, David, for that presentation. I have to say that I appreciate David [Mauk]'s comments. I'm not going to reiterate them, except to second them. Obviously, his group that he represents is a small section of Wilsonville, but those are our citizens, and those comments and	Thank you for your comment.

			those concerns are echoed across our entire community. And I think that was very evident at the open house. We had people show up, and I think unfortunately, because we ran out of paper copies of the comment forms, a number of those people got away without being able to memorialize their comments, which was very unfortunate, given that this is a very expensive FAA planning process for our consultants. And with all due respect, I am astonished that there would not be enough copies and that I would have to go and ask those people that were monitoring the event to take the tablets over to the table where the comment box was. That is very, very unfortunate. I think this was intended as an opportunity for our citizens to have input, and I just want to go on the record to say that it was not a satisfactory public input project. Very poorly run, very, very poorly done, when people cannot have the input that they had hoped to have. So the data that you're going to gather, and the results of that, I think, are not satisfactory. I don't know what conclusions we could draw from them, because people were not able to [submit] in the consistent format of even having the flip chart available, where people put dots on. You're mixing apples and oranges. You know, we expect some really good, hard data, and that certainly was confounded by any means. I'm also disappointed that, a second time now, we're at a significant meeting and a planning session. And not only [do we not] have the total list of alternatives	

			that we were given in the beginning, we now have even a truncated group now, down to two. I recognize that the PAC does not have control of power in this process but I'm very disappointed that we would not get advanced notification that there would be a change in the alternatives that would be offered. Neither time was that given, and I've had numerous conversations with Tim about when the FAA knew that they were going to only approve an increase to a C-I or C-II level for the airport. And he indicated to me that it was that Friday prior to our last PAC meeting, when that information was forwarded to the consultants, and I would have expected that, since that was significant information, that the PAC would have been notified in advance. But here we are again in a situation where we're now down to two alternatives, which again precludes much of an opportunity to… it's like I used to do with my daughters. And I'd say, here are two dresses. You can pick this one or this one, and I'd already made the choices on which were the satisfactory options. That's where we are. So you just need to understand that there is frustration. And I understand [after] my conversations with Tim, why we are at 5500 feet for the runway. But my concern is also the concern that Ben just raised, and that is, at what point does a constrained airport, so constrained that it cannot go any larger? So we are now going to a C-I/C-II. At what point do we go to a D level? And simply because we allow pilots the opportunity to land, and they get to decide, and that is	

			what happens with the airport. And I think you would agree that it does force the airport to be out of FAA compliance, and that that is a significant driver of what is happening with these changes. So I appreciate that we are not going south with the roadway extension. I think north is the only way to go. I think if you if you saw the traffic that goes on that highway, on that Hubbard Highway, especially at rush hour time, a diversion of that highway to make it bow out and come back in again is not a simple thing. It's not a simple fix. And it will impact what happens to the backup in traffic on I5 that goes south from two o'clock in the afternoon until well after six-thirty or seven o'clock at night. So it may sound like it's a simple thing for the for the airport, and it's a fix, but it has other implications, and our city is already in trouble, as is the city of Sherwood, with the Tualatin-Sherwood Highway, as is Tualatin, with the people trying to get on I5 and get home in the evening. So those are my comments. I don't expect you to respond so I'll just leave it at that. Thank you.	
WS.19	**Ted Millar**	*AABC/TLM Holdings*	There were so many changes that we didn't anticipate. I probably don't have a comments to make at this time, just that we need to absorb some of the thought process that has been given to us all tonight, and trying to figure out a way to give you the right kind of input on our concern. Especially from the airport user standpoint; so far, all we've heard from are primarily opposition. As you know, it's very complicated airport with a lot of	Great. Thank you, Ted. And we'll make sure that you all have this information and then we'll touch base. I'll reach out to all of you just to make sure we collect that input and get it recorded.

			major businesses, and the economic impacts to some of these things that you're talking about are huge. So we've got to do some analysis to see how's the correct way to respond.	

Attendee Questions/Comments and Responses[2]

ID	Name	Question/Comment	Response
WS. 20	**George Van Hoomissen**	This sounds like the only comments were from PAC members expressing concerns about Airport impact on non-airport aspects of the community. My concerns are about the airport itself — for example, mainly runway length. Didn't you get any comments from airport users — in particular about the need for a longer runway?!	Yes, we received comments from the public and the PAC on runway length from the beginning of the project. We're getting into the specifics on the justified runway length. Back in chapter four, Facility Requirements, there was a lot of discussion about the methodology that the FAA requires us to use for master plans versus lengths that might be required for individual operators. So yeah, there was quite a lot of discussion on that, but the justified length based on the FAA methodology was defined and that's been applied consistently.
WS. 21	**George Van Hoomissen**	Do you now consider the possibility of a runway extension to 6000' being essentially off the table?	For the purposes of this Master Plan, the length that we documented in the facility requirements, the 5,500 foot length, is what meets the FAA criteria as outlined in the applicable advisory circulars. So that is the length that we, again, consistency between forecast, facility requirements and alternatives, we carry that length forward. So 5,500 is considered viable or at least justified based on the information. So that's where we stand.
WS. 22	**George Van Hoomissen**	In Option 1A, why do [you] assume that the ODOT ROW must remain at 200' and why do you assume that the highway must be centered in the ROW?	That's great question. I think one is, we don't have specific guidance from ODOT at this stage. As we mentioned earlier, there's some ongoing coordination that will be rolling out over the next several weeks. We'll hopefully

[2] Live responses are included, along with additional information/clarification, as needed.

			get some very specific feedback on topics like that. The reason that we maintain the right of way was sort of touched on in some of the comments made earlier by some of the folks about traffic. Since we don't have information from ODOT on our future roadway design, I think it's reasonable to assume that Hubbard Highway will require some very specific upgrades in the next 20 years, whether it's additional lanes or signalization or whatever that is. Bottom line is, we don't know, and we don't want to presume or tell ODOT that they can get by with less right-of-way. If they can, they might communicate that to ODAV. For our purposes though, we wanted to be consistent, so that's why we maintain that. And again, this is a conceptual planning exercise. Centering the future road footprint within the right of way just seems to be reasonable. The ultimate design, you know, at the point if that was pursued, the final alignment would be determined in the design as well. We just are trying to be as consistent as we can.

Additional Emailed Comments

ID	Name	Affiliation	Question/Comment	Response
WS. 23	**George Van Hoomissen**	*VH4 Aviation, LLC*	[Included in screenshot below]	Thank you for your comments. FAA has stated that the runway and runway object free area (ROFA) and runway safety area (RSA) must meet standards before any future improvements – including a runway extension – will be considered. Furthermore, by not addressing the non-standard ROFA and

				RSA, ODAV risks violating grant assurances, jeopardizing future funding eligibility.

George Van Hoomissen
VH4 Aviation, LLC
22320 Yellow Gate Ln NE, Unit N73
Aurora, OR 97002

August 1, 2024

Oregon Department of Aviation
Kenji Sugahara, Director; Tony Beach, State Airports Manager;
Alex Thomas, Planning & Project Manager; Brandon Pike, Aviation Planner

Gentlemen:

I am writing to provide comments regarding your most recent presentation to the Planning Advisory Committee for the Aurora State Airport Master Plan, which was presented to the PAC during the online meeting on July 30, 2024.

As a part of the July 30th presentation, ODAV's consultant Century West Engineering (CWE) explained that, after extensive analysis and consultation with ODAV and the FAA, CWE has determined that the Aurora State Airport currently does not meet applicable FAA design guidelines for a variety of reasons, including unacceptable items in the Runway Object Free Area (Hubbard Highway, Keil Road, ASOS equipment, wind cone), unacceptable items in the Runway Safety Area (south-end drain field, open drainage ditches), unacceptable direct runway access from aprons/hangars, and a runway length that is approximately 500' too short to meet the RDC C-II requirements.

Next, CWE explained that they had developed three "Refined Preliminary Alternatives" (identified as Alternatives 1A, 1B, and 2), each of which presents a potential way that ODAV could conceivably bring the airport into compliance with FAA requirements. Notably, all three of those Refined Preliminary Alternatives include lengthening the runway by 497' to the north (bringing the runway length to 5500'), which apparently could be accomplished on existing ODAV property, with no taking of any private property required at all. I want to point out that, even though this one airport improvement (i.e., a 500' runway extension) would not on its own resolve all of the airport's current deficiencies, nevertheless it would unquestionably make the airport significantly safer for all airport users, and I believe it would be a giant step toward meeting the FAA requirements applicable to this type of airport. Other minor changes to the airport could be made that would address many of the other deficiencies (e.g., moving the windsock and ASOS equipment, replacing open drainage ditches with covered drainpipes, etc.), without requiring significant land acquisitions or negative impacts on properties adjacent to the airport which are now privately owned.

However, as CWE explained during the July 30th presentation, in order to meet all of the FAA's guidelines, either the Hubbard Highway would need to be moved to the west, requiring acquisition and clearing of 39 to 43 acres of private commercial and residential property that is west of the current Hubbard Highway (as detailed in Refined Alternatives 1A and 1B), or the runway would need to be moved to the east, requiring acquisition and clearing of 37 acres of private property that is east of ODAV's current property line and is now in active aeronautical use (as detailed in Refined Alternative 2).

This work by CWE has produced some useful information, and it has been a necessary and helpful part of the Master Plan process – identifying the airport's current deficiencies and exploring the potential implications of various possible ways that the deficiencies, theoretically, could be fixed. Unfortunately, but most importantly, what I believe this work has revealed is that none of the Refined Preliminary Alternatives is even remotely realistic. In fact, I highly doubt that there is anybody at ODAV or CWE who believes that

any of the recently-presented Refined Alternatives will actually be implemented at any time during the Master Plan planning period. All of the presented alternatives are, in my opinion, obvious non-starters, as each of them would require a massive expenditures of public funds, at a level that is extraordinarily unlikely ever to be made available; and regardless which of the alternatives were to be pursued it would be nearly impossible to adequately justify the impacts on adjacent property owners.

While I would very much like to see the Aurora State Airport improved so that it would meet all FAA design guidelines, it is my opinion that this goal realistically cannot (and therefore will not) be achieved within the coming decades. Therefore, it would be very useful for ODAV to direct its consultants to begin exploring ideas for airport improvements that realistically could be accomplished within the Master Plan planning period.

To that end, what I would like to see is CWE developing and presenting to the public some alternatives for projects that would lead to substantial measurable progress in eliminating current non-standard conditions at the airport and that would move the airport meaningfully towards meeting RDC C-II requirements, while also acknowledging that, as a practical matter, it is extremely unlikely that the airport will ever be able to achieve 100% full compliance with FAA design guidelines.

I suggest that ODAV consider what I will call Realistic Alternative No. 3: Leave the runway right where it is now, but extend it 500' to the north. This could be done with or without various other minor changes on the airfield (such as moving the windsock and ASOS equipment and covering drainage ditches) and leaving the Hubbard Highway unchanged (noting that this would still leave the Hubbard Highway within the ROFA, which is undesirable, but perhaps cannot be helped within the foreseeable future). While not perfect, this alternative would make the airport much better for airport users, while minimizing impacts to off-airport lands. Btw, a vehicle service road could be added as well, but that road certainly does not need to be placed right along the taxiway.

I suggest you also consider Realistic Alternative No. 4, which would be the same as No. 3, except that it would also move the Hubbard Highway to the west as far as possible while still keeping it within the existing ODOT right-of-way. Of course, this variation would require cooperation/consent from ODOT, but it would avoid the need for acquisition of a large number of private properties. While this approach may not fully resolve the issue of vehicles traversing through the ROFA, it may enable cost-effective mitigation of that problem. To my knowledge, there is no law of nature, or anything in the Oregon Revised Statues, or any FAA or ODAV rule, that requires that a highway be centered within a public right-away.

Of course there are many other possible variations on this theme. My main point is that the time has come for ODAV to turn its attention to thinking about and exploring feasible alternatives that actually could be accomplished at the Aurora State Airport. If ODAV and CWE are unwilling to explore such alternatives (i.e., projects that would be less-than-perfect but feasible within the near term), then please explain to the PAC why that is.

Thank you for considering this input.

Sincerely,



George Van Hoomissen

Aurora State Airport
Master Plan Project



Planning Advisory Committee – Working Session
Online Meeting
July 30, 2024

Agenda

Time	Topic
5:00-5:15	Introductions
5:15-5:20	Review Approved Forecast (Draft CH 3 – Working Paper #1)
5:20-5:30	PAC Clarifying Questions
5:30-5:40	Review Facility Requirements (Draft CH 4)
5:40-5:50	PAC Clarifying Questions
5:50-6:10	Comment Themes – Preliminary Alternatives (PAC Meeting #6)
6:10-6:40	Review Refined Preliminary Alternatives
6:40-7:40	PAC Comments
7:40-7:55	Public Comments
7:55-8:00	Next Steps Public comments collected through the website **https://publicproject.net/AuroraAirport**

Introductions

Oregon Department of Aviation (ODAV)

Kenji Sugahara
Director

Alex Thomas
Planning & Project Manager

Tony Beach
State Airports Manager

Brandon Pike
Aviation Planner

Project Team

Agency Oversight & Funding

Airport Owner (Sponsor)

Planning & Engineering

Public Involvement

Cultural Resources


Archaeological Investigations Northwest, Inc.

Environmental Review

AGIS Survey

MAGYAR LAND SURVEYING LLC

Project Website Overview



As required by the FAA, the Airport Master Plan will provide specific guidance in making the improvements necessary to maintain a safe and efficient airport that is economically, environmentally, and socially sustainable. The Airport Master Plan will also:

- Define the current, short-term and long-term needs of the Airport through a comprehensive evaluation of facilities, conditions and FAA airport planning and design standards.
- Look at what is happening around the airport that could affect the future plans, development and operation of the airport such as land use, transportation, environmental, economic development, etc.

https://publicproject.net/AuroraAirport

PAC Members & Alternates

- Airport Users/Businesses/Organizations
- Airport Neighbors
- Local Municipalities
- Tribal Organizations
- State Agencies
- Local and Regional Non-Profit Groups
- Environmental / Land Use Groups

PAC Meeting Guidelines

Meetings summaries will **include all comments along with responses/ follow up.**

- Meeting time **for all committee members to speak.** We have added more time for dialogue.
- Comments on **non-agenda items** should be provided in writing.
- Committee members are encouraged to **provide comments on draft work products presented within the allotted review period** provided by the Planning Team.

PAC Meeting Guidelines


As a committee, we agree to **approach this work with honesty, openness, and willingness to work together.**

- This includes building trust and **assuming good intentions in others** and ensuring that our behavior supports a successful process.
- We will work with each other and staff to **address issues as they arise, utilize tools to ensure clear communication and robust participation, and meet the communication needs of members.**
- PAC members represent their organization, please keep your constituents informed of public meetings and project information.
- **We need all PAC members to name/identify themselves.** Duplicates will be removed from the meeting.

Project Schedule – Where are we?

Updated July 2024

Aurora State Airport - Airport Master Plan Project Schedule (all future dates tentative)



Note - Schedule has been updated July 2024 to reflect the addition of a PAC Working Session on 9/17/2024

Master Plan Forecast

U.S. Department
of Transportation
**Federal Aviation
Administration**

Northwest Mountain Region
Colorado · Idaho · Montana · Oregon · Utah
Washington · Wyoming

Seattle Airports District Office
2200 S 216th Street, Rm 1W-422
Des Moines, WA 98198

November 15, 2023
*Corrected January 23, 2024

Tony Beach
State Airports Manager
Anthony.BEACH@odav.oregon.gov
Oregon Department of Aviation

Federal Aviation Administration (FAA)
Aurora (UAO) Aviation Activity Forecast Approval
Airport Improvement Program Grant Number 3-41-0004-022-2021

The FAA Airports District Office has reviewed the aviation forecast for the Aurora (UAO) Airport Working Paper No. 1 (latest revision dated November 2023). The FAA approves these forecasts for airport planning purposes, including Airport Layout Plan (ALP) development, in addition to the existing and future critical aircraft. The FAA approval is based on the information submitted in Chapter 3, summarized as follows:

Airport Planning and TAF Forecast Comparison

	Year	Airport Forecast	TAF	AF/TAF (% Difference)
Passenger Enplanements				
Base yr.	2021	0	0	0.0%
Base yr. + 5yrs.	2026	0	0	0.0%
Base yr. + 10yrs.	2031	0	0	0.0%
Base yr. + 15yrs.	2036	0	0	0.0%
Commercial Operations				
Base yr.	2021	2,006	1,727	16.2%
Base yr. + 5yrs.	2026	2,056	1,845	11.4%
Base yr. + 10yrs.	2031	2,108	1,967	7.1%
Base yr. + 15yrs.	2036	2,160	2,097	3.0%
Total Operations				
Base yr.	2021	76,028	76,794	-1.0%
Base yr. + 5yrs.	2026	79,354	78,053	1.7%
Base yr. + 10yrs.	2031	82,825	79,109	4.7%
Base yr. + 15yrs.	2036	86,449	80,198	7.8%

Note: TAF data is on a U.S. government fiscal year basis (October through September).

*Highlighted cells corrected to correspond to values from Table 3-23 Forecast Summary.

Based on the approved forecast, the FAA also approves the C-II family of aircraft, for the existing and future critical aircraft.

Our approval is based on the following:

- The forecast is supported by reasonable planning assumptions and current data
- The forecast appears to be developed using acceptable forecasting methodologies
- The difference between the FAA Terminal Area Forecast (TAF) and the Airport's forecast for total operations is within the 10 percent and 15 percent allowance for the 5 and 10 year planning horizons.

Approval of this forecast does not automatically justify any of the capital improvements shown on the ALP or recommended in the master plan. All future projects will need to be justified by current activity levels at the time of proposed implementation. Lastly, the approved forecasts may be subject to additional analysis, or the FAA may request a sensitivity analysis if this data is to be used for environmental or Part 150 noise planning purposes.

This forecast was prepared at the same time as the evolving impacts of the COVID-19 public health emergency. Forecast approval is based on the methodology, data, and conclusions at the time the document was prepared. However, consideration of the impacts of the COVID-19 public health emergency on aviation activity is warranted to acknowledge the reduced confidence in growth projections using currently-available data.

Accordingly, FAA approval of this forecast does not constitute justification for future projects. Justification for future projects will be made based on activity levels at the time the project is requested for development. Documentation of actual activity levels meeting planning activity levels will be necessary to justify AIP funding for eligible projects.

If you have any questions about this forecast approval, please call me at (206) 231-4248.

Sincerely,
Tim House
TIMOTHY ALLEN HOUSE
Digitally signed by TIMOTHY ALLEN HOUSE
Date: 2024.01.23 14:33:42 -08'00'
Lead Planner
SEA Airports District Office

cc: (Samantha Peterson)

Key Takeaways from the Airport Master Plan Forecasts

- Summary:
  - The FAA provided extensive reviews of the draft forecasts at both the region and headquarters levels over an extended period
  - The FAA reviews focused on model relevance and forecast growth rates, compared to national FAA forecasts
  - The final recommended forecast model provides a reasonable projection of activity required for master planning
  - The master plan forecasts were approved by FAA in November 2023
  - The current and future design aircraft is a medium/large business jet - Runway Design Code (RDC): C-II

Key Takeaways from the Airport Master Plan Forecasts

- *Why Air Traffic Control Tower (ATCT) data were not used to project future activity in the recommended forecast:*

- Air Traffic Data Limits
  - The Aurora Air Traffic Control Tower started operation in late 2015
  - The small number of years of ATCT data (2016-2021) was insufficient to project a reliable 20-year trend
  - The unprecedented changes in airport activity experienced in 2020 and 2021 (COVID) further reduced ability to define a reliable long-term trend
  - ATCT activity during this brief period yielded a higher growth rate that was not considered sustainable through the 20-year planning period
  - Historical instrument flight plan data was not appropriate for projecting local operations, which is predominantly flight training activity in the traffic pattern

Key Takeaways from the Airport Master Plan Forecasts

- The FAA approved the draft master plan forecasts November 15,2023
- Recommended Model - PSU 2021-2041 Population Forecast - Marion and Clackamas Counties
  - The population-based model reflects a modest upward trend that is consistent with conditions favorable to increased activity at Aurora State Airport
  - The model does not establish a statistical correlation between population and airport activity
  - The model is consistent with broad economic expectations for the region, including growth in employment
  - The model's average annual growth rate (0.9%) is in line with FAA national aerospace forecasts for GA operations at towered airports (<1% annual average growth)

Clarifying Questions?


Review:

Facility Requirements Summary

Facility Requirements – Summary of Evaluation


- Existing & Future Design Aircraft – Medium/Large Business Jet
  - C-II standards for runway-taxiway system
  - All airfield components must meet C-II standards
- Runway Length Evaluation: Justified Length: 5,500 feet
  - Based on current and forecast air traffic

Facility Requirements Summary – Airside



Source: Century West Engineering

Facility Requirements Summary – Landside



Source: Century West Engineering

Facility Requirements Review

- Design Standards
  - Runway Object Free Area (ROFA)
    - Non-standard Items: Hubbard Highway, Keil Road, ASOS, Wind Cone
  - Runway Safety Area (RSA)
    - Non-standard Items: Drain field (south end), open ditches
  - Direct Runway Access
    - FAA design guidance: Avoid straight-line direct access taxi routes between aprons/hangars and runway
- Landside Capacity
  - Development/redevelopment of landside areas to accommodate new demand for hangars and aircraft parking

Clarifying Questions?

PAC Meeting #6

Comment Themes

PAC Meeting #6

Comment Themes

- Noise Concerns
- EFU Land Impacts
- Property Acquisition Needs
- Increase in Traffic/Operations
- Impacts to Existing Roads

Review:

Refined Preliminary Alternatives

Assumptions

- Significant changes in assumptions that went into the refined alternatives:
  - Maintaining current non-standard conditions is not acceptable to FAA
  - FAA requires airfield facilities planning to be consistent with forecast demand and the associated design standards
  - Runway may be placed in maintenance only mode by FAA until progress is made towards meeting design standards
  - Failure to make measurable progress may jeopardize future FAA funding

Assumptions

- Significant changes in assumptions that went into the refined alternatives (continued):
  - All airside alternatives will include a parallel taxilane adjacent to the east parallel taxiway to accommodate aircraft movement and access from landside facilities to the taxiway
  - A Vehicle Service Road (VSR) will be provided along the frontage of the east landside areas
  - East Side Property Acquisition - lands currently in aeronautical use in the vicinity of the Aurora State Airport are identified for future property acquisition to insure continued long-term aeronautical use
    - Several land parcels are required to meet FAA design standards and airfield clearances, varies by alternative
    - Other land parcels would be identified on the ALP to allow their purchase to be eligible for FAA funding

Assumptions

- Significant changes in assumptions that went into the refined alternatives (continued):
  - South Runway Extension Option Eliminated
    - Due to the alternative's greater impacts on EFU-zoned land
  - Existing ODOT Hubbard Highway Right-of-Way Width (200' +/-) will be maintained for all airside alternatives.
    - ODOT plans for future highway configuration (lanes, intersection signalization, etc.) have not been determined, but future upgrades are possible if traffic volume increases
      - This requires additional ROW acquisition west of the highway for the highway shift options
      - The shifted ROW would impact several adjacent residential and commercial properties

Review:

Refined Alternative 1A – Shift Hubbard Highway West and Extend Runway North to 5,500 feet


SUMMARY

Refined Alternative 1A –Shift Hubbard Highway West and Extend Runway North to 5,500 feet

- **Refined Option for Preliminary Alternative 1** - Impacts to both aeronautical use facilities and non-aeronautical properties
  - Extends existing runway 497 feet north (5,500 feet)
  - Shifts Hubbard Highway and ODOT right-of way (ROW) approximately 80 feet west to clear ROFA; assumes new highway is centered in ROW and with the same roadway configuration
  - Maintains existing ODOT ROW width (200') by acquiring additional ROW on west side of highway


REFINED ALTERNATIVE 1A - Shift Hubbard Highway West and Extend Runway North to 5,500 feet

Overview



REFINED ALTERNATIVE 1A - Shift Hubbard Highway West and Extend Runway North to 5,500 feet

Highway Alignment Detail




SUMMARY

Refined Alternative 1A –Shift Hubbard Highway West and Extend Runway North to 5,500 feet

- **Land Requirements**
  - Approx. 43 acres of property acquisition required to shift Hubbard Highway and ROW west and to construct a parallel taxilane and vehicle service road east of Taxiway A.
    - Shifting the ODOT highway ROW impacts 13 residential properties and 4 commercial properties located adjacent (west) of Hubbard Highway
  - Approx. 114 acres of property adjacent to the east side of the Airport identified for potential acquisition to preserve long term aeronautical use, if available

REFINED ALTERNATIVE 1A - Shift Hubbard Highway West and Extend Runway North to 5,500 feet

Property Overview



SUMMARY

Refined Alternative 1A –Shift Hubbard Highway West and Extend Runway North to 5,500 feet

- **Aeronautical Development/Redevelopment**
  - Includes a full length parallel taxilane and vehicle service road (VSR) east of Taxiway A to address direct runway access and VPD issues
  - Requires removal of existing hangars to accommodate VSR
  - Redevelopment of south apron aeronautical large hangars depicted east of current location
  - ASOS, segmented circle/windsock in the ROFA, and drain fields in the RSA to be relocated pending further study
  - Reroutes Keil Road to clear ROFA and TOFA
  - Accommodates existing ATCT location


SUMMARY

Refined Alternative 1A –Shift Hubbard Highway West and Extend Runway North to 5,500 feet

- **Aeronautical Development/Redevelopment (Continued)**
  - South Apron aeronautical properties are acquired, and hangars removed to accommodate parallel taxilane and vehicle service road
    - Approx. 237,000 square feet of existing hangars space removed
  - New hangars constructed along south apron at appropriate setback from parallel taxilane and vehicle service road
    - Approx. 195,000 square feet of new hangar space
  - North landside area reconfigured to accommodate parallel taxilane and vehicle service road
    - Approx. 149,000 square feet of new hangar space
    - 29 small aircraft tiedowns
    - No helicopter parking
    - No large aircraft pull-through parking positions
    - Accommodates existing ATCT location


REFINED ALTERNATIVE 1A - Shift Hubbard Highway West and Extend Runway North to 5,500 feet

Landside North



REFINED ALTERNATIVE 1A - Shift Hubbard Highway West and Extend Runway North to 5,500 feet

Landside South



Review:

Refined Alternative 1B –Shift Runway and Hubbard Highway West and Extend Runway North to 5,500 feet


SUMMARY

Refined Alternative 1B – Shift Runway and Hubbard Highway West and Extend Runway North to 5,500 feet

- **Refined Option for Preliminary Alternative 1 -** Minimizes impacts to aeronautical facilities with greater impacts to non-aeronautical properties
  - Extends Runway 497 feet north (5,500 feet)
  - Shifts Runway approximately 80 feet west to accommodate parallel taxilane and vehicle service road on east side
  - Maintains existing 200' wide Hubbard Highway right-of way and shifts ROW approximately 175 feet west to clear ROFA
  - Includes a full length parallel taxilane and vehicle service road east of Taxiway A to address direct runway access and VPD issues
  - Reduced impacts to existing east hangars


REFINED ALTERNATIVE 1B - Shift Runway and Hubbard Highway West and Extend Runway North to 5,500 feet

Overview



REFINED ALTERNATIVE 1B - Shift Runway and Hubbard Highway West and Extend Runway North to 5,500 feet

Highway Alignment Detail




SUMMARY

Refined Alternative 1B –Shift Hubbard Highway West and Extend Runway North to 5,500 feet

- **Land Requirements**
  - Approx. 39 acres of property acquisition required to shift Hubbard Highway and ROW west and to construct a parallel taxilane and vehicle service road east of Taxiway A
    - Shifting the ODOT highway ROW impacts 20 residential properties and 4 commercial properties located adjacent (west) of Hubbard Highway
  - Approx. 133 acres of property adjacent to the east side of the Airport identified for potential acquisition to preserve long term aeronautical use, if available

REFINED ALTERNATIVE 1B - Shift Runway and Hubbard Highway West and Extend Runway North to 5,500 feet

Property Overview



SUMMARY

Refined Alternative 1B – Shift Runway and Hubbard Highway West and Extend Runway North to 5,500 feet

- **Aeronautical Development/Redevelopment**
  - North landside area redesigned to accommodate parallel taxilane and vehicle service road
    - 178,000 square feet of new hangar space
    - 36 small aircraft tiedowns
    - 2 helicopter parking positions
    - No large aircraft pull-through parking positions
    - Accommodates existing ATCT location
  - Reroutes Keil Road to clear ROFA and TOFA
  - ASOS, segmented circle/windsock in the ROFA, and drain fields in the RSA to be relocated pending further study


REFINED ALTERNATIVE 1B - Shift Runway and Hubbard Highway West and Extend Runway North to 5,500 feet

Landside North



LANDSIDE ALTERNATIVE 1B - Shift Runway and Hubbard Highway West and Extend Runway North to 5,500 feet

Landside South



Review:

Refined Alternative 2 - Shift Runway East and Extend Runway North to 5,500 feet


SUMMARY

Refined Alternative 2 - Shift Runway East and Extend Runway North to 5,500 feet

- **Refined Option for Preliminary Alternative 2**
  - Extends Runway 497 feet north (5,500 feet)
  - Runway & Parallel Taxiway is shifted 85 feet east to clear Hubbard Highway
  - No change to Hubbard Highway required
  - No property acquisition required west of Hubbard Highway
  - Maintains existing ODOT ROW and west airport property boundary
  - Reroutes Keil Road to clear ROFA and TOFA

REFINED ALTERNATIVE 2 - Shift Runway East and Extend Runway North to 5,500 feet

Overview




SUMMARY

Refined Alternative 2 – Shift Runway East and Extend Runway North to 5,500 feet

- **Land Requirements**
  - Approx. 37 acres of property acquisition required shift the runway/parallel taxiway and to construct parallel taxilane and vehicle service road
  - No properties west of Hubbard Highway are impacted
  - Approx. 105 acres of property adjacent to the east side of the Airport identified for potential acquisition to preserve long term aeronautical use, if available

REFINED ALTERNATIVE 2 - Shift Runway East and Extend Runway North to 5,500 feet

Property Overview



SUMMARY

Refined Alternative 2 - Shift Runway East and Extend Runway North to 5,500 feet

- **Refined Option for Preliminary Alternative 2**
  - Requires removal of existing hangars to accommodate VSR
  - Redevelopment of south apron large hangars depicted east of current location
  - Includes a full length parallel taxilane and vehicle service road west of Taxiway A to address direct runway access and VPD issues
  - ASOS, segmented circle/windsock in the ROFA, and drain fields in the RSA to be relocated pending further study
  - ATCT to be relocated pending further study

SUMMARY

Refined Alternative 2 – Shift Runway East and Extend North to 5,500 feet

- **Aeronautical Development/Redevelopment**
  - South apron aeronautical properties are acquired, and hangars removed to accommodate shifted runway, parallel taxilane and vehicle service road
  - 242,000 square feet of existing hangars space removed
  - New hangars constructed along south apron at appropriate setback from parallel taxilane and vehicle service road
  - 142,000 square feet of new hangar space
    - Includes 5,000 square foot FBO building


SUMMARY

Refined Alternative 2 – Shift Runway East and Extend North to 5,500 feet

- **Aeronautical Development/Redevelopment**
  - North landside area redesigned to accommodate parallel taxilane and vehicle service road
    - 35,000 square feet of existing hangar space is removed
    - 143,000 square feet of new hangar space
    - 27 small aircraft tiedowns
    - No helicopter parking
    - 1 large aircraft pull-through parking position
    - ATCT to be relocated pending further study


REFINED ALTERNATIVE 2 - Shift Runway East and Extend Runway North to 5,500 feet

Landside North



REFINED ALTERNATIVE 2 - Shift Runway East and Extend Runway North to 5,500 feet

Landside South



PAC Comments?

Public Comments?

Next Steps

Next Steps

- Receive PAC/Public Input into Refined Preliminary Alternatives
  - PAC feedback due no later than August 20th
  - Public feedback due no later than August 20th

  Note – It is important to provide feedback within the allotted feedback period in order for ODAV and the Planning Team to review and incorporate into the analysis. Any late feedback will be documented in the feedback summaries; however, may not be considered in the review of the refined alternatives.

- Review PAC and Public input and Refine Alternatives as needed

- Next meeting is scheduled for September 17th, 2024

Thank You

Alex Thomas – ODAV

Tony Beach – ODAV


Brandy Steffen – JLA Public Involvement

David Miller – Century West Engineering

Project Website: https://publicproject.net/AuroraAirport

Updated August 2024

Aurora State Airport - Airport Master Plan Project Schedule (all future dates tentative)



Develop Understanding *Explore Solutions* *Implementation* *FAA Review and Approval*

PAC Meetings *Public Open House* *PAC Working Session Meeting*

4 *Forecast Approval Overview*

5 *Facility Goals and Requirements*

6 *Review of Comments and Responses from Facility Requirements & Preliminary Alternatives*

Review of Comments and Responses from Preliminary Alternatives & Refined Alternatives

7 *Alternatives Analsysis*

8 *CIP, ALP, and Draft Final for FAA Review*

Refined Preliminary Alternatives Summary

Project Update 8/1/24

Preliminary Airport Development Alternatives – Refinement Process


It has been recognized that maintaining current non-standard conditions is not acceptable to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA). Consequently, the FAA requires airfield facilities planning to mirror forecast demand and adhere to associated design standards. In instances where progress towards meeting these design standards is incomplete, the runway may be relegated to maintenance-only mode by the FAA until significant advancements are made. A failure to make measurable progress could put future FAA funding at risk.

The refined preliminary alternatives include modifications to address specific review comments provided by the FAA, members of the PAC, airport users, and the public. Several assumptions were made to the proposed airside and landside refined alternatives including:

- The South Runway Extension Option has been eliminated due to its substantial impacts on Exclusive Farm Use (EFU)-zoned land.
- All airside alternatives will include a parallel taxilane adjacent to the east parallel taxiway to facilitate aircraft movement and provide access from landside facilities to the taxiway.
- A Vehicle Service Road (VSR) will be established along the frontage of the east landside areas.
- Regarding land acquisition, the East Side Property Acquisition strategy has been outlined, where lands currently in aeronautical use in the vicinity of Aurora State Airport are designated for future acquisition to ensure their continued long-term aeronautical utility.
  - » This acquisition strategy is multifaceted, including several land parcels required to meet FAA design standards and airfield clearances, which vary by alternative. Additionally, other parcels would be identified on the Airport Layout Plan (ALP) to make their purchase eligible for FAA funding.
- For all airside alternatives, the existing Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) Hubbard Highway Right-of-Way (ROW) width of approximately 200 feet will be preserved. This will increase the impacts to adjacent non-aeronautical properties in the “highway shift” alternatives to account for the uniform ODOT ROW.
  - » Future plans for the highway configuration, such as lanes and intersection signalization, remain undetermined by ODOT, but upgrades could be considered if traffic volume increases. This might involve additional ROW acquisition west of the highway to facilitate highway shift options, which, in turn, could impact several adjacent residential and commercial properties. ODAV is currently in contact with ODOT to gauge the feasibility of the proposed changes to the highway and ROW locations.

REFINED ALTERNATIVE 1A


Shift Hubbard Highway West and Extend Runway North to 5,500 feet
OVERVIEW



- Builds upon Preliminary Alternative 1
- Shifts Hubbard Highway and right-of way approximately 80 feet west to clear ROFA
- Extends Runway 497 feet north to a total length of 5,500 feet
- Includes a full length parallel taxilane and vehicle service road east of Taxiway A to address direct runway access and VPD issues
- Identifies 43 acres of property acquisition to facilitate shifting Hubbard Highway and the construction of parallel taxilane and vehicle service road
  - » Highway shift impacts 13 residential properties and 4 commercial properties west of Hubbard Highway
- Identifies 114 acres to be purchased as aeronautical reserve if available
- South apron aeronautical properties are acquired, and hangars removed to accommodate parallel taxilane and vehicle service road
  - » 237,000 square feet of existing hangars space removed
- New hangars constructed along south apron at appropriate setback from parallel taxilane and vehicle service road
  - » 195,000 square feet of new hangar space
- North landside area redesigned to accommodate parallel taxilane and vehicle service road
  - » 149,000 square feet of new hangar space
  - » 29 small aircraft tiedowns
  - » No helicopter parking
  - » No large aircraft pull-through parking positions
  - » Accommodates existing ATCT location
- Reroutes Keil Road to clear ROFA and TOFA
- ASOS, segmented circle/windsock in the ROFA, and drain fields in the RSA to be relocated pending further study


REFINED ALTERNATIVE 1A

Shift Hubbard Highway West and Extend Runway North to 5,500 feet
HIGHWAY DETAIL




REFINED ALTERNATIVE 1A

Shift Hubbard Highway West and Extend Runway North to 5,500 feet
PROPERTY OVERVIEW




REFINED ALTERNATIVE 1A

Shift Hubbard Highway West and Extend Runway North to 5,500 feet
LANDSIDE NORTH




REFINED ALTERNATIVE 1A

Shift Hubbard Highway West and Extend Runway North to 5,500 feet
LANDSIDE SOUTH



REFINED ALTERNATIVE 1B


Shift Runway and Hubbard Highway West and Extend Runway North to 5,500 feet
OVERVIEW



- Builds upon Preliminary Alternative 1
- Shifts Runway approximately 80 feet west to accommodate parallel taxilane and vehicle service road on east side
- Shifts Hubbard Highway and right-of way approximately 175 feet west to clear ROFA
- Extends Runway 497 feet north to a total length of 5,500 feet
- Includes a full length parallel taxilane and vehicle service road west of Taxiway A to address direct runway access and VPD issues
- Identifies 39 acres of property acquisition to facilitate shifting Hubbard Highway and the construction of parallel taxilane and vehicle service
  - » Highway shift impacts 20 residential properties and 4 commercial properties west of Hubbard Highway
  - » No aeronautical structures are impacted
- Identifies 133 acres to be purchased as aeronautical reserve if available
- North landside area redesigned to accommodate parallel taxilane and vehicle service road
  - » 178,000 square feet of new hangar space
  - » 36 small aircraft tiedowns
  - » 2 helicopter parking positions
  - » No large aircraft pull-through parking positions
  - » Accommodates existing ATCT location
- Reroutes Keil Road to clear ROFA and TOFA
- ASOS, segmented circle/windsock in the ROFA, and drain fields in the RSA to be relocated pending further study


REFINED ALTERNATIVE 1B

Shift Runway and Hubbard Highway West and Extend Runway North to 5,500 feet
HIGHWAY DETAIL




REFINED ALTERNATIVE 1B

Shift Runway and Hubbard Highway West and Extend Runway North to 5,500 feet
PROPERTY OVERVIEW




REFINED ALTERNATIVE 1B

Shift Runway and Hubbard Highway West and Extend Runway North to 5,500 feet
LANDSIDE NORTH




REFINED ALTERNATIVE 1B

Shift Runway and Hubbard Highway West and Extend Runway North to 5,500 feet
LANDSIDE SOUTH



REFINED ALTERNATIVE 2


Shift Runway East and Extend North to 5,500 feet
OVERVIEW



- Builds upon Preliminary Alternative 2
- Hubbard Highway remains on the current alignment
- Runway is shifted 85 feet east to clear the ROFA
- Extends Runway 497 feet north to a total length of 5,500 feet
- Includes a full length parallel taxilane and vehicle service road west of Taxiway A to address direct runway access and VPD issues
- Identifies 37 acres of property acquisition to facilitate shifting the runway and the construction of parallel taxilane and vehicle service
  - » No properties west of Hubbard Highway are impacted
- Identifies 105 acres to be purchased as aeronautical reserve if available
- South apron aeronautical properties are acquired, and hangars removed to accommodate shifted runway, parallel taxilane and vehicle service road
  - » 242,000 square feet of existing hangars space removed
    - – Includes 5,000 square foot FBO building
- New hangars constructed along south apron at appropriate setback from parallel taxilane and vehicle service road
  - » 142,000 square feet of new hangar space
    - – Includes 5,000 square foot FBO building
- North landside area redesigned to accommodate parallel taxilane and vehicle service road
  - » 35,000 square feet of existing hangar space is removed
  - » 143,000 square feet of new hangar space
  - » 27 small aircraft tiedowns
  - » No helicopter parking
  - » 1 large aircraft pull-through parking positions
  - » ATCT to be relocated pending further study
- Reroutes Keil Road to clear ROFA and TOFA
- ASOS, segmented circle/windsock in the ROFA, and drain fields in the RSA to be relocated pending further study


REFINED ALTERNATIVE 2

Shift Runway East and Extend North to 5,500 feet
PROPERTY OVERVIEW




REFINED ALTERNATIVE 2

Shift Runway East and Extend North to 5,500 feet
LANDSIDE NORTH



REFINED ALTERNATIVE 2

Shift Runway East and Extend North to 5,500 feet
LANDSIDE SOUTH



AURORA STATE AIRPORT

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS SUBMITTED BY THE CITY OF WILSONVILLE ON CHAPTERS 1-4

CHAPTER 1

	Comment/Question	ODAV Response
1	The Oregon Attorney General has indicated in a filing on the LUBA Aurora State Airport case that there is no adopted 2011 or 2012 Aurora State Airport Master Plan. Can an Airport Master Plan reference an un-adopted document? The current draft contains many references to the 2012 Master Plan, clarification on the status of the 2012 master plan is needed in the 2022 master plan.	Please see the FAQ "Can you explain the validity of the 2012 Airport Master Plan (AMP)?" on the project website.
2	How does 2012 baseline aircraft and operations projections compare to actual 2021 data?	2021 baseline operations are 76,028, the 2020 forecasted operations from the 2012 plan were 106,338. The 2021 baseline based aircraft count is 281, the 2020 forecasted based aircraft number was 405.
3	A laypersons explanation of the concept of constrained operations and how that relates to runway length is needed. What is the relationship between the two?	Constrained operations are operations where the pilot must adjust parameters from the typical aircraft configuration (i.e. reduce take off or landing weights in the form of fuel or passengers) to allow them to safely operate in certain conditions such as in hot temperatures. Constrained operations may be used to support a longer runway to allow aircraft to operate in a preferred configuration. This Airport Master Plan is not considering constrained operations in the runway length analysis.
4	AAMP Goal 6 states "identify potential environmental and land use requirements that may impact development". What are some examples of both environmental and land use requirements in this context?	Environmental and land use goals and requirements are discussed in detail in "Regional Setting Goals and Requirements" section on page 4-7 of Chapter 4, "Facility Goals and Requirements".
5	Goal 8 – Will there be a new ALP created as part of this process? If not, why? What ALP will be used? When was it created? Was there an opportunity for public input? If it is a goal of the master plan to develop an ALP, is needs to be done with the master plan update. ore detail on the City's concerns appear on page .	Once a preferred alternative has been selected, a new ALP will be developed depicting the Airport's current configuration and any future improvements identified, which will be submitted for FAA approval. Public input on the ALP content has been ongoing throughout the project through the existing conditions analysis, forecast development, facility goals and requirements, and development alternatives process, all of which feed into the ALP. The ALP will be presented and discussed in future PAC meetings and in Chapter 6, "Airport Layout Plan" in the draft working paper. PAC members and the public are invited to provide input at meetings and on draft deliverables.

6	Goal 9 – What are some examples of recommendations to improve land-use and zoning oversight to “remove barriers to appropriate growth at the airport”? How is “appropriate growth” measured in this context?	Environmental and land use goals and requirements are discussed in detail in “Regional Setting Goals and Requirements” section on page 4-7 of Chapter 4, “Facility Goals and Requirements”.
7	How specifically will potential environmental and socioeconomic impacts be measured, weighed or evaluated in the context of ‘future development’ at the airport?	The evaluation of environmental and socioeconomic impacts are discussed in the “Environmental Screening/NEPA Categories” section under "Socioeconomics, Environmental Justice, and Children’s Environmental Health and Safety Risks” on page 2-25.
8	Is the utilization of federal funds to construct projects (air traffic control tower) identified in an un-adopted master plan legal?	The 2012 AMP was approved by FAA and therefore projects identified on the ALP are eligible for FAA funding. The UAO air traffic control tower (ATCT) was constructed using Connect Oregon funding.

CHAPTER 2

	Comment/Question	ODAV Response
9	The 2019 constrained operations study is based on the 2012 master plan, which has no legal standing and therefore needs to be redone after completion of the 2022 Master Plan.	The 2019 Constrained Operations Runway Justification Study was completed to justify the runway extension proposed at the time. The airport master plan that is currently underway has evaluated the runway length that is justified for the current fleet in the Facility Goals and Requirements. See Working Paper #1, Chapter 2.
10	Should there be a section on accurate airport master plan history, including the most recent court rulings?	See the “Applicable Planning Studies/Documents” section in Chapter 2 of Working Paper #1.
11	Page 2-6 states that there are 2,672 direct, indirect and induced jobs. How many jobs are there specifically at the airport — not the total employment count of employers that may be located at the Airport? The City’s information indicates that a majority of employees that ODAV lists “at the Airport” is actually the total employment count reported by businesses at the Airport, of which many businesses such as Columbia Helicopter, HTC and Wilson Construction have a majority of their employees located off-site, working in remote locations not at the Airport.	Thank you for your comment. The employment data presented in the Working Paper are based on the best information available. ODAV does not have access to employment records for businesses located on the Airport.
12	Page 2-6 states that there are 281 aircraft stored at the airport. Figure 2-2 states that there are 396 ‘based aircraft’. What is the difference here?	281 is the validated based aircraft count approved by FAA as the 2021 base number. As stated in the last paragraph of page 2-6, the data presented in Figure 2-2 and Table 2-4 present FAA Airport Master Record (Form 5010) data: “The most recent FAA Airport Master Record Form (5010) data available is presented for these airports to provide common reporting of activity. It is noted that the FAA 5010 data listed for Aurora State Airport is obsolete, but will be revised to reflect the 2021 baseline data developed in the Airport Master Plan. Current

		based aircraft and aircraft operations data for Aurora State Airport are provided later in this chapter and will be used to develop the aviation activity forecasts (Chapter 3)."
13	Figure 2-2 shows 94,935 annual operations. Baseline is 76,028 operations. Is Figure 2-2 incorrect?	76,028 is the FAA approved operations base number for 2021. As stated in the last paragraph of page 2-6, the data presented in Figure 2-2 and Table 2-4 present FAA Airport Master Record (Form 5010) data: "The most recent FAA Airport Master Record Form (5010) data available is presented for these airports to provide common reporting of activity. It is noted that the FAA 5010 data listed for Aurora State Airport is obsolete, but will be revised to reflect the 2021 baseline data developed in the Airport Master Plan. Current based aircraft and aircraft operations data for Aurora State Airport are provided later in this chapter and will be used to develop the aviation activity forecasts (Chapter 3)."
14	Text on 2-10 states that the based aircraft does not include helicopters. Figure 2-5 (and 3-8) shows 10 helicopters contributing to the 281 based aircraft at the airport. Which is correct?	The text states: "The reduction in the Airport's based aircraft total reflects a more precise verification of aircraft and removal of previously-counted aircraft (helicopters) located at two private heliports adjacent to the Airport." The helicopters counted in the table are located on the airport or access the airport via a through the fence (TTF) agreement. Only helicopters from Columbia Helicopters and HTS were removed from the count.
15	How many gallons of jet fuel is stored on ODAV property?	Atlantic Aviation has a 20,000 gallon tank for Jet A on leased ODAV property. See "Fuel Services" the "Airport Support Services" section in Chapter 2 of Working Paper #1.
16	If the constrained operations study (2019) concluded that a runway extension of 7888' was justified, why was the recommendation only for 6002'?	This is a new airport master plan. Please refer to the 2019 Constrained Operations Runway Justification Study for details about that study.
17	Since the 2019 Constrained Operations Study (COS) was based on the 2012 MP, should it not now be redone to reflect more accurate conditions and process?	The 2019 Constrained Operations Runway Justification Study was completed to justify the runway extension proposed at the time. The airport master plan that is currently underway has evaluated the runway length that is justified for the current fleet in the Facility Goals and Requirements. See Working Paper #1, Chapter 2.
18	What is the level of accuracy expected from the survey conducted in the 2019 COS?	This is a new airport master plan. Please refer to the 2019 Constrained Operations Runway Justification Study for details about that study.
19	What are 'constrained operations' and why do they matter?	Constrained operations are operations where the pilot must adjust parameters from the typical aircraft configuration (i.e., reduce take off or landing weights in the form of fuel or passengers) to allow them to safely operate in certain conditions such as in hot temperatures. Constrained operations may be used to support a longer runway to allow aircraft to operate in a preferred configuration. This Airport Master Plan is not

		considering constrained operations in the runway length analysis.
20	Page 2-21 notes the presence of arsenic in the water. Where is the arsenic coming from and what are the ppm compared to EPA tolerances?	The text we believe you are referencing is on page 2-23. We believe you are referencing a previous version of the working paper. Please reference the current version of the working paper available on the project website. Please review the Environmental Screening Report in Appendix 2. Further environmental review/analysis is outside the scope of this project.
21	Page 2-20 states that Columbia Helicopter is identified by EPA as a RCRA Corrective Action Site. What does that mean exactly? What was found there? Were there any fines? Is the site in compliance now?	The text we believe you are referencing is on page 2-23. We believe you are referencing a previous version of the working paper. Please reference the current version of the working paper available on the project website. Please review the Environmental Screening Report in Appendix 2. Further environmental review/analysis is outside the scope of this project.
22	Pages 2-19 – 2-20 address the issue of resilience in terms of a major earthquake. However, there is no analysis or review of the Oregon Department of Geology and Mineral Industries (DOGAMI) data and the potential impacts to Airport and runway. There is merely a note that the Oregon HazVu Statewide Geohazards Viewer "shows that the southern half of the airfield is classified as a Moderate hazard area and the north half is classified as a High hazard area." The lack of serious data review of the earthquake hazard and potential impacts to Airport is a major shortcoming of the plan.	The Oregon Resilience Plan is summarized on pages 2-19 and 2-20. Existing published data will be considered as it pertains to development various development alternatives. A detailed geotechnical analysis is outside the scope of this project. Geotechnical analysis is commonly required as part of a project design.
23	Page 2-22, does FAR Part 77 overlay airspace extend over any part of the city of Wilsonville? Why is the FAR 77 overlay not included inside the Wilsonville corporate limits on figure 2-8?	Figure 2-9 on page 2-27 depicts zoning districts surrounding the Airport. We believe you are referencing a previous version of the working paper. Please reference the current version of the working paper available on the project website. While the Part 77 surfaces do extend over the City of Wilsonville, our research found that the City of Wilsonville has not adopted airport overlay zoning districts, so they are not depicted on the map. See the note under Figure 2-9.
24	Figure 2-8 does not properly identify city of Wilsonville zoning, it would appear to be a generic categorization. That should be noted, or changed.	Figure 2-9 on page 2-27 depicts zoning districts surrounding the Airport. We believe you are referencing a previous version of the working paper. Please reference the current version of the working paper available on the project website. The zoning data presented in the figure were downloaded from Metro RLIS and are presented without alterations. See source under Figure 2-9.

25	Are there any documented leaks in the underground storage tanks located on ODAV property according to DEQ?	Oregon DEQ lists no active projects for leaking underground storage tanks on Airport property.
26	Page 2-23, where exactly are the two areas of residential property that are located under the primary, approach, or transitional surfaces?	The text we believe you are referencing is at the end of page 2-28. We believe you are referencing a previous version of the working paper. Please reference the current version of the working paper available on the project website. As the text states, “At Aurora State Airport, two areas of residential property are located beneath the west transitional surface”. These areas are visible in Figure 2-9 as yellow areas west of Highway 551.
27	Is pavement condition a consideration in allowing operations that exceeding weight limits? Who approves such requests? Are all requests granted? How many requests are granted versus denied? Please provide numbers.	Pavement condition as well as other factors are considered in evaluating requests for overweight waivers. Requests are approved or denied at the discretion of ODAV. Data on overweight aircraft requests have been requested.
28	Does a runway expansion cause the RPZ to impact other residential homes not currently impacted?	It is possible. Relocating a runway end would also relocate the RPZ. As the RPZ is moved some areas will no longer be within the zone and others will enter the zone.
29	Should the utilities section on page 2-39 address fire and police protection?	The Utilities section is found on page 2-46 in the current version of Working Paper #1. We believe you are referencing a previous version of the working paper. Please reference the current version of the working paper available on the project website. Fire and Police services at the airport are summarized on page 2-43 in the Airport Support Services” section under “Emergency Services”.
30	What are some examples of ‘FAA noncompliance’ as described on page 2-41.	The FAA Compliance Overview is found on page 2-48 of the current working paper. We believe you are referencing a previous version of the working paper. Please reference the current version of the working paper available on the project website. Please see the bulleted list under FAA Compliance Overview on page 2-48.
31	Draft Chapter 3 lists Annual Aircraft Operations only for the years 2016 thru 2021; however, the same chapter uses 2012 thru 2021, for example Aurora State Airport Instrument Flight Operations. The same set of years should be used for all data tables and analysis, 2012 thru 2021.	The Annual Aircraft Operations history from 2016 to 2021 that you referenced are based on counts from the air traffic control tower (ATCT) which has only been in operation since October of 2015. These counts include all traffic at Aurora State Airport. The other set of data ranging from 2012 to 2021 that you referenced are from Traffic Flow Management System Counts (TFMSC) which are available for a longer time period but only include Instrument Flight Rule (IFR) flights with a filed flight plan on record. These are two different and distinct datasets used for two different purposes which are described in detail in Working Paper #1.
32	Page 3-8, if the number of active commercial and private pilots will decline, how will operations increase?	While nation-wide annual growth of licensed commercial and private pilots is projected to decline slightly (-0.1% and -0.4% respectively), the number of

		active GA pilots as a whole (all ratings, excluding student pilots) are projected to grow slightly at a rate of +0.2%. Also, the rates cited in Table 3-2 reflect national averages and may not reflect the exact conditions at individual airports, including Aurora State Airport.
33	Is there a decibel level that should not be exceeded in residential areas near GA airports?	Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 150, Airport Noise Compatibility Planning provides guidance for land-use compatibility around airports. Under these guidelines, all land uses, including residential, are considered compatible with noise exposure levels of 65 dB DNL and lower.
34	What are the considerations taken into account when recommending a runway expansion when there are already conflicts with residential neighborhoods regarding noise? What elements are balanced?	In the case of any project proposing a change in runway geometry, multiple factors are considered. These include: the characteristics of the current and future fleets using the runway; environmental factors (dominant wind direction, airfield elevation, and temperature); site constraints; on- and off-airport land use; and noise impacts.
35	Is there ever consideration given to the off airport impacts associated with the recommendations for airport expansion?	Yes, it is standard practice to consider off-airport impacts in the master planning process including potential noise impacts to neighboring properties; review of incompatible off-airport land uses; and other environmental impacts. Detailed environmental studies are required by FAA for individual development projects, and are beyond the scope of work for airport master plans.
36	How many of the total aircraft operations are touch and go landings?	The Aurora ATCT estimates that 40-45% of the total operations are related to flight training. Nearly all of the local flight training operations are runway related movements including touch-and-go or stop-and-go landings. Please see the “Flight Training” section on page 3-9.
37	How many of the based aircraft are seasonal (located at airport more than half the calendar year)? How is seasonality measured and through what process? Are there multiple surveys in a year?	For an aircraft to count toward an airport’s based aircraft count, it must reside at that airport for at least half a year. Aircraft that reside at the airport for less than half a year are not counted toward the airport’s based aircraft total. Generally, FAA requests that airports evaluate and update their based fleets at least once a year. This updated information was reflected in the 2021 “validated count” of based aircraft used as the baseline for the master plan’s FAA-approved aviation activity forecasts.
38	Pages 3-10 et seq indicate that ODAV does not plan to use actual flight operations at the Airport and instead to substitute other methodologies to determine an operations forecast. It seems suspicious that real, actual operations data is not being used, and instead other, older data is being used to determine operations forecast. Rather than use the 10 years of actual Airport operations data collected by the ATCT, ODAV uses only data from 2016 -2021; however, Airport operations data is available up until 2023, as the FAA has provided to	A model based on historic operations counts from the Aurora ATCT was developed and evaluated, but discarded based on the short time period in which data were available and from which to develop meaningful trends. Furthermore, the annual growth rate that the Aurora Historic Counts Trend yielded (3.6%) was not considered sustainable as it is over three times higher than nearly every other model evaluated. Please see the “Historical Operations Data Challenges” section on page 3-14 in Working Paper #1 and Appendix 8 – Discarded Forecast models.

	the City. No adequate justification is provided for not using real, actual Airport operations data.	
	ODAV indicates that it is using the combined average annual population growth of Clackamas and Marion Counties to determine Airport operations. This appears ridiculous, as there is No correlation or relationship between Airport operations and general population growth of counties, especially for an airport that does not offer commercial aviation services.	As noted in Working Paper 1, several aircraft operations models were considered through multiple rounds of review with the FAA Seattle Airports District Office (ADO) and FAA Headquarters over several months. Through their extensive review process, the combined county model was identified by FAA as the model that most closely resembles nationwide trends by airports of similar operational characteristics as those of Aurora State Airport. At the conclusion of the review, FAA found that the forecasts were reasonable and developed using acceptable forecasting methods, which led to their approval of the forecasts.
	ODAV also appears to have miscalculated the combined average annual population growth of Clackamas and Marion Counties: ODAV indicates a growth rate of 0.9%; however the PSU data actually shows a growth rate of 0.7%. At the very minimum the growth rate should be changed to match the actual populations projections.	The FAA-approved aircraft operations forecast (Combined County Population Growth Model) was derived from current population forecasts for Clackamas and Marion Counties from Portland State University – Population Research Center (PSU-PRC). For consistency between the two counties (with different base years), the 2021 value for each was interpolated from the reported 2020 and projected 2025 values. The PSU-PRC forecasts are presented in 5-year intervals. The 2041 values were interpolated between 2040 and 2045 projections. Based on these data, the Compound Annual Growth Rates (CAGR) for the period were 0.74% for Marion County and 0.96% for Clackamas County. The CAGR of the combined county populations (Clackamas Population + Marion Population) for the same period is 0.86%. In the working paper, that rate was presented as 0.9% (rounded to nearest 0.1%) to match table formatting. However, all calculations were based on the growth rate 0.86%. The PSU-PRC growth rates vary over the forecast period. As it is unlikely that aircraft operations will track population growth year over year, the approved forecast assumes a linear 20-year growth rate from 2021 to 2041. It should also be noted that local and regional population forecasts are updated more frequently than airport master plan forecasts and are regularly adjusted up and down to account for a variety of conditions.

QUESTIONS FROM JANUARY 2023 PAC MEETING

	Comment/Question	ODAV Response
39	From the FAA approval of the Airport Forecast: “This forecast was prepared at the same time as the evolving impacts of the COVID-19 public health emergency. Forecast approval is based on the methodology, data, and conclusions at the time the document was prepared. However, consideration of	As is noted in the next paragraph of the Forecast Approval Letter: “…Justification for future projects will be made based on activity levels at the time the project is requested for development. Documentation of actual activity levels meeting planning activity levels will be necessary to justify AIP funding for eligible projects.”

	the impacts of the COVID-19 public health emergency on aviation activity is warranted to acknowledge the reduced confidence in growth projections using currently-available data." What is the solution to the above issue?	This means that prior to initiating a future project identified in the Airport Master Plan, activity levels at that time will be evaluated to ensure that the planned project meets the activity criteria required to justify the project.
40	"Accordingly, FAA approval of this forecast does not constitute justification for future projects. Justification for future projects will be made based on activity levels at the time the project is requested for development. Documentation of actual activity levels meeting planning activity levels will be necessary to justify AIP funding for eligible projects." What kind of documentation is being referenced?	Updated activity data that will be evaluated to justify future projects at the time of programming include, but are not limited to, based aircraft counts, aircraft operation counts, fleet mix, and environmental data.

ODAV PAC MEETING #5; APRIL 30, 2024 - QUESTIONS ON DRAFT MASTER PLAN CHAPTER 4

	Comment/Question	ODAV Response
41	The existing Runway Design Code (RDC) defines the standards used for runway construction. Page 4-3 notes that "the approach visibility component may change within AAC/ADG C-II". Can you please explain exactly what that comment means?	As noted in the chapter, approach visibility minimums are determined independently from the RDC, based on visual or instrument approach capabilities. Changes to the current approach visibility minimums (defined by FAA instrument approaches or through a separate FAA-issued "Notice to Air Missions" (NOTAM)), could be accomplished for a variety of reasons. This section notes that RPZ dimensions are determined by the approach visibility minimums for each runway end, therefore a change in minimums could change RPZ dimensions for AAC/ADG C-II.
42	Page 4-9 notes that comments regarding environmental concerns raised by PAC members will be included in Appendix 9 in the master plan, for future consideration by FAA during the completion of any environmental assessment required by NEPA. When will that documentation will be available on the project web site?	A summary of comments and responses, including for environmental concerns, will be posted on the project website to document review of each draft work chapter or full working paper. Comments and responses provided during the review of Working Paper 1, are currently provided on the project website. Comments provided after individual comment periods conclude are reviewed with responses posted on the project website when available. During the ongoing development of master plan chapters, responding to current chapter review is the highest priority and responses to previous chapters will be documented in preparation of the draft master plan document. At draft final all meeting

		summaries, PAC and public comments, and responses will be summarized in Appendix 9.
43	Page 4-9 notes that the City of Wilsonville and other jurisdictions will need to update their comprehensive plans to "remain compliant with state land use laws". City recently updated the Comprehensive Plan to address airport issues. ODAV was notified of these proceedings. What is exactly involved in the city's future Comprehensive Plan update? What exactly will be required of the City?	This section is intended to summarize Oregon land use regulations that apply to local governments. ORS 836.610 Local government land use plans and regulations to accommodate airport zones and uses.
44	Page 4-9 notes that the city should "develop overlay zone ordinance for airspace protection". What exactly does that mean for existing land uses? How does this overlay zone work? What is being effected? Please provide specific information regarding this comment.	This section is intended to summarize Oregon land use regulations that apply to local governments. ORS 836.610 Local government land use plans and regulations to accommodate airport zones and uses. Additional technical information may be found in the Oregon Department of Aviation Airport Land Use Compatibility Handbook.
45	Page 4-10 notes that noise evaluations will be conducted in the Airport MP. When will those be created? Which Chapter addresses noise impacts?	Noise contours will be developed for the 65 DNL noise contour identified for the current conditions as well as the twenty-year contour. Noise contour modeling will use the forecasts and fleet mix identified in the forecast chapter for each run to analyze impacts of airport modifications as it relates to noise. Noise contours will be prepared following the selection of a preferred alternative.
46	Page 4-16 notes a runway length of 5,500 lineal feet. Which direction, N or S will the additional runway be extended, if approved?	Future decisions about runway configuration will be made by ODAV at the conclusion of the airside alternatives evaluation.

ORIGINAL LETTER

WILSONVILLE
OREGON

May 14, 2024

Sent via email to:

Kenji Sugahara, Aviation Director — *Kenji.Sugahara@odav.oregon.gov*
Alex Thomas, Planning and Programs Manager — *Alex.R.Thomas@odav.oregon.gov*
Oregon Department of Aviation

Timothy House, Lead Airport Planner — *timothy.a.house@faa.gov*
Federal Aviation Administration Seattle Airports District Office
FAA Northwest Mountain Region Airports Division

RE: Comments on Draft 2022/23/24 Aurora State Airport Master Plan Chapters 1-4

Dear Director Sugahara, Mr. Thomas and Mr. House:

The City of Wilsonville is a jurisdiction impacted by the operations of the Aurora State Airport and adjacent through-the-fence private properties that are conducted under the auspices of the Oregon Department of Aviation (ODAV) and the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA). The City of Wilsonville has been an active participant for over 20 years in relation to the Aurora State Airport, including serving on the Planning Advisory Committees (PAC) of the Aurora State Airport Master Plan process in 2011/12 and the current 2022/23/24 Master Plan PAC. During this time the City has sought to collaborate with local governments and state and federal agencies to comply with Oregon public-process and land-use laws and to engage in coordinated planning efforts.

The following comments review general, structural problems and specific issues of concern with the current 2022/23/24 Draft Aurora State Airport Master Plan Chapters 1 through 4 and the master planning process. The City's comments are split between a set of basic questions/issues of concern that pertaining to Chapters 1-4 and recent PAC meetings; and a specific issues of concern.

Chapter 1 questions/comments

1. The Oregon Attorney General has indicated in a filing on the LUBA Aurora State Airport case that there is no adopted 2011 or 2012 Aurora State Airport Master Plan. Can an Airport Master Plan reference an un-adopted document? The current draft contains many references to the 2012 Master Plan, clarification on the status of the 2012 master plan is needed in the 2022 master plan.
2. How does 2012 baseline aircraft and operations projections compare to actual 2021 data?

CITY OF WILSONVILLE • ADMINISTRATION DEPARTMENT
Phone 503-682-1011
Fax 503-682-1015
29799 SW Town Center Loop East
Wilsonville, OR 97070
www.ci.wilsonville.or.us
info@ci.wilsonville.or.us

3. A laypersons explanation of the concept of constrained operations and how that relates to runway length is needed. What is the relationship between the two?

4. AAMP Goal 6 states "identify potential environmental and land use requirements that may impact development". What are some examples of both environmental and land use requirements in this context?

5. Goal 8 – Will there be a new ALP created as part of this process? If not, why? What ALP will be used? When was it created? Was there an opportunity for public input? If it is a goal of the master plan to develop an ALP, is needs to be done with the master plan update. ore detail on the City's concerns appear on page ___.

6. Goal 9 – What are some examples of recommendations to improve land-use and zoning oversight to "remove barriers to appropriate growth at the airport"? How is "appropriate growth" measured in this context?

7. How specifically will potential environmental and socioeconomic impacts be measured, weighed or evaluated in the context of 'future development' at the airport?

8. Is the utilization of federal funds to construct projects (air traffic control tower) identified in an un-adopted master plan legal?

Chapter 2 questions/comments

9. The 2019 constrained operations study is based on the 2012 master plan, which has no legal standing and therefore needs to be redone after completion of the 2022 Master Plan.

10. Should there be a section on accurate airport master plan history, including the most recent court rulings?

11. Page 2-6 states that there are 2,672 direct, indirect and induced jobs. How many jobs are there specifically at the airport — not the total employment count of employers that may be located at the Airport? The City's information indicates that a majority of employees that ODAV lists "at the Airport" is actually the total employment count reported by businesses at the Airport, of which many businesses such as Columbia Helicopter, HTC and Wilson Construction have a majority of their employees located off-site, working in remote locations not at the Airport.

12. Page 2-6 states that there are 281 aircraft stored at the airport. Figure 2-2 states that there are 396 'based aircraft'. What is the difference here?

13. Figure 2-2 shows 94,935 annual operations. Baseline is 76,028 operations. Is Figure 2-2 incorrect?

14. Text on 2-10 states that the based aircraft does not include helicopters. Figure 2-5 (and 3-8) shows 10 helicopters contributing to the 281 based aircraft at the airport. Which is correct?

15. How many gallons of jet fuel is stored on ODAV property?

16. If the constrained operations study (2019) concluded that a runway extension of 7888' was justified, why was the recommendation only for 6002'?

17. Since the 2019 Constrained Operations Study (COS) was based on the 2012 MP, should it not now be redone to reflect more accurate conditions and process?

18. What is the level of accuracy expected from the survey conducted in the 2019 COS?

19. What are 'constrained operations' and why do they matter?

20. Page 2-21 notes the presence of arsenic in the water. Where is the arsenic coming from and what are the ppm compared to EPA tolerances?

21. Page 2-20 states that Columbia Helicopter is identified by EPA as a RCRA Corrective Action Site. What does that mean exactly? What was found there? Were there any fines? Is the site in compliance now?

22. Pages 2-19 – 2-20 address the issue of resilience in terms of a major earthquake. However, there is no analysis or review of the Oregon Department of Geology and Mineral Industries (DOGAMI) data and the potential impacts to Airport and runway. There is merely a note that the Oregon HazVu Statewide Geohazards Viewer "shows that the southern half of the airfield is classified as a Moderate hazard area and the north half is classified as a High hazard area." The lack of serious data review of the earthquake hazard and potential impacts to Airport is a major shortcoming of the plan.

23. Page 2-22, does FAR Part 77 overlay airspace extend over any part of the city of Wilsonville? Why is the FAR 77 overlay not included inside the Wilsonville corporate limits on figure 2-8?

24. Figure 2-8 does not properly identify city of Wilsonville zoning, it would appear to be a generic categorization. That should be noted, or changed.

25. Are there any documented leaks in the underground storage tanks located on ODAV property according to DEQ?

26. Page 2-23, where exactly are the two areas of residential property that are located under the primary, approach, or transitional surfaces?

27. Is pavement condition a consideration in allowing operations that exceeding weight limits? Who approves such requests? Are all requests granted? How many requests are granted versus denied? Please provide numbers.

28. Does a runway expansion cause the RPZ to impact other residential homes not currently impacted?

29. Should the utilities section on page 2-39 address fire and police protection?

30. What are some examples of 'FAA noncompliance' as described on page 2-41.

Chapter 3 questions/comments

31. Draft Chapter 3 lists Annual Aircraft Operations only for the years 2016 thru 2021; however, the same chapter uses 2012 thru 2021, for example Aurora State Airport Instrument Flight Operations. The same set of years should be used for all data tables and analysis, 2012 thru 2021.

32. Page 3-8, if the number of active commercial and private pilots will decline, how will operations increase?

33. Is there a decibel level that should not be exceeded in residential areas near GA airports?

34. What are the considerations taken into account when recommending a runway expansion when there are already conflicts with residential neighborhoods regarding noise? What elements are balanced?

35. Is there ever consideration given to the off airport impacts associated with the recommendations for airport expansion?

36. How many of the total aircraft operations are touch and go landings?

37. How many of the based aircraft are seasonal (located at airport more than half the calendar year)? How is seasonality measured and through what process? Are there multiple surveys in a year?

38. Pages 3-10 *et seq* indicate that ODAV does not plan to use actual flight operations at the Airport and instead to substitute other methodologies to determine an operations forecast. It seems suspicious that real, actual operations data is not being used, and instead other, older data is being used to determine operations forecast. Rather than use the 10 years of actual Airport operations data collected by the ATCT, ODAV uses only data from 2016 -2021; however, Airport operations data is available up until 2023, as the FAA has provided to the City. No adequate justification is provided for not using real, actual Airport operations data.

    ODAV indicates that it is using the combined average annual population growth of Clackamas and Marion Counties to determine Airport operations. This appears ridiculous, as there is No correlation or relationship between Airport operations and general population growth of counties, especially for an airport that does not offer commercial aviation services.

    ODAV also appears to have miscalculated the combined average annual population growth of Clackamas and Marion Counties: ODAV indicates a growth rate of 0.9%; however the PSU data actually shows a growth rate of 0.7%. At the very minimum the growth rate should be changed to match the actual populations projections.

Questions from the January 2023 PAC meeting

39. From the FAA approval of the Airport Forecast:

"This forecast was prepared at the same time as the evolving impacts of the COVID-19 public health emergency. Forecast approval is based on the methodology, data, and conclusions at the time the document was prepared. **However, consideration of the impacts of the COVID-19 public health emergency on aviation activity is warranted to acknowledge the reduced confidence in growth projections using currently-available data**."

What is the solution to the above issue?

40. "Accordingly, FAA approval of this forecast does not constitute justification for future projects. Justification for future projects will be made based on activity levels at the time the project is requested for development. **Documentation of actual activity levels meeting planning activity levels will be necessary to justify AIP funding for eligible projects**."

What kind of documentation is being referenced?

ODAV PAC Meeting #5; April 30, 2024 - Questions on DRAFT Master Plan Chapter 4:

41. The existing Runway Design Code (RDC) defines the standards used for runway construction. Page 4-3 notes that "the approach visibility component may change within AAC/ADG C-II".

Can you please explain exactly what that comment means?

42. Page 4-9 notes that comments regarding environmental concerns raised by PAC members will be included in Appendix 9 in the master plan, for future consideration by FAA during the completion of any environmental assessment required by NEPA.

When will that documentation will be available on the project web site?

43. Page 4-9 notes that the City of Wilsonville and other jurisdictions will need to update their comprehensive plans to "remain compliant with state land use laws".

City recently updated the Comprehensive Plan to address airport issues. ODAV was notified of these proceedings. What is exactly involved in the city's future Comprehensive Plan update? What exactly will be required of the City?

44. Page 4-9 notes that the city should "develop overlay zone ordinance for airspace protection".

What exactly does that mean for existing land uses? How does this overlay zone work? What is being effected? Please provide specific information regarding this comment.

45. Page 4-10 notes that noise evaluations will be conducted in the Airport MP. When will those be created? Which Chapter addresses noise impacts?

46. Page 4-16 notes a runway length of 5,500 lineal feet. Which direction, N or S will the additional runway be extended, if approved?

Specific issue of concern: Failure to Provide Public Notice of Public Comment Opportunity on Draft Master Plan Chapters 1-4

The City alerted ODAV in 2022 regarding the agency's failure to publish any kind of public notice of the public comment opportunity on Draft Master Plan Chapters 2 through 3 that had a due date of April 12, 2022. The same situation has now occurred again: ODAV failed to publish a public notice for Chapters 3 and 4, in which public comment dates were announced verbally during PAC meetings on March 12 and April 30, 2024, with due dates for public comment respectively "a week after the meeting" and May 14, 2024. City staff alerted ODAV staff on May 3 of the on-going failure to publish public-comment deadlines that help to encourage public participation.

Rather, notice of the opportunity to comment and the deadline for public comments was only provided verbally by ODAV and consultant during the April 5 PAC Work Session meetings. Only after the City contacted ODAV to complain about the lack of public notice did ODAV arrange for public notice of a sort to be buried on the website in text regarding meetings that have been held. Rhetorically speaking, how are members of the public to be aware that there is a public comment opportunity if no public written notice is published or advertised in advance of the comment deadline?

The City of Wilsonville appreciates consideration of our comments and looks forward to ODAV and FAA responses to the issues of concern and questions raised regarding the 2022/23/24 Draft Master Plan Chapters 1-4. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Chris Neamtzu
Community Development Director
City of Wilsonville

Mark Ottenad
Public/Government Affairs Director

cc: Members of the Oregon Congressional Delegation:
Senator Wyden, Senator Merkley, Congresswoman Salinas

Office of Governor Kate Brown

Members of the Oregon Legislature: Senate President Wagner, House Speaker Fahey, Senator Woods, Representative Neron

FAA Northwest Mountain Region administrators: Grady Stone and Aleta Best

PAC Meeting #7 – October 15, 2024

NOTICE OF A MEETING
FOR THE AURORA STATE AIRPORT
Airport Master Plan Project

Notice is hereby given that the Oregon Department of Aviation (ODAV) will hold an online (via Zoom) Public Planning Advisory Committee (PAC) #7 Meeting. This meeting was previously scheduled to occur in September, but has been rescheduled as follows:

When: Tuesday, October 15, 2024
PAC Meeting from 5:00 p.m. - 8:00 p.m.

Where: Zoom or Join by Phone
Please join the virtual **PAC meeting** by visiting:
https://us02web.zoom.us/j/84488377615

This meeting will allow the PAC to further discuss the alternatives for the Aurora State Airport Master Plan. For copies of the airport planning work products, please visit the "meetings" page at: https://publicproject.net/AuroraAirport

Accessible Meeting Information
Special accommodations are available upon advanced request. Please contact Alex Thomas at least 48 hours prior to the event to discuss specific needs.

For airport questions or project information, please contact Alex Thomas, ODAV Planning & Programs Manager, through the following means: Alex.R.Thomas@odav.oregon.gov

AURORA STATE AIRPORT

AIRPORT MASTER PLAN

PAC MEETING #7 AGENDA

Date/Time: October 15, 2024, from 5:00-8:00 pm

Location: Zoom Webinar: https://us02web.zoom.us/j/84488377615

Meeting Goals: Continue discussions about the Aurora Airport Master Plan Alternatives.

Time	Topic	Person
5:00-5:15 pm	**Introductions**	Brandy Steffen
5:10-5:20 pm	**Review feedback form results**	David Miller
5:20-5:30 pm	**PAC clarifying questions**	Brandy Steffen
5:30-5:40 pm	**Review refined alternatives**	David Miller
5:40-5:50 pm	**PAC clarifying questions**	Brandy Steffen
5:50-6:10 pm	**Review preferred alternative for Master Plan**	David Miller
6:10-7:40 pm	**PAC questions and comments**	Brandy Steffen
7:40-7:55 pm	**Public Comments** • Comments may be emailed before the meeting through the website: https://publicproject.net/AuroraAirport# • Commenters may have up to 2 minute to speak. We ask that only one representative from each organization speaks. We may not be able to hear from everyone. • *Reminder:* public comments typed into Zoom may not be answered during the meeting, but answers will be included in the written meeting summary.	Brandy Steffen
7:55-8:00 pm	**Next Steps**	Brandy Steffen

A meeting summary with all PAC and public comments will be posted to the project website.

We always will take comments via the website, which will be included in the meeting notes and shared with the PAC members: https://publicproject.net/AuroraAirport#

AURORA STATE AIRPORT

PLANNING ADVISORY COMMITTEE (PAC)
MEETING #7 SUMMARY

Date: Tuesday, October 15, 2024
Time: 5:00-8:00 pm
Location: Zoom Webinar

In Attendance

PAC Members Present

Ben Williams, *Friends of French Prairie*
Bill Graupp, *Aurora CTE, Inc*
Bruce Bennett, *Positive Aurora Airport Management*
Brian Asher, *City of Aurora*
Cathryn Stephens, *ODAV Board*
Councilor Joann Linville, *City of Wilsonville*
David Waggoner, *Willamette Aviation*
Dave Mauk, *Charbonneau Country Club*
Dave Tibbetts, *Columbia Helicopters*
Jamie Stickel, *City of Canby*
Ken Ivey, *Aurora Butteville Barlow Community*
Naomi Zwerdling, *Oregon Dept of Transportation*
Melissa Ahrens*, alternate, Oregon Dept of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD)*
Micheal Weimer, *Life Flight Network*
Pam Barlow Lind, *Confederated Tribes of the Siletz Indians*
Patrick Donaldson, *Wilsonville Chamber of Commerce*
Ted Millar, *AABC/TLM Holdings*
Tony Helbling, *Aurora Airport Improvement Association*
Whitney Stewart, *Oregon Office of Emergency Management*

PAC Members Absent

Aron Faegre, *alternate*, *AABC/TLM Holdings*
Austin Barnes, *Marion County Planning Dept.*
Beth Wytoski, *Regional Solutions*
Bob Buchanan, Alternate, *Columbia Helicopters*
Brandon Reich, Alternate, *Marion County Planning Dept. Planning Organization*
Cheryl Pouley, *Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde Community of Oregon*
Commissioner Danielle Bethel, *Marion County*
Commissioner Tootie Smith, *Clackamas County*
Don Hardy, *alternate,* City of Canby
Greg Hughes, *alternate*, *Vans Aircraft*
Jon Bickford, Atlantic *Aviation*
Matt Crall, *Oregon Dept of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD)*
Matt Lawyer, *alternate, Marion County*
Matt Williams, *Deer Creek Estates HOA*
Raul Suarez, *Aurora Air Traffic Control*
Rian Johnson, *Vans Aircraft*
Matt Nash, *alternate*, *Columbia Helicopters*
Robert Fournier, *Helicopter Transport Service*
Roger Kaye, *1000 Friends of Oregon*
Wayne Richards, *alternate*, *Friends of the French Prairie*

Agency Representatives Present
Kenji Sugahara, *ODAV*
Alex Thomas, *ODAV*
Tony Beach, *ODAV*
Brandon Pike, *ODAV*
Tim House, *FAA*
Stacy Posegate, DOJ

Staff and Consultants
Matt Rogers, *Century West*
David Miller, *Century West*
Samantha Peterson, *Century West*
Mark Steele, *Century West*
James Kirby*, Century West*
Brandy Steffen*, JLA Public Involvement*
Jen Winslow*, JLA Public Involvement*
Ashley Balsom*, JLA Public Involvement*

Audience / Members of the Public
Bill Poehler
Brad Schuster
Bruce Bergman
Chris Neamtzu

Audience / Members of the Public (cont.)
Doris Wehler
Elizabeth Peters
George Buley
George Van Hoomissen
Glenn Lancaster
Greg Leo
Jason Paolo
Jennifer Redding
Jim Knight
Joseph Schaefer
Julie Fitzgerald
Krista Kroiss
Lukas Nickerson
Mark Ottenad
Neal White
Rya Butterfield
Tom Herzog
Wendie Kellington

Overview

Planning Advisory Committee (PAC) members continued discussions about the Aurora Airport Master Plan alternatives. The Master Plan team presented the Preferred Alternative. *The presentation, FAQs, meeting recording and other materials are posted on the website (publicproject.net/AuroraAirport). Comments collected during the meeting have been added to this meeting summary.*

Welcome and Introductions

Brandy Steffen, JLA Public Involvement, welcomed everyone to the meeting, reviewed the agenda and Zoom meeting tips and etiquette. She reminded the members of their roles and responsibilities. The meeting was extended by an hour to ensure time to discuss and ask questions about the alternatives.

Presentation

David Miller, Century West, reviewed the preliminary alternatives, the process to develop them, and refinements.

The alternatives process for the master plan involved evaluating options for airport facility improvements in consultation with the FAA and ODAV. A wide range of options was considered, focusing on meeting FAA standards for runway design and identifying facilities that met or did not meet those standards. The team narrowed down the options, presenting seven preliminary airside and three landside alternatives, eventually reducing them to three refined options: 1A, 1B, and 2.

- Option 1A involves shifting the Hubbard Highway west and extending the runway north, with property acquisition impacts.
- Option 1B proposes a larger shift west, minimizing impacts on existing airport structures.
- Option 2 shifts the runway east to avoid changes to the highway but requires relocating the air traffic control tower. Each option will ensure compliance with FAA safety standards and includes adjustments for a runway extension and infrastructure improvements.

Throughout the process, input from the PAC and public influenced ODAV's decision-making. Cost estimates were prepared to compare the options, with significant contingencies factored in for uncertainties.

PAC Feedback for the Preferred Alternative

David reviewed the feedback that was received from the PAC and how it influenced the selection of the Preferred Alternative. He noted that about half of the respondents use the airport, with an even split in preference among alternatives 1A, 1B, and 2. Regarding runway adjustments to meet C-II standards, more than half of the respondents suggested no shift, which is a feature of alternative 1A.

On land use, there was a split opinion on whether ODAV should acquire more land if the airport runs out of developable space, with more respondents favoring acquisition. David emphasized the need for open discussion about the concerns.

Key issues included:

- The FAA's evolving position on modifying standards, which now requires a path to compliance.
- Clarification that no modification of standards was issued with the 2012 airport layout plan.
- The recommendation to remove non-compliant drain fields, with relocation responsibilities falling on the owners.
- Questions about vehicle service road design, which aims for clearer sightlines and safer interactions between vehicles and aircraft.
- Discussion on long-term aeronautic reserves and the possibility of acquiring properties from willing sellers.
- Consideration of a major realignment of Highway 551 onto Boones Ferry Road was deemed impractical due to its significant impact on adjacent properties.

Preferred Alternative

David then reviewed the Preferred Alternative for the Master Plan and discussed how ODAV selected Refined Alternative 1A, following feedback from the PAC, public input, and FAA coordination. While Refined Alternative 1A has some challenges, it is considered the most realistic option for the airport's future development. Key features of 1A include keeping the existing runway in place, reducing impact on west-side property owners compared to other alternatives, and avoiding the need to relocate the air traffic control tower.

The plan involves a phased approach to meet FAA standards, starting with projects that ensure the runway object-free area (ROFA) and safety area conform to standards. The phasing allows for gradual progress over many years, potentially even decades, and allows work on different parts of the project as funding and needs arise. Some elements, like the runway extension, are longer-term goals, while more immediate efforts focus on safety improvements.

PAC Questions and Comments

Brandy began the discussion for PAC questions. *Comments and responses are provided in the table below.*

Public Comment

Brandy opened the public comment section of the meeting. There were three (3) public comments, and each person was given two minutes to speak. *Written comments and responses are provided in the table below.*

Next Steps

The next virtual PAC meeting #8 will be held on December 10 from 5:00-8:00 p.m., to present the final plan before being shared with the Aviation Board, ODAV, and FAA, who are the final decision makers.

The PAC and public are welcome to submit final comments on the Preferred Alternative through October 29, 2024, to be included in the meeting summary.

Brandy and Tony thanked the PAC and public attendees for their time and input, then ended the meeting.

PAC Member Questions/Comments and Responses[1]

ID	Name	Affiliation	Question/Comment	Response
7.1	**Councilor Dr. Joanne Linville**	*City of Wilsonville*	Is ODOT responsible for any of the costs of the alternatives? Has the cost of moving the highway been included in the total cost estimates? Is Alternative 2's replacement runway included in the cost?	We have not allocated shares of the project at this point, and this is the total cost of the project at a planning level. Each project will be individually identified, with the majority of airfield-related and likely many highway-related costs being eligible for FAA funding. The specific percentages will depend on the authorization bills in effect at the time of the project. ODAV, as the sponsor, would need to provide a local match. Cost-sharing discussions between all involved parties, including ODOT, will be addressed through the implementation program. The cost estimates provided are all-inclusive and not separated into FAA or ODOT-specific expenses. Yes, it is included in Alternative 2. Alternative 1B and 2 require a new (replacement) runway that is shifted a small amount laterally. For the runway shift options, an entirely new runway and parallel taxiway is required.
7.2	**Tony Helbling**	*Aurora Airport Improvement Association*	As a PAC member, I was floored by seeing the alternatives and the limited amount we were given to respond. These alternatives were first shown during a meeting, without prior notice, and then members were given minimal time to respond. We only got a week long extension when we asked. The potential taking of private property at an evaluated market cost has major impacts and would undervalue the property and fail to	**David Miller, CWE:** The FAA's guidance throughout the process was that the master plan should outline a path toward meeting design standards. Tim House, FAA indicated that the FAA would not consider modifications to standards for a runway extension in an email in March. I am not going to comment on whether that is a legal response and will allow Tim to clarify if he would like to. **Tim House, FAA**: I am not an attorney, and there is not a legal department at

[1] Live responses are included, along with additional information/clarification, as needed.

			account for relocation costs. The basis of these alternatives is that the FAA would not allow modifications to standards or fund improvements at airports not in compliance with FAA design standards. Who at the FAA is making these claims? It is so damaging. These proposed changes are highly disruptive to private property owners and seem unlikely to be implemented. Is your response a legal response, that the FAA is saying that there will be no modifications to standard? I asked if there is a basis for the FAA's guidance that modifications to standards won't be allowed, which has led the state of Oregon to create a plan that could potentially harm private property. I believe there needs to be some factual basis behind this direction from the FAA. FAA directives allow for modifications to standards if a risk analysis is conducted and applied for, suggesting this should be considered instead of current actions. There's an Oregon state statute that requires the Oregon Department of Aviation (ODAV) to protect private property investments, but ODAV is failing to do so and is instead allowing the potential destruction of that property. This proposal is destroying investment.	the FAA. A legal opinion usually comes down through a court ruling. They (CWE) are following advisory circulars and FAA orders to prepare the master plan. **Tony Beach, ODAV:** The pilot through-the-fence program is distinct from federal requirements for FAA master plans at federally obligated airports. The department is following federal requirements and adhering to the standards and advisory circulars related to master plans, as mentioned by Tim. *It was also noted that the FAA now evaluates modification of standards (MOS) proposals during the project development stage, not as part of the airport master planning process. As such, a path to conformance for the applicable design standards must be defined on the master plan's ALP drawing. Any future project-specific MOS approved by FAA on an interim basis would be noted through a "pen-and-ink" change to the ALP, with an expiration date and a planned path to conformance clearly noted. This process is not consistent with the suggestion that FAA could issue a MOS as part of the ALP approval process associated with this airport master plan.*

			FAA guidance requires master plan proposals and alternatives to be realistic and achievable, and the alternatives are not. These unrealistic proposals create a situation where both the state and the FAA lack the necessary funding, and limits the airport's options.	
7.3	**Ben Williams**	*Friends of French Prairie*	To Tim's last comment, who is THEY are following advisory circulars? Tim House is the person who communicated that reversion to B-II alternatives would not be accepted. So, no one above Tim House in the FAA Regional Office or Washington office is making these decisions? They are being made locally at the Regional level by House in consultation with ODAV and Century West??????	"They" in reference to Tim House's comment are ODAV and their consultant Century West. *Tim House (FAA) explained the internal process used by FAA to evaluate master plan alternatives and the application of design standards, consistent with the critical/design aircraft reflected in the FAA approved master plan forecasts.*
7.4	**Bill Graupp**	*Aurora CTE, Inc*	Are these 2025 cost estimates or is there some CPI index cost based on a 10-year outlook?	The cost estimates were prepared based on 2024 dollars. The calculations were prepared during the refinement of the alternatives (1A. 1B, and 2) within the last 30 to 45 days. When compiling the capital improvement program, a Consumer Price Index (CPI) is used to tie costs to the base year. As the implementation progresses in future years, the actual project year CPI will be applied to adjust the costs accordingly and will need to be readjusted again at the design phase.
7.5	**Dave Mauk**	*Charbonneau Country Club*	What's the average cost for Oregon State airports for their most recent plans? And what is highest cost of an ODAV project & FAA project in Oregon or Washington?	The costs of projects at other airports would be information not related to this master plan project and requests may be made directly to ODAV. As such researching costs of those projects is outside the scope. Requests for FAA

				Capital Improvement Projects completed in Oregon and Washington may be made to FAA SEA ADO.
7.6	**Councilor Dr. Joanne Linville**	*City of Wilsonville*	Have the cost estimates been presented to the ODAV Board and if so, what has been their concerns?	These numbers in the presentation are primarily for the benefit of the PAC and the cost estimates have not yet been formally presented to the board. The cost estimates were developed in coordination with ODAV and we expect additional comments from PAC members and the public.
7.7	**Dave Tibbetts**	*Columbia Helicopters*	I have concerns about the runway protection zone (RPZ) that intersects with my company's property. Does this mean that we will need to vacate our location. The RPZ runs directly through our main building, and I'm shocked by this given that Columbia Helicopters has been at the airport for 50 years and employs many people. Why isn't the RPZ located at the southern end of the airport where there are no buildings?	An RPZ is an FAA-defined area typically located at the ends of runways to ensure safety and reduce incompatible land uses. While the FAA prefers that airports control RPZs through ownership, easements are also commonly used to ensure land use compatibility. Shifting the Runway north will shift the RPZ and will also shift the Runway 17 approach surface. The cost estimates for alternatives do not include property acquisition within the RPZ, as there are other solutions to address FAA concerns. The width of the RPZ is influenced by runway visibility minimums, which may require further consideration. Reducing the approach visibility minimums for UAO instrument procedures to 1-mile (currently NOTAM'd to 7/8-mile) would reduce the RPZ dimensions. It is noted that the existing and future Part 77 34:1 approach surface for Runway 17 (based the current 7/8-mile approach visibility minimums) does not extend over the buildings at the north end of your parcel.

7.8	**Ben Williams**	*Friends of French Prairie*	In reference to the comment in the chat (above) – Tim House later mentioned following FAA advisory circulars but seemed to imply that the decisions were made locally, in conjunction with ODAV and Century West, rather than being guided by the FAA. We need to know who is making these decisions, especially given the significant financial implications and potential impacts on the regional aviation system. So I want to be clear, given the scope and scale of these three alternatives, financial and otherwise. As the last PAC meeting ended, the aviation board members that were on the call were in shock about the scope and the potential impact on the regional aviation system. I think we've all seen Tim's email, which was delivered before the open house at North Marion… The result of which was pulling the B2 revision alternatives.	**David Miller:** I'm referencing a different email from March which clarified that the questions were presented to both the FAA regional level management and the Seattle Airport District Office, indicating that the decision-making involves more than just Tim House—it includes his office (Seattle Airports District Office) and the Northwest Mountain Region office. Century West, as the airport planning consultant for ODAV, is responsible for applying FAA design standards, and any airport layout plan must meet FAA expectations, for approval. **Tim House, FAA:** The master plan is not being prepared by the FAA itself, but by the state, which is the airport owner. The state has hired Century West as the consultant to develop the plan, and they are adhering to FAA advisory circulars when preparing the master plan.
7.9	**Ben Williams**	*Friends of French Prairie*	The input leading to the selection of the three alternatives and the elimination of others came from higher managerial or administrative levels at the Seattle and regional offices of the FAA, indicating that this is beyond just local Oregon input. The FAA is deciding what may or may not stay in this plan. If Tim is saying these two revisions are not acceptable, the FAA has got a hand in shaping the plan.	**Tim House, FAA:** No one at the FAA is putting together this plan. Please reference the email from March.

7.10	**Ben Williams**	*Friends of French Prairie*	Thank you for documenting this, because those who opposed the 2012 master plan may not have witnessed the "ping pong" effect—where ODAV deflected challenges by attributing them to the FAA, and vice versa. The term "the FAA" is vague and misleading and can imply different meanings and lead to confusion.	**Tony Beach, ODAV:** A lot of this information about roles, responsibilities, and master planning is in the introduction of the draft working paper and FAQs, available on the project website.
7.11	**Tony Helbling**	*Aurora Airport Improvement Association*	I looked up advisory circular 155, 5070-6, and it talks about a plan being achievable by incorporating realistic forecast phase development strategies and prioritizing projects based on their feasibility and available funding. The proposed plans are neither feasible nor realistic. This is not what the FAA wants and you are telling us we have to do it in accordance with the FAA. I've tried to have meetings with ODAV and was told discussions about these plans could only happen in this meeting. We need open discussions among PAC members.	The current FAA guidance document for airport master plans is AC 150/5070-6B (Change 2). The refined preliminary alternatives have been evaluated against facility requirements, PAC, public, and FAA input. Preliminary cost estimates have also been prepared for each. Alternative 1A has been identified as the preferred alternative as it provides a clear path to meet FAA ROFA and RSA standards, which must happen prior to any runway improvements. The alternative also addresses current safety and ground traffic flow issues through the addition of a vehicle service road and parallel taxilane. Implementing this preferred alternative over the 20-year planning period is realistic and feasible. All discussions and coordination regarding the master plan must take place through the PAC process as it ensures that all stakeholders have equal opportunity to provide input.
7.12	**Councilor Dr. Joanne Linville**	*City of Wilsonville*	To Tim House - would the airport still be out of compliance with FAA standards and require these modifications if the airport was not rated as C-II?	**Tim House, FAA:** If the airport was a B-II, the standards would not be the same, but the airport is classified as a C-II, and those are the standards we are applying. The number of operations

				show that is currently a C-II and there is no moving to a B-II.
7.13	**Bruce Bennett**	*Positive Aurora Airport Management*	My life depends on this airport. My family has been at this airport for over 50 years. What is the likelihood of this plan happening, since we are talking about 2 million dollars and there is current hangar construction. I am impressed with ODAV and everyone else working on this, but a reality check is necessary. An impossible plan is not a plan. It's critical to add a vehicle service road, but placing it next to the runway is a terrible idea. It should be as far away on the eastern property fence line, and that has already begun to be privately constructed.	Alternative 1A has been identified as the preferred alternative as it provides a clear path to meet FAA ROFA and RSA standards, which must happen prior to any runway improvements. The alternative also addresses current safety and ground traffic flow issues through the addition of a vehicle service road and parallel taxilane. ODAV believes that implementing the preferred alternative over the 20-year planning period is realistic and feasible. It is also important to note that the phases presented at the meeting identify a series of incremental steps that can be accomplished over many years. As explained, the phase that focuses on meeting C-II RSA and OFA standards for the runway does not impact any structures on the east side of the runway-taxiway system, except for addressing the drain field at south end of the runway. Also important to note is that FAA has indicated that no runway extensions will be supported by FAA without a path for conformance being identified on the ALP. The intent of the vehicle service road (VSR) depicted in the Refined Alternatives is to provide a delineated dedicated route for ground vehicles to navigate across the airport separately from taxiing aircraft. Many of the recent Vehicle or Pedestrian Deviation (VPD)s reported by ATC involved vehicles entering movement areas as they go around parked aircraft on the apron. The VSR as depicted provides a safe and clear path free of parked aircraft for

				ground vehicles to operate. Locations where the VSR crosses active taxiways or taxilanes will include appropriate markings to warn drivers of the active surfaces. The privately constructed drive that you reference routes vehicles east of the private hangar areas forcing drivers to enter the area at gates and drive across active aprons and taxilanes to reach their destinations in the interior of the properties. Once drivers enter the interior of the properties they are much more likely to remain on property and cut across the active surfaces to reach other locations in the area or to attempt to find their way in cases where they get lost. This is the type of situation where drivers enter into the movement area and a VPD occurs. A properly delineated dedicated VSR outside of object free areas that parallels the movement area line provides a clear visual cue to drivers on where it is safe to drive, keeping them out of the movement area and away from aircraft.
7.14	**Dave Mauk**	*Charbonneau Country Club*	Who as in what organization kicked the other alternative plans to the curb?	ODAV has selected Refined Preliminary Alternative 1A as the Preliminary Preferred Alternative based on facility requirements discussed in Chapter 4 of the Draft Working paper, input from the PAC, FAA, and the public.
7.15	**Tony Helbling**	*Aurora Airport Improvement Association*	PDX has a modification as standard for their fence in the NE corner of the airport. Other airports, such as Tacoma Narrows, have been granted modifications to standards for various structures, and it's unreasonable to suggest such modifications wouldn't be possible here. The FAA's own	**David Miller:** The consulting team is working to develop an airport master plan that meets FAA requirements and the FAA's Seattle Airport District Office is expected to approve the final airport layout plan. Regarding modifications to standards, as Tim mentioned, the FAA has indicated that they are not open to

			guidance mentions that these modifications are meant for pre-existing structures with economic and historical significance. Alternative 1A has major impacts to businesses who are contributing throughout the nation and region. The state plans to purchase hangars at fair market value, but with the intention of demolishing them, which drastically reduces their value, something I refer to as "pre-condemnation lite." This approach discourages potential buyers and impacts businesses that operate both regionally and nationally, including those providing essential services like LifeFlight for emergency response or Wilson Construction. This is a horrible plan. I believe this plan misuses FAA funds. The FAA has stated that they aren't the ones driving this master plan, yet the consultant claims that it's required due to FAA directives. The state and the FAA seem to be pointing fingers at each other, which creates confusion about who is actually responsible. This situation also appears to violate Oregon statutes that require the state to protect private investments at airports. We've submitted alternatives that would address the airport's needs without displacing private property owners, but these suggestions haven't been seriously considered. Additionally, we've provided a study demonstrating that a modification of	considering modifications as a substitute for meeting standard requirements in this situation. While I respect Aaron's contributions, the FAA views such modifications as temporary measures, not long-term solutions. We've coordinated closely with both the FAA and ODAV throughout the project, following their published guidelines. All relevant documents, including Aaron's memo, have been included for the FAA's review. The FAA has made it clear that the master plan needs to find a way to fully conform to their standards without relying on modifications.

			standards could be achieved with proper risk mitigation, as required by the FAA. However, the state refuses to pursue these options, choosing instead a plan that I see as unfeasible, unaffordable, and ultimately harmful. The limited time given for discussion and the lack of response to many of our comments are incredibly frustrating.	
7.16	**Tony Helbling**	*Aurora Airport Improvement Association*	I just want it on record that the FAA is telling the state of Oregon that no modification standards will be allowed. However, the FAA isn't directing what the state of Oregon submits or how the master plan is shaped. Meanwhile, the state is claiming that they're following this path because the FAA says they must, but the FAA is saying that they're not actually requiring it to be done this way. Am I understanding that correctly? I want to point out that the ones pursuing this alternative aren't directly impacted and they don't stand to lose anything personally from it. Meanwhile, the state of Oregon has a responsibility to protect private investors, and I believe they are failing to do so. It's frustrating to see this play out, especially since I believe that modifications to standards could address our needs while still ensuring safety. This airport has been here for a long time, and the purpose of the modification standard program is to allow for development through a careful risk	**Tony Beach, ODAV:** I want to clarify what was said earlier: The FAA has made it clear that the airport must meet certain standards to remain eligible for future funding. While the FAA doesn't dictate the specific plan for the airport, compliance with their standards is necessary. That's why we've developed this plan with input from the PAC, the community, and the public. It's a plan that addresses the non-standard items to ensure the airport can continue to be improved and maintained, rather than being restricted to maintenance mode and losing eligibility for federal improvements. The FAA Seattle ADO has clearly and repeatedly stated that the airport master plan must identify a "path to conformance" based on the C-II standards defined by the current and future critical aircraft represented in the FAA-approved master plan forecasts for the Airport. The FAA has also indicated that any potential modification of standards (MOS) that it may consider, would be temporary, would not support future runway improvements (e.g., runway extension), and would be an interim step toward implementing a

			analysis. But instead, we're in a position that's harming property owners now because this conversation is public. While the state insists that meeting FAA standards is their priority for safety, I believe they're missing a viable path forward that wouldn't hurt these owners. We'll have to agree to disagree on this direction. I'm really concerned that we can't have discussions with ODAV outside of these PAC meetings, especially since this is such a significant undertaking. It feels like the decision to move forward with Alternative 1A is being railroaded through before we've had a real chance to discuss it thoroughly. It just seems like this process is being rushed, and that's frustrating.	preferred alternative that is capable of meeting C-II standards. All discussions and coordination regarding the master plan must take place through the PAC process as it ensures that all stakeholders have equal opportunity to provide input.
7.17	**Tony Helbling**	*Aurora Airport Improvement Association*	What is the status of two drain fields, one in the north end and one in the south end, mentioned in previous chapters of the master plan, which were supposed to be studied but are now proposed for removal. What is the basis of this decision, especially if the fields could be adjusted to meet FAA standards for supporting emergency vehicles and aircraft during overruns?	Septic drain fields are not a compatible land use in the RSA as they will not support the weight of an aircraft and emergency equipment. Structural enhancements to the drain fields intended to meet that requirement would have to be evaluated by FAA and would likely require a MOS. Future siting of the drain fields is dependent on a number of factors which require further study during the permitting and design phase of the project. Future sites appropriate for drain fields should be identified during the predesign phase of that project.
7.18	**Tony Helbling**	*Aurora Airport Improvement Association*	What we are hearing tonight is very different than has been stated to the public to date. Path to conformance is not the same as the	The FAA Seattle ADO has clearly and repeatedly stated that the airport master plan must identify a "path to conformance" based on the C-II

			runway can't be extended until the ROFA is perfectly met. Which is how ODAV has presented the FAA position to date. Was the state basis for the take it or leave it alternatives presented to the PAC as driving alternatives? FAA absolutely allows the runway to be extended and FAA is required to consider a MOS and the aviation stakeholders have present a comprehensive MOS for the 32 feet of HWY 551 in the ROFA. What we are hearing now is the FAA will allow the runway to be extended and the ROFA to be what it is - ostensibly based upon the Faegre MOS and then at the end of the planning period the HWY moves 32 feet west if there is funding. That was NEVER presented. Question then - will ODAV consider an alternative that extends the runway now based upon the Faegre MOS and then plan in the MP to move the HWY 32 feet in ROW at the end of the planning period? if ODAV and FAA have denied the study provided on the drain field - we'd like to have info provided showing WHY an improved drain field installation will not be acceptable.	standards defined by the current and future critical aircraft represented in the FAA-approved master plan forecasts for the Airport. The FAA has also indicated that any potential modification of standards (MOS) that it may consider, would be temporary, would not support future runway improvements (e.g., runway extension), and would be an interim step toward implementing a preferred alternative that is capable of meeting C-II standards.
7.19	**Councilor Dr. Joann Linville**	*City of Wilsonville*	Where is the data that the FAA used to get to the C-II rating?	The current AAC/ADG determination was based on Traffic Flow Management System Counts (TFMSC) data. The process is discussed in Chapter 3 of the Draft Working Paper.
7.20	**Tony Helbling**	*Aurora Airport Improvement Association*	So ODAV's consultants says that their "refined preliminary alternatives" are based on what	As stated earlier, Alternative 1A has been selected as the preferred alternative by ODAV. The decision

			they were told by FAA personnel as to what is permissible; and then the FAA personnel state that the FAA is not dictating what is in the master plan. So perhaps the consultants misunderstood the input from the FAA and the consultants should go back to reconsider potential alternatives, even if they would not produce a design that would meet 100% of design standards.	provides a clear path to meet FAA ROFA and RSA standards, which must happen prior to any runway improvements. The alternative also addresses current safety and ground traffic flow issues through the addition of a vehicle service road and parallel taxilane. ODAV believes that implementing the preferred alternative over the 20-year planning period is realistic and feasible.
7.21	**Dave Mauk**	*Charbonneau Country Club*	The number of operations by large aircraft do not justify a B-II categorization. Well over 85% is lightweight aircraft. The number of large operations is actually declining. It costs FAA & ODAV 0$ for large aircraft to use Salem or McMinnville airports & return Aurora to B-II.	The current and future AAC/ADG C-II designation for Aurora State Airport (Runway 17/35) was confirmed in the FAA approval of the master plan forecast in late 2023. The AAC/ADG classification of a runway is based on the most demanding aircraft(s) using the runway that meet the FAA regular use threshold, 500 annual operations. The TFMSC data presented in Chapter 3 of the draft working paper identify more than 500 annual operations by aircraft classified as AAC C or D, and ADG II or larger. Please refer to Chapter 3 of the draft working paper.
7.22	**Councilor Dr. Joann Linville**	*City of Wilsonville*	I appreciate Tony (Helbling's) frustration. I want to clarify a couple of things. I'm looking back at the working paper and data that led to the airport's C-II categorization. I want to make sure I'm understanding correctly that this is what was presented to the FAA, leading them to say that staying at B-II wasn't an option. The airport is now considered C-II, and certain safety standards and modifications are required. The data I'm referencing, from page 216 in Chapter 2, shows operations of C and D jets from 2012 through 2021. From what I see, the tipping point for categorization is 500 operations.	**David Miller, CWE:** Thank you for the thoughtful questions. To address them, the data referenced in Table 2-16 is found in the inventory chapter, which discusses existing conditions. However, the evaluation of critical or design aircraft is detailed in Chapter 3, the forecast chapter. The base year for our updated forecasts is 2021. The data from the TFMSC, or instrument flight plan data, documented the instrument flight plan activity at Aurora State Airport, showing that we were already in the C-II realm during our base year. This data confirmed the existing critical aircraft for the runway.

			Between 2012 and 2019, those operations exceeded 500 annually, except during 2020 due to COVID. In 2021, it was back up to 640 operations. Am I right that this is the data that prompted the change to C-II? And also, did the airport's allowance of these C and D aircraft operations lead to the reclassification to C-II? How much of that approval is up to ODAV or the Airport?	For future planning, growth projections indicated continued activity, starting above the threshold for C-II. It's important to note that while air traffic control tower data counts takeoffs and landings, it does not specify the categories of those operations (C-II, D-II, or B-II). That's why we rely on the FAA's instrument flight plan data. So yes, 2021 was indeed our base year for this assessment. Generally speaking, an airport doesn't restrict its traffic based solely on its design category. For example, if an airport has a B-II runway, a C-II aircraft can still land there; it's ultimately up to the pilot to decide if the runway meets their needs regarding length, strength, and other factors. Over time, the airport transitioned from a B-II to a C-II designation. Even when it was classified as B-II, it was accommodating a growing number of C-II and B-II operations, which is typical for airports. There are weight limitations to consider. However, it's important to note that not all C-II aircraft require weight waivers, as many operate well below the threshold. **Tony Beach, ODAV:** The FAA has stated the only factor that we can restrict aeronautical uses is by weight. So we do that through a waiver process. We restrict aircraft that are overweight But no, we do not have the ability to restrict aircraft that are higher than our design aircraft.
7.23	**Councilor Dr. Joann Linville**	*City of Wilsonville*	Do we know how many of these aircraft are operating under waivers versus those based solely on pilot decisions? I'm trying to clarify this. I'm concerned about whether	**Tony Beach, ODAV:** I want to clarify that it's not necessarily about waivers. As David and Tim pointed out, the aircraft that use the facility determine its requirements and the design aircraft. This was discussed in Chapter 3. When

			ODAV has allowed waivers that pushed us over the operational threshold. It's not just that these aircraft are classified as C-II or D; they are also heavier than the runway can safely accommodate. If ODAV has permitted this, they are creating an issue for our airport. Are these decisions being made by pilots or are they relying on waivers?	we reach the threshold of 500 operations, that figure dictates the design aircraft and establishes the facility requirements for the next 20 years throughout the planning period.
7.24	**Dave Mauk**	*Charbonneau Country Club*	What's the level of design aircraft use that determines need? We have actual data everyday & it's well below that. Well below.	The FAA sets a critical aircraft threshold at 500 annual takeoffs and landings, which indicates regular use. The airport has consistently been above that 500 threshold for C and D aircraft for most of the past 10 years.
7.25	**Tony Helbling**	*Aurora Airport Improvement Association*	Is the airports division at the FAA requiring all sponsors to meet ROFA standards or just Aurora Airport? Also - have the rules changed for Mod of Standards - if not - why are other airports allowed to have Mod of Standards but Aurora is not?	**Tim House, FAA:** I don't have specific information about which airports have modifications or standards for their ROFA at the moment. However, I know these details are clearly outlined in the master plans we create. Any proposals for extension or widening are very complex and require careful consideration. **David Miller, CWE:** I want to address the questions regarding whether modifying standards could be a suitable alternative to the options presented. My understanding is that the FAA has directed us throughout this master plan process to ensure that our recommendations conform to standards. Modifications do not meet these standards, and I believe we have no latitude in this regard. We must adhere to the rules and procedures laid out in FAA publications and guidance from various FAA branches. I understand that this might not be what people want to hear, but the message

				we've consistently received from the FAA is clear. A frequently cited example is the Friedman Memorial Airport in Sun Valley, Idaho, and if they can do it, why not UAO? This airport has modifications to its standards due to various issues, but their analysis revealed that these modifications were only interim approvals, with the ultimate goal being that the owner committed to relocating the airport. There have been several failed attempts to do so since that time and continue to face challenges. It's important to recognize that these modifications are often more complicated than they appear.
7.26	**Tony Helbling**	*Aurora Airport Improvement Association*	We're asking for the "hard consideration" Tim House just mentioned!!!! THAT IS THE WHOLE POINT! The ODAV needs to be on the side of the airport!!! Defending the airport and make that "hard" ask.	Thank you for your comment.
7.27	**Ted Millar**	*AABC/TLM Holdings*	I'm concerned that our attempts to set up a work session with ODAV have been blocked, with the insistence that our comments must only be addressed in this public forum. I've invested in an 86-page document prepared by Wendie Kellington's and Aaron Fagre's firms, outlining a viable alternative that we believe should be discussed. Our aeronautical stakeholders' alternative is fully justified, and any proposal that eliminates aeronautical uses is unacceptable and contrary to Oregon regulations. I also want to emphasize that Highway 551 can be moved west	**David Miller, CWE:** I want to clarify that Aaron's memo you referenced is included in the public PAC review comment materials sent to the FAA, so Tim and his team at the Seattle ADO will have the chance to review it. If they find anything in it that suggests an alternative path, they can certainly weigh in on that. Regarding the technical report on the drain field, I wasn't directly involved in the coordination between ODAV and the FAA, but I believe it addresses some of the technical issues that might be relevant. If the technical memo was included in your comments, it should

			within the existing right-of-way with minimal impact on private property. Wiping out aeronautical uses in this master planning effort is unacceptable and contrary to ORS 836-640-642, ODAV and the entire point of the master planning effort to serve aeronautical uses. There is no justification for moving the septic tank drainfield without considering feasible improvements that comply with FAA standards, as our technical report demonstrates. I feel like our concerns are being dismissed without proper consideration, making this process feel unfair and unbalanced. It's like a kangaroo court.	already be part of the record; if not, it could be added.
7.28	**Ted Millar**	*AABC/TLM Holdings*	There's a feasibility study submitted by Faegre and Associates that justifies the need for a risk analysis regarding any modifications and modifications of standards. These analyses have always been conducted to ensure safety according to specific standards. We provided a full-page report detailing how this is being achieved, but it seems like no one is addressing it, and it hasn't been discussed at all. Did you read our submitted risk analysis, which demonstrates that this issue couldn't occur according to your risk assessment for over 300 years. They typically use 100 years as the standard. I want to know why you won't share that information with the rest of the PAC members so we can all be on the same page. I understand that the memo was attached to my	**David Miller, CWE:** The modifications that I mentioned that were approved by FAA for the Sun Valley Airport also included the same risk analysis approach, the methodology, and they were deemed acceptable, but they were still identified as interim solutions, not permanent solutions. I think that that's pretty consistent with what I've seen at other airports. **Tony Beach, ODAV:** It's included in the record of PAC comments and will be available on the project website for public access. However, I want to emphasize that the FAA has made it clear we need a plan that meets standards, and modifications cannot be part of the master planning process. The FAA's approach to considering modifications has changed; they are now project-specific, not tied to the master planning process, which

			comment letter, which is fine, but it should be accessible to everyone.	requires compliance to get the airport layout plan approved.
7.29	**Tony Helbling**	*Aurora Airport Improvement Association*	I had a great conversation with Tim House a couple of months ago, and I really respect him, so I want to emphasize that. I feel like we're making some progress, but it's frustrating. I understand that requests for modifications to standards, like for runway extensions, can be challenging, and I'm asking David Miller and Tony Beach to advocate for us in this process. We submitted a substantial amount of information, including an 87-page document, yet it seems like the ODAV team and consultants acknowledge receipt but aren't discussing it where we've been told we can. This leads me to believe there's a predetermined outcome, with the FAA and ODAV pointing fingers at each other regarding responsibility. I heard David mention that the FAA's modification program has changed, and I'd like to see the document that outlines these changes, especially since Aaron's study was based on the latest modification requirements. The FAA is required to consider modification requests, not just suggested to do so. For example, it's clear that Friedman Memorial Airport isn't going to relocate, just like Portland won't move their fence. So why wouldn't they approve modifications	**David Miller, CWE:** I'll do my best to address your points. First, I want to clarify that I'm not predicting Friedman Airport will be moving. There's still an expectation that it will either meet standards or be relocated, and I've seen discussions about potential realignments, like with the highway situation at Friedman in Haley, which resembles the Highway 551/OFA situation. However, there's a lot of work left to do, and modifications are not open-ended. Regarding how modification standards are currently evaluated, my earlier comment was meant to highlight a shift from past FAA practices. In the last master plan, it was common for modifications to be tied to the planning process. Based on the latest FAA guidance and advisory circulars, which have been updated as recently as 2023, modifications are now approached in a project-specific manner rather than being tied to planning. I apologize if I wasn't clear in my previous responses. Current FAA guidelines indicate that planning is not the appropriate avenue for modification applications.

			for Aurora Airport? We should be able to ask for a modification for things like a highway, windsock, or antennas without facing barriers. I'm really struggling to understand why we can't pursue these options, especially when it seems that historical and economic benefits are at stake for the airport's operations. I hope you can help clarify this.	
7.30	**Tony Helbling**	*Aurora Airport Improvement Association*	I recently met with ODOT, and they informed me that ODAV can purchase property from the Oregon Highway Trust and potentially realign the highway within the existing right-of-way without needing to buy homes on the other side. This could widen our ROFA which would benefit everyone involved. I'm looking for a way for ODAV and the aeronautical stakeholders to collaborate and find creative solutions to these challenges. It feels like we're not working together effectively, and the people most affected—those of us with stakes in this situation—are caught in the middle. This is unacceptable. I don't want to clash with our partners at Aurora; we all want to operate our aircraft or our businesses safely and with respect to our neighbors, to Ben Williams and to the mayor up in Wilsonville. I mean, the last thing I want to do as a pilot is fly over built-up areas. If I lose an engine, I want to be over a golf course. I want to be over a farm field. However, the lack of	**David Miller, CWE:** I don't want to revisit the conformance issues, but I understand that even a minor realignment of the highway within the right-of-way wouldn't fully resolve the problems on the east side related to the vehicle service road and taxi lane. While it might reduce some impacts on properties to the west, this information has already been discussed in earlier PAC meetings. I know this was part of ODAV's consideration when weighing the available options to identify the most feasible solution. We're working on providing options that meet FAA standards, but ultimately, it's the airport owner's responsibility to navigate these challenges moving forward. **Tony Beach, ODAV:** I don't have much to add, but I want to emphasize that we recognize that all three refined alternatives require significant work to bring the airport up to standard. This was a tough decision for us, as want to do what's best for the airport, its users, the pilot community, and the local communities.

			collaboration is concerning, and the ideas being presented seem contrary to the ORS statute that ODAV is supposed to uphold to protect private investment. If we continue down this path without cooperation, I foresee significant losses in tax revenue at the airport and the potential shutdown of businesses that have been part of this community for decades. It's frustrating to see regulations being used as barriers instead of as frameworks for collaboration. Every regulation offers opportunities for working outside its constraints or seeking variances. All I'm asking is for us to work together instead of presenting decisions that have already been made without our input. It was already decided and now we're just going to give it to you in a public meeting. That's not how this should operate. Thank you.	We understand that each alternative carries its own set of unintended consequences that we don't want to impose on anyone. Our focus is on the long-term benefits for the airport and the surrounding community to maintain this important transportation facility, which serves both Oregon and the nation. **Kenji Sugahara, ODAV:** I want to highlight that the biggest issue we're facing is the modification standards, especially since the FAA is quite adamant about adhering to these standards when spending money, whether for reconstruction or other projects. This focus on standards is critical. We also need to consider the impacts on businesses, which is very important to me. It's a challenging situation as we don't have the best options available, but we have to make a decision that accounts for the future growth of the airport, safety, and compliance with standards. I've had conversations with FAA officials, and their message is clear: we must adhere to these standards. The alternatives we're considering require modification standards that we can't implement, but I want to assure everyone that all input has been carefully weighed by our staff and consultants. These decisions are not taken lightly, and we genuinely think about the economic impact. Coming from private industry, I understand the importance of supporting businesses while also

				balancing community interests and FAA requirements. I want to stress that this process is ongoing, and while we have presented the preferred alternative, there's still a lot of work to do. Thank you all for being part of the process.
7.31	**Ted Millar**	*AABC/TLM Holdings*	I want to add to what Tony mentioned about the importance of collaboration. If we can work together with Dave, the consultants, and ODAV, there are several simple improvements we can implement. For example, the internal circulation road through the South End Air Park is already installed and paid for. It could be utilized to create a circulation route away from the airport, which would significantly reduce the risk of runway incursions. All it would take is a minor extension of Yellow Gate Road to Stenbach, which would benefit nearly two-thirds of the airport without any cost to anyone. We could collaborate with ODOT to eventually move the road while staying within the right-of-way boundaries, avoiding any property acquisitions on the west side of Highway 551. There are a lot of little things that could be done if you would work with us. Unfortunately, we can only have discussions during these public hearings, which limits our ability to address these topics properly.	The internal circulation road through South End Air Park that you reference routes vehicles east of the private hangar areas forcing drivers to enter the area at gates and drive across active aprons and taxilanes to reach their destinations in the interior of the properties. Once drivers enter the interior of the properties they are much more likely to remain on property and cut across the active surfaces to reach other locations in the area or to attempt to find their way in cases where they get lost. This is the type of situation where drivers enter into the movement area and a VPD occurs. A properly delineated dedicated VSR outside of object free areas that parallels the movement area line provides a clear visual cue to drivers on where it is safe to drive, keeping them out of the movement area and away from aircraft. In discussions regarding Hubbard Highway, ODOT indicated that they could not provide a binding response pertaining to the final alignment of the highway, instead they would review design documents and provide comment at that time. Refined alternatives 1A and 1B depict relocating the entire ROW outside of the ROFA as such a shift is the maximum displacement that should be depicted on the ALP in order for acquisition of the

				impacted properties to be eligible for FAA funding.
7.32	**Tony Helbling**	*Aurora Airport Improvement Association*	In the spirit of collaboration - path forward - after the MP is done (with this preferred alternative) - would the FAA then entertain a Mod of Standard so we could avoid the loss of businesses? I'm trying to address the concern of explaining to owners that the preferred alternative involves the state buying and tearing down their hangars. This would cause significant disruption to aviation businesses, leading to substantial financial losses. The Aurora State Airport generates over half a billion dollars annually, and much of this could be impacted by the drain field issue and the displacement of front-row businesses that contribute to the local economy and tax base. I believe we could explore modification of standard applications after the master plan is accepted. This collaborative approach could help us find solutions instead of imposing changes without consideration. Although we've requested work sessions to discuss these issues, we've been told they aren't allowed. This is the time for us to collaborate on ideas; if we could all meet and think outside the box, I believe you'd be surprised at how successful we could all be.	**Tim House, FAA:** Modification standards are only considered during project-based discussions. I'm not entirely sure what you mean by the loss of business, but as David mentioned, we don't include modifications of standards in the master planning process. It's only after the master plan is finalized and we start implementing projects that these modifications are taken into account.
7.33	**Brian Asher**	*Mayor, City of Aurora*	I want to point out that throughout this process, the City of Aurora has been excluded from discussions among airport officials and	The City of Aurora has not been excluded from discussions regarding this airport master plan. The City is represented on the PAC, and like all

			business stakeholders. While there have been meetings with the City of Wilsonville, there hasn't been any communication regarding Aurora, despite being the closest neighbor. We have city stores and water services that could support your needs, yet you haven't reached out to discuss potential collaboration. I just want to state that we are here and need to be included in these conversations moving forward. Thank you.	PAC members is encouraged to provide comment in the meetings and/or outside the meetings through the project website or an alternate means. ODAV met with the City of Aurora individually on December 18, 2023, and jointly with the City of Wilsonville on May 29, 2024. ODAV also met with the City of Wilsonville individually on November 17, 2023. These meetings were held to discuss the master plan materials that had been presented up to those times and answer clarifying questions that Cities had regarding the materials.
7.34	**Tony Helbling**	*Aurora Airport Improvement Association*	This is a comment for the record - this "zoom meeting" methodology is a leftover from COVID days - we could be so much more effective as a collaborative group if we were allowed to be in a room together - and make sure we include Aurora!!!	Thank you for your comment.
7.35	**Dave Mauk**	*Charbonneau Country Club*	Who is in the room when the alternative plans are considered & decided upon?	**David Miller, CWE:** From the consultant's perspective, our work has been collaborative, both internally and with our client. We've integrated input from the FAA and worked through a thorough process to evaluate and refine alternatives before presenting them to ODAV. This has been an open process, and Tony can provide more details about their internal decision-making. The consulting team provided a briefing to the aviation department board in September, which also informed their decision-making process. **Tony Beach, ODAV:** This has not been a one-time discussion but a lengthy process lasting nearly three years, during which we've shared preliminary

				alternatives and gathered feedback from the start. All members of ODAV have been involved in these conversations, which have contributed to the evaluation of feedback and the selection of a preferred alternative.
7.36	**Tony Helbling**	*Aurora Airport Improvement Association*	I want to state that Brian Asher is a great guy and the city of Aurora needs to be included in these discussions, as they are a significant part of the community. We value our relationship with the city, despite the tension from past lawsuits. Regarding the Zoom meetings, I believe they were originally initiated during COVID, but I feel they lack the collaborative spirit that in-person meetings provided. Past master plans involved more direct interaction, allowing for meaningful input and visibility of emotions, which is necessary for projects involving significant funding, like the current one. I have a concern about the costs of moving businesses and how interruptions will be handled. David mentioned that only tax roll values were considered, but we know these do not reflect actual market values. There are easements associated with airport access and drain fields that were established in good faith. I want to know how the FAA, ODAV, and consultants plan to address these easements, especially since businesses invested in good faith based on promises made.	The property valuations used in the cost estimates were based on the Real Market Value numbers developed by the Marion County Assessor Office as presented on their website. Real Market Value, as applied by Marion County Assessor Office, is defined by ORS 308.205.

7.37	**Ted Millar**	*AABC/TLM Holdings*	Tony Beach mentioned his team trying to do what's best for the airport. The cities of Aurora and Wilsonville, along with state economic development officials, need to recognize the impact of their decisions on major employers with hangars at Aurora Airport. These businesses contribute significantly to the local economy, generating over 1,200 jobs and a combined economic impact of $2.5 billion. If we remove the headquarters of companies like mine, along with others in the aviation sector, we're not just losing jobs; we're risking the viability of the airport itself. Many of these companies might relocate to nearby states, which would be detrimental to our community and undermine the reason for having the airport. For the past 20 years, we've followed the Oregon State Economic Development Department's guidance to foster growth, and if we disregard this progress, we will lose that economic development. This is a serious matter that needs thoughtful consideration.	Thank you for your comment.
7.38	**Dave Mauk**	*Charbonneau Country Club*	Decision making not process	Thank you for your comment.
7.39	**Tony Helbling**	*Aurora Airport Improvement Association*	What is happening right now is exactly what we're talking about... preferred alternatives are being decided upon when we've not considered the ADMITTED complexities of the path being	ODAV has selected Refined Preliminary Alternative 1A as the Preliminary Preferred Alternative based on facility requirements discussed in Chapter 4 of the Draft Working paper, input from the PAC, FAA, and the public. We will

			taken. We're doing this wrong... we need to bring this thing to a hold so we can figure out a path forward that we can collaboratively produce. Why are next steps being presented - why are they already decided upon? proof that ODAV, Consultants and FAA have already decided where this is going!!! We are asking to STOP and HOLD so we could figure out a way to collaborate. Strongly recommend ODAV and the Consultants take a long hard look at the ORS statute that is being flat out being ignored.	continue to take PAC and public comments through this process.
7.40	**Councilor Dr. Joann Linville**	*City of Wilsonville*	Isn't there supposed to be an environmental study or analysis?	A "desktop" environmental review of the existing site was completed as part or the existing conditions analysis in Chapter 2 of the Draft Working Paper. Further environmental investigations will precede future development projects. Further clarification: The environmental review that is summarized in Chapter 2, and presented in Appendix 2 is used as a baseline of known existing conditions for the master plan. All FAA-funded projects are subject to requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The FAA will require environmental studies and separate FAA environmental approvals for all projects involving FAA funding prior to project implementation. This includes property acquisition and development projects, as prescribed under NEPA. The noise analysis will be completed based on the current/future runway

				configuration in the preferred airside alternative.

Attendee Questions/Comments and Responses[2]

ID	Name	Question/Comment	Response
7.41	**Wendie Kellington**	I represent Pac Member. I believe I should be a part of the PAC segment.	**Brandy Steffen:** Thank you for your request, Wendie. The primary PAC member will be on the Panel, and in the event they are unavailable then their Alternate would be on the Panel. Our belief is that you represent Ted Millar and he is on the Panel tonight.
7.42	**Wendie Kellington**	Please have David Miller speak up and clearly. His last comment on Alt 2 impacts were inaudible.	**Bruce Bennett:** Good Point
7.43	**George Van Hoomissen**	So ODAV's consultants says that their "refined preliminary alternatives" are based on what they were told by FAA personnel as to what is permissible; and then the FAA personnel state that the FAA is not dictating what is in the master plan. So perhaps the consultants misunderstood the input from the FAA and the consultants should go back to reconsider potential alternatives, even if they would not produce a design that would meet 100% of design standards.	Tony Helbling: I'm entering this in the panelist section as one of my questions.... ODAV is responsible for completing this airport master plan in line with current FAA guidelines. As part of the planning process ODAV solicits input from all stakeholders and the public. As FAA is responsible for approving the ALP at the completion of the process, ODAV and the project team have coordinated extensively with FAA. Through that coordination, FAA has clearly and consistently stated that the plan should outline a clear path to meeting runway design standards and that a modification to standards will not be considered as part of the master plan.
7.44	**Jason Paolo**	Does option 1a and 1B include the cost for ODOT to relocate the Hubbard hwy?	Yes, thank you for your question.
7.45	**Wendie Kellington**	To meet the ROFA requires HWY 551 move just 32 feet and that is entirely within the existing ROW as confirmed by ODOT. On what basis does ODAV conclude that private	In discussions regarding Hubbard Highway, ODOT indicated that they could not provide a binding response pertaining to the final alignment of the highway, instead they would review

[2] Live responses are included, along with additional information/clarification, as needed.

		property must be taken for Alternative 1A or B?	design documents and provide comment at that time. Refined alternatives 1A and 1B depict relocating the entire ROW outside of the ROFA as such a shift is the maximum displacement that should be depicted on the ALP in order for acquisition of the impacted properties to be eligible for FAA funding.
7.46	**Jason Paolo**	Are business relocation costs included in these option estimates due to not being able to operate after reduced property footprint as a result of ODA/Aurora airport property acquisition?	The costs with relocating businesses is not included in the cost estimates and would have to be addressed.
7.47	**Wendie Kellington**	The last chat I am able to see is Brandy with FAQs. Please post chat for all to see.	The chat has been posted on the website. Thank you.
7.48	**George Van Hoomissen**	Question for the FAA representative — with the just disclosed preferred alternative, is it possible that the FAA would grant (or entertain a request for) a waiver/modification to the design standards to allow the runway extension to happen first, with other more expensive and difficult phases to follow? Note, I think most pilots would agree that the one change that would most positively impact airport safety is the contemplated 497' runway extension.	FAA has clearly and repeatedly stated that in order for any runway improvements (including extension) to be eligible for FAA funding, the runway must first meet AAC/ADG C-II ROFA and RSA standards.
7.49	**George Van Hoomissen**	Please post the presentation on the website now, so that we can look back at the slide presented earlier. I want to be able to see the slides during the meeting, not after. Thank you.	The presentation was posted during the meeting. Thank you for your comment.
7.50	**Wendie Kellington**	All the FAA statements about their requirements are wholly consistent with the following: (1) extend the runway now on the Faegre MOS for HWY 551 (READ "TEMPORARILY" or as an "INTERIM MEASURE" and 2) plan to move the hwy west 32 feet in the existing ROW at the end of the planning period when funding is made available. Therefore, what exactly is the reason that is not being proposed? It is obvious that it is not FAA demanding the runway wait to be extended until the hwy ROFA is met.	FAA has clearly and repeatedly stated that in order for any runway improvements (including extension) to be eligible for FAA funding, the runway must first meet AAC/ADG C-II ROFA and RSA standards.
7.51	**Bruce Bergman**	Why are a vehicle access road and second taxiway considered mandatory. We have a	The recommendation for an enhanced vehicle service road was made by the

		workable plan for a vehicle access road already and living with a single taxiway instead of destroying public property seems like a better idea.	Runway Safety Action Team. Other proposed concepts have been considered by ODAV, and they've taken those into account in their decision-making process. Some PAC members aren't in favor of having the vehicle service road along the taxiway, but this approach has been implemented at several airports.
7.52	**George Van Hoomissen**	Hallelujah to Tony Helbling's comment regarding the value of meeting IN PERSON. The COVID pandemic is over. Can you have future PAC meetings in person?	Thank you for your comment.

Public Comment

ID	Name	Question/Comment	Response
7.53	**Neal White**	Why has the extension to the south been abandoned?	During the process of screening alternatives, a lot of valuable input was gathered in the early PAC meetings leading up to the preliminary alternative stage in June. Two key factors influenced the decision to favor the North Runway extension over the South: first, the North extension doesn't require any property acquisition, which simplifies the process; and second, the South extension would impact Exclusive Farm Use (EFU) land, a concern voiced by community members and the PAC regarding land protection. While there were other considerations, such as grading issues at the south end of the runway, these were the primary reasons for moving forward with the North Extension.
7.54	**Wendie Kellington**	As a representative of airport stakeholders, I want to emphasize that this agency doesn't operate in an echo chamber. ODAV's decisions must be grounded in substantial evidence, and currently, the only evidence supports that the drain field in the south can	The septic drain fields in the existing and proposed RSA are an incompatible land use. The suggested structural improvements to the drain fields have been evaluated by ODAV and FAA and have been found to not meet RSA

		be improved to meet FAA standards. Therefore, there's no legal justification for ODAV to threaten or propose its removal elsewhere. Regarding modifications of standards, the airport master plan serves as a long-term blueprint for development, and one of the fundamentals of that is the sequencing of events. The runway extension is urgently needed for safety to protect pilots and passengers so they don't die. There's no law preventing the runway from being extended now, based on a modification to standard related to Highway 551, which involves moving the highway 32 feet to the west to meet ROFA. Contrary to what some may say, the FAA has not stated that this extension is not permitted; they've only requested a compliance plan. This plan could involve expanding the runway now while also planning to move the highway during the master plan period. Additionally, any proposal by ODAV to acquire privately owned properties outside the current airport boundary necessitates expanding that boundary first. There has not currently been any indication from ODAV about such an expansion, and if they intend to purchase private property, they must address this boundary issue. We've had comments about it. Let's propose to expand the airport boundary if ODAV is considering buying up private property. Because when the airport boundaries expanded, that's what allows the airport to plan to do airport things. Thank you.	grading standards and could impede the function of the drain field. The commentor is correct in stating that there is no law preventing the runway extension. However, FAA has clearly and repeatedly stated that in order for any runway improvements (including extension) to be eligible for FAA funding, the runway must first meet AAC/ADG C-II ROFA and RSA standards. The AMP preliminary preferred alternative identifies neighboring aeronautical-use for acquisition by ODAV in the event that the properties become available for sale. At the time of acquisition, the airport boundary would be updated to include the property or properties acquired.

Additional Emailed Comments

ID	Name	Question/Comment	Response

7.55	**George Van Hoomissen**	Question for the FAA representative — with the just disclosed preferred alternative, is it possible that the FAA would grant (or entertain a request for) a waiver/modification to the design standards to allow the runway extension to happen first, with other more expensive and difficult phases to follow? Note, I think most pilots would agree that the one change that would most positively impact airport safety is the contemplated 497' runway extension.	The FAA's guidance throughout the process has consistently been that the master plan should outline a path toward meeting design standards. They have clearly stated that they would not consider modifications to standards for a runway extension in an email in March.
7.56	**George Van Hoomissen**	ODAV's consultants says that their "refined preliminary alternatives" were based in large part on what the consultants were told by FAA personnel as to what the FAA would allow, but the FAA representative has stated clearly that the FAA is not dictating what is in the master plan. So perhaps the consultants have misunderstood the input from the FAA and the consultants should go back to reconsider potential alternatives -- even potentially as interim solutions -- even if the other potential alternative would not meet 100% of design standards. Is it ODAV's understanding that the master plan must show a plan to achieve full compliance with design standards, but AFTER the plan is approved then ODAV could request a waiver/modification to allow a project intended to achieve an interim step that would move toward, but not fully meet, the design standards?	ODAV is responsible for completing this airport master plan in line with current FAA guidelines. As part of the planning process ODAV solicits input from all stakeholders and the public. As FAA is responsible for approving the ALP at the completion of the process, ODAV and the project team have coordinated extensively with FAA. Through that coordination, FAA has clearly and consistently stated that the plan should outline a clear path to meeting runway design standards and that a modification to standards will not be considered as part of the master plan.
7.57	**George Van Hoomissen**	There are many advantages to having meetings IN PERSON. Can you have the next PAC meeting and any future PAC meetings in person? If not, why not? Thank you.	Additional in-person or hybrid PAC meetings are not included in the scope for this project. There are no plans to move to an in-person meeting format.

Additional comments submitted to the project team are saved to the "Public Records Page" at https://publicproject.net/AuroraAirport

Transcript

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 16:56:22
So I'm going to start the webinar.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 16:56:28
And start reporting.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 16:56:37
So welcome to all you early people

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 16:56:39
Thanks for joining us. We still have a few minutes before we're going to start the meeting.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 16:56:45
But if you want to raise your hand and test anything or if you

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 16:56:50
should have been in the um

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 16:56:56
participant and the panelists, if you're a PAC member and you accidentally got in the attendee list.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 16:57:01
let us know and we will

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 16:57:03
get you into the right location.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 16:57:12
And hopefully all of you can rename yourself as well.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 16:57:18
If your affiliation isn't showing for some reason.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 16:57:23
So I'm going to

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 16:58:15
Okay, so I'm just going to be taking a look at all of our attendees and making sure that you're all in the right spot.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 16:58:21
So feel free to rename yourself in the meantime, if you're a PAC member and you'd like to list your affiliation, feel free to hover over your name.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 16:58:32
There's three little dots over your name and then you can add your affiliation.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 16:59:24
So welcome, everyone. We're just a few minutes out from starting the meeting. So please feel free to rename yourself. You should be able to do that.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 16:59:33
If you are in the attendee area and you are a PAC member, please raise your hand and we will get you in the right area.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 16:59:44
We will have public comment period at the end.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 16:59:53
And Wendy, I see you have your hand raised. I think you're

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 16:59:58
You can submit a question or comment into the Q&A section.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:00:04
And then we'll have the public questions at the end.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:00:22
Please just type your question into the Q&A and hopefully I can answer it for you.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:00:48
Okay, well, I keep hearing the little doorbell, which means that people are still joining us.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:00:58
So thank you so much.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:01:01
We will get started here in just a minute. I think a few more people are

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:01:07
joining it in.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:01:51
Okay, we'll get started here.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:01:55
So welcome, everyone. This is the seventh PAC meeting.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:02:00
For the Aurora State Airport Master Plan Project.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:02:05
um and

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:02:06

It's October 15th already. So thank you for joining us.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:02:10
here tonight. Again, if continue to um

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:02:16
Let us know if you're in the wrong spot or if and we'll try to get you sorted out here.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:02:24
So thanks for bearing with us during some of our technical

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:02:29
startup. So just a reminder, I'm Brandi Steffen. I'm going to be facilitating the conversation today.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:02:35
We are recording this meeting and it will be posted on the project website.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:02:40
Again, you can adjust your name by clicking on the three little dots when you hover over your photo or where your name is if you're off camera.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:02:49
um and

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:02:51
you know when you're speaking, we'd love to be able to see your face, but feel free to keep your cameras off during the presentation.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:02:59
As a reminder, we'll keep everyone muted until key points of the meeting. We have lots of time for

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:03:05
Questions, answers, and conversation.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:03:09
So for those of you who are attending from the community, we'll have a chance to speak at the end of the meeting.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:03:15
And you can always submit any questions or comments in the FAQ section.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:03:22
Just as a reminder, also, we need to know who's here at the meeting. So please name yourself correctly. If we do have duplicates, we will need to, we'll try to reach out to you, but then eventually if we can't get you named correctly, we'll need to remove you from the meeting. This was something that was discussed in previous meetings.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:03:44
And we will just have the primary PAC member who is in the panelist area and alternates will be in the attendee area.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:03:55
So David, if you could go to the next slide.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:03:58
We'll just briefly run through the agenda.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:04:02
So our goal tonight is to

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:04:06
Continued discussions about the Aurora Airport Master Plan alternatives.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:04:12
And David, I'm not seeing that advance.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:04:15
Yeah, I'm trying to advance it. Let me see.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:04:17
Okay.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:04:18
Hold on, it might have frozen on me.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:04:22
Okay, no worries.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:04:32
So I'll just continue to go through and David, hopefully you'll get that sorted.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:04:40
But I wanted to just remind you that the PAC is a sounding board and we'll review information and provide feedback.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:04:49
but does not make a formal recommendation.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:04:52
All viewpoints. Oh, great. There we go, David.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:04:53
Here we go. Sorry, I got it. Sorry.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:04:55
No worries.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:04:57
All viewpoints will be gathered and will be included in the meeting summary as we have in the past.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:05:05
Okay.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:05:05
So here's our agenda.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:05:07
We'll do some quick housekeeping and go through that information. Then we will go through the alternative process and review the refined preliminary alternatives.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:05:19
We'll have time for questions.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:05:22
Then we'll review the PAC feedback and comment themes that we've heard over the last several months.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:05:28
Again, we'll have some time for some clarifying questions.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:05:31
And then we'll review the preferred alternative. And there we have lots of time for questions and comments, about an hour.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:05:40
before we have 15 minutes for public comments, and then we'll go into our next steps.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:05:47
So if you can go to the next slide, David.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:05:55
Oh, okay. Yeah, great. So I'm going to hand it over to Tony just to say hello to you all tonight.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:06:08
Maybe. Tony, you're muted.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:06:19
Uh-oh, what is, let's see.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:06:26
I'm so sorry, Tony. You…

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 17:06:29

Okay. All right. There we are. Can you hear me now?

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:06:30
Somehow.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:06:31
Yeah, sorry about that.

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 17:06:33
Okay. All right. Well, thank you. And thank you, Brandy, for the overview of the agenda and

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 17:06:38
My name is Tony Beach. I'm the state airports Manager with the Oregon Department of Aviation.

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 17:06:43
Our director is Kenji Sugahara

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 17:06:45
And Alex Thomas is our policy planning and program manager. And Brandon Pike is our aviation planner.

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 17:06:52
And we just want to say thank you all for all of your engagement and participation in

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 17:06:59
the PAC process so far and not just the PAC, but for the public as well in our open houses and

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 17:07:06
And you can see all the comments and responses to the PAC and public comments that we received, as Brendan mentioned.

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 17:07:12
And so thanks again. We look forward to going over your comments, questions, and

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 17:07:16
The agenda items for this meeting and

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 17:07:21
That's all I've got. Thank you. Brandy, back to you.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:07:24
Wonderful. Thanks, Tommy.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:07:28
Okay, so this slide shows the project team

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:07:34
And all the people who are working on this project

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:07:37
The next slide shows

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:07:40
the website. And I also included the link in the chat

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:07:45
With a reminder that we are recording this meeting.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:07:49
You can also submit comments through the website at any time.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:07:54
The next slide shows

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:07:57
who you all are as PAC members. So we have lots of different viewpoints listed here.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:08:03
represented on the pack and including airport users and businesses and organizations, airport neighbors, local municipalities, tribal organizations, state agencies, local and regional nonprofit groups, and environmental and land use groups.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:08:20
So the next slide is just a reminder of our meeting guidelines.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:08:25
Again, we want all viewpoints represented so that Oregon Department of Aviation can hear from you all. And so we'll collect all of those and include them into the meeting summary.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:08:37
The chats are included into the meeting summary as well as the frequently asked questions. So please go ahead and put those in as we're going through. If you have questions, whether you're here as a public attendee in the FAQ part, or if you are a PAC member in the chat.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:08:57
We do ask that most of this time is set aside for committee members. And we have lots of time for dialogue in this meeting.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:09:09
Anything on non-agendum items, we'd love to have in writing. We can include those in the summary as long as you get those to us in the next two weeks.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:09:19

And…

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:09:21
If you go to the next slide, please, David.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:09:24
you'll see that our guidelines also include how we work together with honesty, openness, and willingness to work together, including assuming good intentions in others.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:09:36
We ask that you please be respectful of each other and direct all comments to the FAA or ODAV.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:09:43
And again, it is okay to have different feelings and we want those to be represented.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:09:50
Again, if you'd like to rename yourself.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:09:53
to show your affiliation, please feel free to do that.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:09:57
Now for the next slide, David, thank you. No, you're totally fine. So this is our schedule. It's also been updated on the website.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:10:05
You can see here.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:10:07
that we are there, pack number seven, kind of in the middle of those green lines.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:10:14
They're in October. And then we'll have our final meeting in December on December 10th.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:10:21
And that will be our time to hear about

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:10:27
the next phase of the project.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:10:29
So I am going to hand it off to David to start taking us through the

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:10:37
refined preliminary alternatives. Again, we'll have some question time and clarification time before we get into the PAC feedback and common themes that we

heard.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:10:46
And then the refined alternative.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:10:50
preferred alternative for the master plan. And again, we'll have about an hour to go through comments and questions at that time.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:10:57
All right, David, all yours.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:11:00
Okay. Well, thank you, Brandy, and sorry for all those technical glitches on the way in. So thanks, everyone. David Miller, the lead aviation planner for Century West Engineering.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:11:09
So as Brandy mentioned, we've got a full agenda tonight. We thought we'd go back through and just do a review of the alternatives process to begin just to refresh everyone's memory of how we got to where we are today.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:11:24
And then we'll work through some more, as Randy outlined, some of the feedback on the preliminary alternatives and ultimately get into more of a detailed discussion on the

[David Miller - Century West] 17:11:35
preferred alternatives.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:11:38
So I won't go into a lot of detail on this, but just the way we break this process out, and we're specifically talking about the alternatives process within the master plan, is that we began with internally as a team and

[David Miller - Century West] 17:11:51
consultation with ODAV and the FAA, we discussed a wide range of options.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:11:58
that were capable of meeting FAA standards. And if you recall, the emphasis of the facility requirements assessment was

[David Miller - Century West] 17:12:06
identifying those facilities on the airport that meet standards, the current airport reference code or runway design group category.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:12:14
C2, which corresponds to the critical aircraft

[David Miller - Century West] 17:12:18

design aircraft and then also identifying those

[David Miller - Century West] 17:12:21
facilities that don't meet standards. So the real focus of the

[David Miller - Century West] 17:12:25
alternatives process as we outlined in the preliminary alternatives was to work through, identify options for

[David Miller - Century West] 17:12:32
meeting those criteria.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:12:35
So a lot of options were rolled around internally. We looked a lot of different things and

[David Miller - Century West] 17:12:41
We'll cover some of these as we go through here. But when we came to you in the next phase, which is the preliminary alternatives that we presented in our June meeting.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:12:53
We had narrowed down the field, so to speak. We came in with seven

[David Miller - Century West] 17:12:58
preliminary alternatives for airside facilities and three for landside facilities.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:13:02
And as you can see, those were presented back at PAC meeting number six in the open house that followed a day later, a couple days later.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:13:09
Important part about that is that that

[David Miller - Century West] 17:13:13
presentation generate a lot of input from the PAC and the public as well. And as Brandy mentioned, all of the comments that were received, all the feedback that was received.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:13:26
was documented, cataloged and documented and then that

[David Miller - Century West] 17:13:30
feedback helped inform the decisions that were being made by ODAV on the refinements. So the process of working through concepts to preliminary to refined alternatives

[David Miller - Century West] 17:13:41
is really what's involved here.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:13:44

We presented the refined alternatives package, which we had narrowed down to really three options.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:13:51
which are really two options with a sub option. And then we presented that at the work session in July.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:13:59
We're also um

[David Miller - Century West] 17:14:00
made a presentation to the Oregon Aviation Department Board in September.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:14:09
So how we refine the alternatives, as I said, we started out with seven airside alternatives as we presented to the FAA.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:14:17
act and the public.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:14:19
as I mentioned, the process of refinement resulted in several options being discarded.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:14:26
Just prior to the PAC meeting number six, the FAA had an opportunity to review the preliminary alternatives.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:14:33
And indicated that they were not able to support the options that we identified that related to

[David Miller - Century West] 17:14:40
assigning design group 2, B2 standards to the airport, and that was based on the current design aircraft and the existing forecaster traffic that was

[David Miller - Century West] 17:14:50
clearly in the C2 category. So that reduced the field a bit. The no action alternative, or sometimes called the do nothing alternative, was discarded also.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:15:01
Mostly because it failed to implement FAA mandated safety requirements.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:15:07
And it also in process, being out of conformance with no path to conformance.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:15:14
would potentially jeopardize their state's ability to access FAA funds, which is critical to the

[David Miller - Century West] 17:15:22
both the maintenance and the improvement of the airport.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:15:25
So through that process, we

[David Miller - Century West] 17:15:30
We also, again, this was driven largely by feedback generated by the public and the PAC.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:15:36
We also narrowed the field a bit by eliminating the south runway extension options. The reasons were varied, but they came down largely the fact that

[David Miller - Century West] 17:15:45
The north extension options can be accommodated on airport property, existing airport property. So that was better in that sense.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:15:53
It also reduced the impact on adjacent EFU land.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:15:57
So those are two factors. There were some other grading issues and other factors involved, but that was really

[David Miller - Century West] 17:16:05
I think the information that was considered

[David Miller - Century West] 17:16:09
And ultimately, it was determined that the south options would would

[David Miller - Century West] 17:16:13
be discarded.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:16:14
So when we met with you last, we brought in the refined preliminary alternatives, which were captured as Alternative 1A, 1B, and 2. And remember, these alternatives one and two really came down to

[David Miller - Century West] 17:16:31
Alternative one focused on shifting the Hubbard Highway West.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:16:35
alternative two focused on shifting the runway east and that was

[David Miller - Century West] 17:16:40
Again, the primary purpose or focus of that was to

[David Miller - Century West] 17:16:46
allow the runway object-free area or ROFA, to meet FAA standards. The highway, the

Hubbard Highway, chief among several features that conflict with that standard.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:16:56
And then the…

[David Miller - Century West] 17:16:59
Yeah, so we presented those and that was when we had additional feedback from that point.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:17:05
So I'm sorry, backwards.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:17:08
So that brings us to our, just I wanted to briefly summarize the refined preliminary alternatives. We're going to go back over information we covered in the prior work session, but just to

[David Miller - Century West] 17:17:19
everyone to get kind of up to speed with this.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:17:22
So as I said, 1A option, alternative 1A was to shift to Hubbard Highway West, extend the runway north.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:17:28
to 5,500 feet.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:17:33
So the main features of this

[David Miller - Century West] 17:17:37
from the airfield standpoint, this option allows the existing runway to be maintained. In other words, the center line of the runway

[David Miller - Century West] 17:17:45
in the existing surface could be

[David Miller - Century West] 17:17:48
the extension could be added to it.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:17:50
The other two options

[David Miller - Century West] 17:17:53
involves shifting the runway, effectively requiring an entirely new runway.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:17:58
So all of these options, as I mentioned, 1A, 1B, and two have a 497 foot extension to the north.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:18:05
This option has, as we recall, has impact on the adjacent properties west of the Hubbard Highway.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:18:14
the basic action with this is to shift the existing ODOT right-of-way

[David Miller - Century West] 17:18:19
Approximately 80 feet west of the object-free area, which is what allowed the road to be reconstructed outside the Hubbard Highway.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:18:27
So we maintain the 200-foot ODOT right-of-way width

[David Miller - Century West] 17:18:31
And it's…

[David Miller - Century West] 17:18:34
it will affect properties adjacent to the highway.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:18:40
And then the alternative also on the east side

[David Miller - Century West] 17:18:45
provides for a future

[David Miller - Century West] 17:18:49
vehicle service road and a parallel taxi lane.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:18:53
These are items the vehicle service road improvement was identified as a recommendation from the runway safety action team and other efforts to improve safety. The taxi lane is a

[David Miller - Century West] 17:19:04
is an improvement that could also facilitate

[David Miller - Century West] 17:19:08
better movement of aircraft within the apron area.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:19:11
So these options have, as we talked about before, have impacts on both the highway side and the airfield side.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:19:20
We also have the realignment of Powell Road and

[David Miller - Century West] 17:19:25
the relocation of facilities within the OFA, including the ASOS and Sigmund Circle.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:19:32
This involves property acquisition, approximately 43 acres of property.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:19:39
And that includes

[David Miller - Century West] 17:19:40
the properties needed to accommodate the aeronautical

[David Miller - Century West] 17:19:44
We design standard compliance, but also the areas that are

[David Miller - Century West] 17:19:49
adjacent to the right of ways, the highways.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:19:56
And this, for recollection, is what alternative 1A looks like. So again, the highway along the west side of

[David Miller - Century West] 17:20:07
one way gets shifted the right of where you could see where the future road alignment may be difficult to see on the screen but the

[David Miller - Century West] 17:20:14
Future road alignment is depicted and these are the parcels that will be affected by that adjacent.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:20:21
On the runway stays in place, the north extension is accommodated here, the parallel taxiway stays in place.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:20:28
And then everything to the east is a combination of the vehicle service road and the parallel taxi lane. It has

[David Miller - Century West] 17:20:38
clear impacts on the southeast portion of the airport, the hangars, the large hangars that are shown in

[David Miller - Century West] 17:20:43
kind of orange represent new buildings the area just

[David Miller - Century West] 17:20:47
Underneath those are hard to see kind of within the pink area

[David Miller - Century West] 17:20:51
our existing hangars that would need to be removed and then replaced further back from the development area.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:20:58

the landslide area.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:21:01
just north of the control tower is developed out in line with one of the land site alternatives that we presented earlier.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:21:10
I mentioned earlier

[David Miller - Century West] 17:21:12
the conformance to standards on the OFA, one of the specific conformance items also

[David Miller - Century West] 17:21:18
with this alternative will be to remove the drain fields that are in the runway safety area. Right now the

[David Miller - Century West] 17:21:24
South Drainfield is in the existing RSA runway safety area for the runway.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:21:31
And once the runway extension is factored in, one of the north green fields would be in that runway safety area. There's also a third smaller greenfield adjacent to the north end of the taxiway that would need to be relocated.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:21:46
And we'll talk about those a little bit later.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:21:50
So alternative 1B is a similar option, but it involves a greater shift of the highway, a larger shift of the highway than a 1A. It has the same north extension.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:22:01
This one may uh

[David Miller - Century West] 17:22:04
basic difference is that the right of way for option 1b

[David Miller - Century West] 17:22:09
shifts approximately 175 feet west.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:22:14
to clear the RFA, the ROFA.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:22:17
And then that um

[David Miller - Century West] 17:22:20
that development also involves shifting the runway center line west and that the purpose of that is to reduce the impact

[David Miller - Century West] 17:22:30
that option would be to reduce the impact on existing airport hangars and other development.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:22:35
show you a graphic of that here.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:22:37
This one also, 1B also includes the other features talked about, all of the other features, the parallel taxi landing vehicle service road east of taxiway.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:22:47
There's about 39 acres of property acquisition required in this, and that's heavily

[David Miller - Century West] 17:22:53
heavily on the

[David Miller - Century West] 17:22:56
west side of the long runway.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:22:58
adjacent to the hangar. There are some impacts to existing hangars, but they're less than alternative 1A.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:23:07
I think we covered all those.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:23:12
There's the 1B graphic. So as I said, you can

[David Miller - Century West] 17:23:17
You can visualize the shift. Essentially, here's the in red. You can make out the existing runway. So the future runway in this configuration would be shifted

[David Miller - Century West] 17:23:27
to the west slightly and then the object-free area will move with that

[David Miller - Century West] 17:23:33
And then you can see that the boundaries are

[David Miller - Century West] 17:23:37
pushed a little further west.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:23:41
And then the airfield side, the parallel taxiway.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:23:45
would come with the shift of runway

[David Miller - Century West] 17:23:49

And the current separation would be maintained. And then the vehicle service road and the

[David Miller - Century West] 17:23:54
parallel taxi lane could be accommodated.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:23:57
in the landside area in the north section above the tower is very similar.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:24:03
same basic issues with the drain fields and the runway safety area.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:24:11
So alternative two alternative

[David Miller - Century West] 17:24:15
The other approach to solving the object-free area problem, and that was to shift the runway away from the highway.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:24:21
So the same North Extension, same 5,500 feet

[David Miller - Century West] 17:24:27
But we move everything on the airfield east. So no changes to the Hubbard Highway in this alternative, no impact on the adjacent property owners.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:24:35
west of the highway.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:24:38
Same issue, basically the same improvements addressing Kyle Road, the drain fields, clearing the object-free area of the ASOS and other facilities.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:24:52
One thing that's unique about alternative two.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:24:56
different than the other two alternatives.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:24:58
is that this alternative would require the relocation of the air traffic control tower.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:25:03
an alternative 1A and 1B, we're able to avoid that.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:25:08
So this alternative has approximately 37 acres of property acquisition. It's needed to shift the runway to the east. Of course, I'll show you the graphic on that.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:25:20
I've seen these before. Basically has presented.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:25:24
So the impacts are similar a little bit

[David Miller - Century West] 17:25:27
on the southeast section of the airport.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:25:32
So essentially the existing hangars in the southeast apron area would need to be removed.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:25:39
And reconstruction could occur further east. Additional apron area could be incorporating the purple area down in the southeast is included in it.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:25:51
Okay, so those are the kind of, if you recall, those are the options that were presented. And in terms of continuing our evaluation.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:26:01
We prepared engineering cost estimates to sort of illuminate the differences between these options, these alternatives.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:26:09
And I'd say that a couple of things to remember. First, we're going to just kind of give you the high level cost of

[David Miller - Century West] 17:26:17
total price, if you will, and not get into a lot of detail on what went into those. There's a planning level cost estimates.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:26:25
They include contingencies for unknown factors and project complexities in the range of 20 to 30%.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:26:33
The costs include property acquisition costs, and for that, we use Marion County's

[David Miller - Century West] 17:26:38
assessor's office, real market value dollars, which is consistent with, or instead of 308, 25.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:26:47
So without further ado, I will

[David Miller - Century West] 17:26:50
to the chase.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:26:52
So alternative 1a which as you recall, is the shift of the

[David Miller - Century West] 17:26:59
highway, the first shift

[David Miller - Century West] 17:27:02
The estimate on that is approximately $185 million.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:27:08
And the second option, which is the larger highway shift, actually is lower. It's around $131 million.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:27:17
The main difference for this is the lack of acquisition of the hangers and the areas on the southeast side of the airport. There's a significant valuation associated with that.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:27:29
And then the option two is estimated at $190 million.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:27:36
So it is.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:27:39
although it avoids impacting

[David Miller - Century West] 17:27:42
the Hubbard Highway and the properties west of the Hubbard Highway is the third option or option alternative two

[David Miller - Century West] 17:27:50
clearly has the most significant impact on current facilities on the airport and adjacent to the airport east.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:28:02
And a note about this, these are the, as I said, these are the summary costs of the estimates.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:28:09
the draft project cost estimates will be discussed further at our December 12th meeting, and there will be detailed worksheets

[David Miller - Century West] 17:28:19
the detailed engineering cost breakouts will be provided.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:28:22
On the project website after this meeting.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:28:26

So you will be able to look at them and sort of detail out or get some idea of how we came up with the numbers.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:28:32
The other thing I would say about these sets of costs is to keep in mind that these costs represent

[David Miller - Century West] 17:28:38
the projects that are needed for the airfield to meet FAA standards. These are not the total

[David Miller - Century West] 17:28:44
costs of improvements of the airfield over the next 20 years. It would be a host of other improvement projects.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:28:50
But this is what we've tried to do is focus this on

[David Miller - Century West] 17:28:54
what work would be needed in these various options to meet the standards that have been stated.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:29:01
And then, as I said, on the December 12th meeting, we'll have a more robust CIP for the airport, which will include these costs, but will also include other maintenance related costs and other life cycle costs.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:29:14
Okay, Brandy, I think it's time for some clarifying questions.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:29:19
Okay, great. So there have been a couple of clarifying questions that have come in through the chat. I'm going to get to those and then I see Councillor Linville's hand is raised.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:29:28
So we are Tony Hebling asked, did I miss the part of the agenda where David was going to review feedback form results?

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:29:38
There were significant feedback. And yes, you're right, Tony, that is our next agenda item where we'll review the feedback form results from PAC members.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:29:49
So I think that was the only other clarifying question.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:29:54
So Councillor Linville, do you have clarifying questions from what David has presented?

[Councilor Dr. Joann Linville, City of Wilsonville] 17:30:00
I do.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:30:02
Great.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:30:04
Go ahead.

[Councilor Dr. Joann Linville, City of Wilsonville] 17:30:05
Thank you. Thank you, David. I have a question first about the pricing.

[Councilor Dr. Joann Linville, City of Wilsonville] 17:30:14
As you went through all of those alternatives.

[Councilor Dr. Joann Linville, City of Wilsonville] 17:30:18
does the cost

[Councilor Dr. Joann Linville, City of Wilsonville] 17:30:22
that o dot

[Councilor Dr. Joann Linville, City of Wilsonville] 17:30:24
Well, I guess…

[Councilor Dr. Joann Linville, City of Wilsonville] 17:30:27
Would ODOT be responsible for a portion of those costs or

[Councilor Dr. Joann Linville, City of Wilsonville] 17:30:32
Or is what ODOT's portion

[Councilor Dr. Joann Linville, City of Wilsonville] 17:30:36
not included in the total

[Councilor Dr. Joann Linville, City of Wilsonville] 17:30:40
cost estimates for

[Councilor Dr. Joann Linville, City of Wilsonville] 17:30:43
those alternatives, especially 1A and 1B.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:30:47
Okay, sure. And I see by ODOT you mean the highway side of the department, not

[Councilor Dr. Joann Linville, City of Wilsonville] 17:30:50
Yeah, the movement of the Hubbard Highway.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:30:53
Right. The answer is no, we have not allocated shares, if you will, of the cost at this point.

[Councilor Dr. Joann Linville, City of Wilsonville] 17:30:54

Mm-hmm.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:31:03
The other part of the answer is that this is the total cost of the project at a planning level estimate.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:31:11
the determination of eligibility is done on a project by project basis, if you will, within that.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:31:18
So in our capital improvement program, when we developed that.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:31:23
Each individual project will be identified. The majority of the airfield related things and likely a majority of the highway related costs would be

[David Miller - Century West] 17:31:32
eligible for FAA funding. The percentages may vary depending on the authorization bills that are in place at the time of the project.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:31:39
ODAB is a sponsor. It would be responsible for a local match.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:31:43
Discussions between all the parties, including ODOT, for cost of highways, I think would

[David Miller - Century West] 17:31:49
would be…

[David Miller - Century West] 17:31:51
Worked out through the implementation program. So that's but

[David Miller - Century West] 17:31:56
to your point, the costs are all inclusive not

[David Miller - Century West] 17:32:00
broken out just FA or just ODF.

[Councilor Dr. Joann Linville, City of Wilsonville] 17:32:02
But you're saying that those alternatives do include

[Councilor Dr. Joann Linville, City of Wilsonville] 17:32:09
what it would cost to move that highway.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:32:12
Correct. Yes.

[Councilor Dr. Joann Linville, City of Wilsonville] 17:32:13

Okay. And in alternative two.

[Councilor Dr. Joann Linville, City of Wilsonville] 17:32:18
then I assume since you said it likely would require

[Councilor Dr. Joann Linville, City of Wilsonville] 17:32:24
a replacement of the runway, in essence. Is that included in that

[Councilor Dr. Joann Linville, City of Wilsonville] 17:32:31
price of 190 million.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:32:32
Yes, it is. And yes, just to clarify

[Councilor Dr. Joann Linville, City of Wilsonville] 17:32:34
It is.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:32:37
in among the three alternatives.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:32:39
1A, 1B, and 2.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:32:41
Only alternative one

[David Miller - Century West] 17:32:44
utilizes the existing runway.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:32:47
Alternative 1B and 2 require a brand new runway that's shifted laterally

[David Miller - Century West] 17:32:53
a relatively small amount, but it ends up being a

[David Miller - Century West] 17:32:56
an entirely new runway and parallel taxiway so

[David Miller - Century West] 17:33:00
Yes.

[Councilor Dr. Joann Linville, City of Wilsonville] 17:33:02
Thank you.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:33:05
Great. And then Tony Helbling has a question.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:33:11
And then we have a few more that have come through chat.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:33:13
So Tony, let me find your name. I had to find you and then unmute you. Let me see where you are.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:33:14
Okay.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:33:21
Okay.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:33:22
Oh, there you are. Okay.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:33:25
you should be able to unmute now.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 17:33:29
Okay, am I here?

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:33:30
Great. Yes.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:33:31
Yep.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 17:33:31
Sorry, I don't know how to raise my hand on this thing.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:33:33
No worries, no worries. Anyone can just send me a message. Yeah.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 17:33:34
Okay, hey.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 17:33:36
Well, first off.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 17:33:38
the first time as a PAC member, we were allowed to see these were the night they were presented and there was a question at the time

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 17:33:46
for us to ask. And I'm not going to speak for the other PAC members. I'm going to speak for myself.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 17:33:52
I was so floored and shocked.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 17:33:55
with these alternatives

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 17:33:57
And the way that they weren't shared with us prior to that meeting, we only found out about them and then asked and then got a very, very, very short time to respond

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 17:34:08
essentially the taking of private property

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 17:34:11
it.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 17:34:13
an evaluated market cost, which is always going to be worth less than what it is. It doesn't include the costs of moving our businesses, et cetera.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 17:34:19
I mean, we're floored. And then we were told that it wouldn't be delayed. We got a one week extension.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 17:34:26
But I guess one of the questions I have for David and or whoever else wants to answer this

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 17:34:32
The basis for these alternatives

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 17:34:35
is that the FAA is not going to allow modifications to standard, nor are they going to fund

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 17:34:43
airport improvements

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 17:34:45
on an airport that is not in compliance

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 17:34:48
with FAA design standards.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 17:34:52
who at the FAA is saying that? We can't find that person.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 17:34:57
And the thing is.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 17:35:00
This is so damaging.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 17:35:02
to private property on both sides of the highway

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 17:35:06
for a state agency to even explore things like this

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 17:35:11
that probably will never happen

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 17:35:14
But it damages so many people on both sides of the highway. This is just

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 17:35:19
It's just crazy. So who at the FAA is telling you that who is

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 17:35:24
what is the source that no modifications to standards will be allowed?

[David Miller - Century West] 17:35:30
Well, I can start with that. And I think Tim House from the FAA Seattle Airport District Office is on the call and he will probably jump in and give you the official

[David Miller - Century West] 17:35:40
The information that we've provided, been provided by the FAA throughout this process is that the expectation is that

[David Miller - Century West] 17:35:48
The master plan will identify a path to conformance with standards and that

[David Miller - Century West] 17:35:54
that was throughout the FAA agency contacts that we had, but clarification was

[David Miller - Century West] 17:36:02
requested from the FAA back in March, and Tim provided an email to that effect which said that the FA would not consider modification standards.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:36:11
for a runway extension and i think that that

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 17:36:13
Is that a legal opinion?

[David Miller - Century West] 17:36:16
I'm not going to offer a comment on that. I'd let Tim perhaps clarify if he would like to.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:36:22
Yeah, Tim, are you there?

[Tim House - FAA] 17:36:27
Yeah, I'm working with a slightly different computer setup tonight, so pardon my

timing on coming on there.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:36:30
Okay.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:36:30
Thank you.

[Tim House - FAA] 17:36:34
So the question

[Tim House - FAA] 17:36:36
was, is that a legal opinion?

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 17:36:39
Yeah. And Tim, you and I have spoken on the phone, but

[Tim House - FAA] 17:36:40
Okay.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 17:36:42
Is it a legal opinion or a legal position that the FAA is taking that there will be no

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 17:36:48
modifications to standard?

[Tim House - FAA] 17:36:50
I am not an attorney, and there is a

[Tim House - FAA] 17:36:55
you know, legal department at the faa

[Tim House - FAA] 17:36:58
But no, to think that that's a legal opinion, I mean, I think that usually comes down through a court ruling or something like that would be my assumption on that.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 17:37:08
Is there, I mean, some basis, I mean, if you're sharing with the state of oregon

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 17:37:14
that modifications to standard won't be allowed and therefore

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 17:37:18
the state needs to put together a plan that could end up damaging private property

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 17:37:23
I mean, there's got to be some basis in fact

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 17:37:28

of that direction from the FAA.

[Tim House - FAA] 17:37:31
So they are following advisory circulars.

[Tim House - FAA] 17:37:35
And FAA orders.

[Tim House - FAA] 17:37:37
to prepare the master plan.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 17:37:40
I got you. But there's also FAA directives and guidance that explains that modifications to standard can be issued if a risk analysis is conducted and those are properly applied for.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 17:37:53
So I guess then the question then is rather than go down

[Tim House - FAA] 17:37:55
That is not a part of the master plan.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 17:37:59
Well, and see the challenge that the state of Oregon faces

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 17:38:03
is there's an Oregon state statute that says the Oregon Department of Aviation is supposed to protect the investment made and good by faith in good faith.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 17:38:13
by…

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 17:38:14
private property owners through the fence property owners

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 17:38:18
And that creates a situation where ODAV is now advocating for the destruction, or they're not advocating for the protection of that property.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 17:38:26
They're advocating for the destruction of that property.

[Tim House - FAA] 17:38:30
I knew it.

[Tim House - FAA] 17:38:32
That's your opinion, I understand.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 17:38:33
Well, I mean, I can send you the statute.

[Tim House - FAA] 17:38:36
I don't need the statute. I'm following my FAA advisory circulars.

[Tim House - FAA] 17:38:42
And the FAA orders.

[Tim House - FAA] 17:38:43
to make sure that they're following those

[Tim House - FAA] 17:38:45
to prepare the master plan.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:38:48
And…

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 17:38:48
Well, I think we can agree to disagree on that one.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:38:50
Sorry, just to chime in really quickly, there was a question about who they is. And so, Tim, are you saying that

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 17:38:51
The…

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:38:58
ODAB is using the circulars.

[Tim House - FAA] 17:39:01
ODAV and their consultant, Century West.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:39:03
Okay, great.

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 17:39:04
If I can clarify too um

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 17:39:07
The ORS on ODAVs

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 17:39:09
pilot through the fence program.

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 17:39:11
is separate from the federal requirements for FAA master plans for our federally obligated airports.

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 17:39:18
So they are two separate things and we're following the federal requirements and and

as

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 17:39:22
Tim mentioned the standards and and

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 17:39:25
advisory circular for master plans.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 17:39:29
Well, I guess what I'm saying is there needs to be an effort on the state of Oregon's part to protect the private investment

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 17:39:35
But at the same time, I wanted in the record that I believe there is also FAA guidance

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 17:39:42
four master plans that the master plan proposals or alternatives that presented

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 17:39:46
need to be realistic and achievable.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 17:39:50
And these alternatives are not really realistic, nor are they achievable.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 17:39:55
But what they do is set up a situation where the state of Oregon

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 17:40:00
who doesn't have the money, the FAA doesn't have money.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 17:40:03
but it it

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 17:40:05
basically paints the airport into a box.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 17:40:07
Additionally, I have an additional question, if that's okay, Brandy, since I've got the floor. Is that okay

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:40:13
Sure. And then we have several other questions that have come in through the chat. And I know we want to get through.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 17:40:17
Sure.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 17:40:18
Okay, I'll wait if you want me to and come back to it.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:40:21
Okay, is that all right, Tony? And then we can…

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 17:40:22
That's fine with me. I still got my hand up so

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:40:24
Okay. Okay. Yeah.

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 17:40:24
We are going to address some of the um

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 17:40:26
Thanks.

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 17:40:30
Some of the concerns that Tony just raised in the later part of the presentation as well.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:40:34
Okay, great. Yeah, thanks for clarifying so hopefully

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:40:38
the presentation will help answer a few of these things. And then Tony, I'll just flag it that you have a follow-up question. And if you don't by that time, then you can say that.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 17:40:50
Well, I'd like to get this question before we move out of this segment, please.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:40:54
Sure. Sounds good.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:40:56
Okay, so I see a question from Bill Graup saying, are the 2025 cost estimates

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:41:04
Oh, sorry, are these 2025 cost estimates or is there some

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:41:10
CPI index cost based on a 10-year outlook.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:41:15
Great question. These cost estimates are based on 2024 dollars because we have just prepared them in the last 30 to 45 days.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:41:26
Since our prior meeting. So the way that works

[David Miller - Century West] 17:41:30
from an airport management standpoint is

[David Miller - Century West] 17:41:34
When the capital improvement program is put together, there's a CPI index, which

[David Miller - Century West] 17:41:39
ties to the base here, the cost year and then

[David Miller - Century West] 17:41:43
as well.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:41:45
implementation goes forward in future years, the CPI at that time can be applied

[David Miller - Century West] 17:41:49
And there's a formula to make adjustments. So that's how that

[David Miller - Century West] 17:41:53
So to answer your question, the costs are current year costs.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:41:57
And at the point of implementation, they will need to be adjusted at the time of design.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:42:04
Okay, great. And then it looks like I think David Malk with Charbonneau asks, what's average cost for Oregon State airports for their most recent plans and what is highest cost for an ODAV project and FAA project in Oregon or Washington?

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:42:24
I'm not sure if you have that, David. Maybe that's something that we can follow up on.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:42:27
i i

[David Miller - Century West] 17:42:29
I do not. That would be a Tony question, I think, and maybe need some research. It's an interesting question.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:42:32
Okay.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:42:38
So Tony, unless you go off mute, I'm going to assume that you probably need some more time to find an answer for that.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:42:48
And then I see a question.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:42:51
hear from Councillor Linville, have the cost estimates been presented to the ODAV board, and if so what

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:42:59
has been their concerns.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:43:05
I'll let Tony answer that, but my understanding is they have not been presented to the board formally this is the

[David Miller - Century West] 17:43:13
presentation for the benefit of the PAC.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:43:15
They were developed by our staff, coordinated with Tony and his staff at the Department of Aviation.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:43:23
So this is really the earliest

[David Miller - Century West] 17:43:25
earliest looks at these numbers and

[David Miller - Century West] 17:43:28
We expect comments from all quarters.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:43:32
Okay, great. Thank you.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:43:35
And then I see Dave Tibbetts has a question let me

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:43:42
Let me get to you, Dave, and then um

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:43:46
And then I see Ben Williams, you have your hand raised as well. So we'll come back to you and then we'll circle back with Tony Hubbley.

[Dave Tibbetts, Columbia Helicopters] 17:43:53
Yeah, Brandy, thank you. Dave Sivets here from Columbia Helicopters.

[Dave Tibbetts, Columbia Helicopters] 17:43:57
I'm interested in understanding what this uh

[Dave Tibbetts, Columbia Helicopters] 17:44:01
zone that goes right through Columbia's property is this RPZ zone.

[Dave Tibbetts, Columbia Helicopters] 17:44:05
Does that mean we have to clear out?

[David Miller - Century West] 17:44:06
Sure.

[Dave Tibbetts, Columbia Helicopters] 17:44:07
What is that?

[David Miller - Century West] 17:44:08
Runway protection zone is an FA designed surface, if you will, that, as you know.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:44:16
is located off typically off the ends of a runway

[David Miller - Century West] 17:44:20
sort of aligns with an approach surface, which is a similar shape, but they have different purposes.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:44:26
The FAA's interest in runway protection zones is that number one, airports should control them.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:44:31
And that can either be accommodated through or accomplished through ownership or easement.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:44:37
The main concern is that from the FAA perspective is to

[David Miller - Century West] 17:44:42
eliminate or reduce incompatible land uses in one-way protection zones.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:44:46
So I think the short answer is that would be something that wouldn't necessarily require acquisition. If an easement could be acquired to secure that and the criteria for compatible land use was met, I think that's

[David Miller - Century West] 17:45:03
That would be an item that would be discussed between the principals, the property owner and the airport FAA.

[Dave Tibbetts, Columbia Helicopters] 17:45:11
So that goes right through our main building.

[Dave Tibbetts, Columbia Helicopters] 17:45:14
And I guess I'd like to understand that, you know, this is a company that's been here for

[David Miller - Century West] 17:45:19

No.

[Dave Tibbetts, Columbia Helicopters] 17:45:19
50 years on this airport. In fact, the airport's named after our founder.

[Dave Tibbetts, Columbia Helicopters] 17:45:22
We employ hundreds of people.

[Dave Tibbetts, Columbia Helicopters] 17:45:25
with good paying jobs.

[Dave Tibbetts, Columbia Helicopters] 17:45:27
And it's a little shocking to see that go right through the middle of our building and say that's the best plan.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:45:32
Well, I think there are a couple of factors. The runway approach surface, which, as I said, is different than the RPZ, but it is essentially the same footprint, has always gone over your building.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:45:43
To that extent. And I know that shifting north will bring

[David Miller - Century West] 17:45:47
that closer, but at this stage the um

[David Miller - Century West] 17:45:54
the uh

[David Miller - Century West] 17:45:56
costs of conforming, let me put it this way, the costs of these prices these alternatives

[David Miller - Century West] 17:46:03
does not include property acquisition within the runway protection zone.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:46:08
And that is because there are other options typically available to airports to satisfy the FAA's concerns.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:46:15
So, um.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:46:17
Unless I am mistaken, the wider runway protection zone coverage over your property does not

[David Miller - Century West] 17:46:25
necessarily translate into the need for ODAF to acquire your property.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:46:28
Now, I would point out we had conversations about this throughout the early stages of the master plan, and it related the width of the runway protection zone itself.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:46:37
is driven by the approach visibility minimums for the runway.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:46:42
And with visibility below the one mile level, that's where the larger RPC comes into play.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:46:50
with either the old three quarters of a mile or seven eighths of a mile minimums, the wider RPZ is required.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:46:57
So it is a conversation that has been circulating over the last year or two that

[David Miller - Century West] 17:47:04
You know, there are options available to reduce the visibility minimums on the approaches by that one eighth of a mile.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:47:11
That's kind of an off-topic conversation, but that is one of the considerations in terms of size of RPCs.

[Dave Tibbetts, Columbia Helicopters] 17:47:19
Yeah, it's just curious that this

[Dave Tibbetts, Columbia Helicopters] 17:47:22
isn't at the south end where there's no buildings.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:47:25
Thank you.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:47:26
Right, I understand.

[Dave Tibbetts, Columbia Helicopters] 17:47:30
Thank you. Appreciate it.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:47:32
Thanks, Steve. So Ben, I see you're next.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:47:33
Okay.

[Ben Williams, Friends of French Prairie] 17:47:39
Great, thank you, Brandy. So I put this in the chat, but I think I, for one, would really like Tim House to answer the question.

[Ben Williams, Friends of French Prairie] 17:47:51
It started when Tony Helpling put the proposition to him about

[Ben Williams, Friends of French Prairie] 17:47:57
a legal opinion.

[Ben Williams, Friends of French Prairie] 17:47:59
And his response was, I'm not an attorney, blah, blah, blah.

[Ben Williams, Friends of French Prairie] 17:48:04
um but

[Ben Williams, Friends of French Prairie] 17:48:05
Then he said they are following advisory circulars in the context of statements about the FAA.

[Ben Williams, Friends of French Prairie] 17:48:14
Then he qualified it to make it sound like, no, it wasn't the FAA. They was me with ODAF and Century West.

[Ben Williams, Friends of French Prairie] 17:48:22
So I want to be clear, given the scope and scale of these three alternatives, financial and otherwise.

[Ben Williams, Friends of French Prairie] 17:48:30
Whether the decisions were made at the regional level, that is locally.

[Ben Williams, Friends of French Prairie] 17:48:36
Tim House, O'Dav, and Century West with nobody else in the FAA involved because

[Ben Williams, Friends of French Prairie] 17:48:43
As the last PAC meeting ended i mean

[Ben Williams, Friends of French Prairie] 17:48:47
The aviation board members that were on the call were like in shock about the scope

[Ben Williams, Friends of French Prairie] 17:48:52
and the potential impact on the regional aviation system.

[Ben Williams, Friends of French Prairie] 17:48:56
I mean, are these just being made locally? Who is the they in that statement?

[David Miller - Century West] 17:49:04
I'll let Tim, yeah.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:49:04
Yeah, so sorry, just let me jump in really quickly. Thank you for your comment and question, Ben. Accidentally, you just sent your comment to me and so no one else saw that. So I just added it in the chat so that everyone can see your previous message.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:49:06
Oh, sorry.

[Ben Williams, Friends of French Prairie] 17:49:21
Thank you.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:49:21
So yeah, yeah, definitely. So, okay, David, I'll let you take that.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:49:26
Yeah, I'll let Tim respond to Ben's comment specifically, but I can go back to, and I think this

[David Miller - Century West] 17:49:33
Copy of Tim's email is in our, I believe it's in our project um

[David Miller - Century West] 17:49:39
public information piece of the

[Ben Williams, Friends of French Prairie] 17:49:40
Yeah, and I think we've all seen Tim's email, which was delivered before the open house at North Marion, right? The result of which was pulling the B2 revision alternatives.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:49:42
Awesome.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:49:47
Yeah.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:49:52
Now, I'm actually speaking of a different email. I apologize. This is an email Tim sent. There were questions raised in March, this goes back to March, about

[Ben Williams, Friends of French Prairie] 17:49:55
Okay.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:50:01
the ability, the FA gets some clarification from the FAA on the ability to entertain a modification standards.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:50:10
And in his email, which will be in the record here, he made it clear that the question, once it was presented to FA, was asked at both

[David Miller - Century West] 17:50:20
The regional level management and the Seattle Airport District Office

[David Miller - Century West] 17:50:26

off a management level. So I think that answers your question partly. It isn't just Tim House. It's his

[David Miller - Century West] 17:50:32
administration in the Seattle Airport District Office.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:50:34
And beyond that, it's the administration in the regional office. So Tim, if I got off

[David Miller - Century West] 17:50:39
If you've got any of that wrong, just go ahead and correct me.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:50:42
But that was our understanding. So just to clarify the they on our side of the house, Century West working, we're the consultant working for the Department of Aviation.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:50:52
And our task in this mixture is to apply the design standards

[David Miller - Century West] 17:50:58
as they're written and as they're applied by FAA, the expectation of FAA is that when an airport layout plan is presented for approval, it will meet their expectations or requirements.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:51:12
If Tim's available, you could straighten me out.

[Tim House - FAA] 17:51:17
No, I think you said it very clearly.

[Tim House - FAA] 17:51:21
The FAA is not preparing this master plan. This master plan is being prepared by the sponsor.

[Tim House - FAA] 17:51:29
Which is the state in this case, which is the owner of the airport.

[Tim House - FAA] 17:51:34
They have hired a consultant.

[Tim House - FAA] 17:51:36
That is Century West.

[Tim House - FAA] 17:51:39
they are following.

[Tim House - FAA] 17:51:41
the advisory circulars on the preparation of this master plan.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:51:42
Thank you.

[Tim House - FAA] 17:51:46
Is that what you were asking?

[Ben Williams, Friends of French Prairie] 17:51:50
Well, that was part of what I'm asking, but the other part of it was in Dave's response, which was

[Ben Williams, Friends of French Prairie] 17:51:55
that the input that led to these three alternatives and the jettisoning of all the other alternatives

[Ben Williams, Friends of French Prairie] 17:52:03
came from managerial or administrative input from the Seattle office level and the regional level, which is

[Ben Williams, Friends of French Prairie] 17:52:10
I think that's Western US or the major part of the Western US.

[Ben Williams, Friends of French Prairie] 17:52:15
It's considerably higher level than just what I would call local Oregon.

[Ben Williams, Friends of French Prairie] 17:52:22
Right?

[Tim House - FAA] 17:52:27
So…

[Tim House - FAA] 17:52:29
We are not. We are not. The FAA. Nobody at the FAA is putting together this plan.

[Ben Williams, Friends of French Prairie] 17:52:37
But the FAA is deciding what may or may not stay in the plan.

[Ben Williams, Friends of French Prairie] 17:52:41
So I fully understand the FAA is not doing the plan.

[Tim House - FAA] 17:52:42
Oh, no, we're not.

[Ben Williams, Friends of French Prairie] 17:52:44
But Tim, if you're saying these two revisions are not acceptable, the FAA has got a hand in shaping the plan. That's just…

[Tim House - FAA] 17:52:46
We go back to the email, go back to the email.

[Ben Williams, Friends of French Prairie] 17:52:53
Common sense.

[Tim House - FAA] 17:52:54
Nope. No, we don't.

[Tim House - FAA] 17:52:57
Go back to what the email says.

[Ben Williams, Friends of French Prairie] 17:52:57
Okay. Tony, here's another one we can all disagree on.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:53:03
Okay, so…

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:53:05
So I think maybe we can make sure that that email is shared and that there's clarity on

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:53:13
on this issue, I think I'm hearing that Ben is wondering who is involved and what the process is with FAA. And so I'm wondering if this is also going to be

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:53:27
I think we'll continue to have this

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:53:30
question um and so

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:53:31
I think we need to make sure that we have

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:53:34
a response that answers your question, Ben.

[Ben Williams, Friends of French Prairie] 17:53:38
Well, thank you for saying that and documenting it, because for those that weren't here.

[Ben Williams, Friends of French Prairie] 17:53:44
in the opposition to the 2012 master plan.

[Ben Williams, Friends of French Prairie] 17:53:48
They wouldn't have experienced the, what I at the time called ping pong, which is when Odev got confronted with something that was a challenger they didn't like, they said it was the FAA. And conversely.

[Ben Williams, Friends of French Prairie] 17:54:01
So, you know, using the phrase the faa

[Ben Williams, Friends of French Prairie] 17:54:06
is not only vague.

[Ben Williams, Friends of French Prairie] 17:54:08
institutionally vaguely

[Ben Williams, Friends of French Prairie] 17:54:11
organizationally vague, but it ends up being double talk because it can mean any number of things.

[Ben Williams, Friends of French Prairie] 17:54:17
So Brandy, thanks for that.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:54:19
Yeah, I think let's make sure that I believe, and I think Samantha just pointed out that I believe this email is all posted on the website. And I just want to make sure that we get you the right information. And Tony, I see you went, your camera went on. So I'm wondering if you can share a little bit.

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 17:54:40
Yeah, I do want to remind everyone that a lot of the information

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 17:54:45
Especially a lot of these questions about roles, responsibilities, and master planning is in the introduction of

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 17:54:52
of the draft working paper, number one that we've gone over in previous PAC meetings. So you can reference prior material

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 17:54:59
to get answers to those questions and also the frequently asked questions in

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 17:55:04
on the project website and um

[David Miller - Century West] 17:55:07
Okay.

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 17:55:08
And if we can keep the questions focused to the content of this

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 17:55:13
the material that we're covering here in this meeting.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:55:16
Great. So I think let me i um

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:55:22
um i think

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:55:24
we can try to find the link to the fa

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:55:28
Hughes on the website to get you that information, Ben. And then we can, if it still doesn't feel like we have the answer, let's follow up on that because we want you to feel like you have the correct information.

[Ben Williams, Friends of French Prairie] 17:55:41
Okay, we've said enough on this point for tonight.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:55:44
Okay, great. So let's briefly check in with you, Tony Helbling, and then we can move to the

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:55:54
PAC responses that have come through and we will again continue to have some questions and conversation around these topics.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 17:56:02
Okay, real quick, before I get to the second question, I did look up real quick advisory circular 155, 5070-6.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 17:56:11
One of the things it talks about here is

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 17:56:14
a plan should be achievable

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 17:56:16
by incorporating realistic

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 17:56:20
forecast phase development strategies and prioritizing

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 17:56:24
prioritizing projects based on their feasibility and funding availability.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 17:56:28
what is being proposed is not feasible. It's not realistic. And I'm pushing back on tim

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 17:56:35
This is not what the FAA wants. And to tell us that we have to do it in accordance with the FAA and

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 17:56:42
you know that and and pushing back

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 17:56:46
Also, we've tried to have meetings with ODAV since the last PAC meeting to discuss some of this stuff, and we were told, no, we can't.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 17:56:53
this is the place that we have to discuss it.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 17:56:56
So what I want to do is make sure that Ben Williams gets his time to express his stuff

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 17:57:02
And I do and other PAC members without being told by somebody that's been covered previously.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 17:57:07
Kenji told us this is where this has to be discussed.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 17:57:11
So we need to be able to freely discuss it. And that takes me to my

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 17:57:15
My other question.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 17:57:17
hold tight. I got a road it out. Now I got to find it

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:57:21
Okay.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 17:57:23
Okay, in previous

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 17:57:25
chapters, we talked about, I'm going to talk about the two drain fields, the one on the north end and the one on the south end.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 17:57:31
In previous chapters, it was mentioned that these were to be studied.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 17:57:37
Now in this, in the proposed alternatives.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 17:57:40
In the same master plan.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 17:57:43
We're saying they have to go.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 17:57:45

A, what happened to the study and b

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 17:57:48
If it can be shown and we can prove

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 17:57:51
that they can be brought to within standards that the FAA requires to support emergency vehicles

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 17:57:57
and aircraft in the case of an overrun

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 17:58:01
Why are we having

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 17:58:03
what is the source that is forcing them to be removed or are calling for them to be removed?

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 17:58:09
when it can be clearly shown, then it can be made to comply with the standards.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:58:15
So Tony, I think you are prepping us for our next, not our next agenda item, but the one following that where we talk through

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:58:24
the preferred, the preliminary preferred alternative.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:58:28
So I know you just said like, don't push you to off, but I do know that David has some information to present and then we'll come to you first, okay? So.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 17:58:36
Right.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 17:58:41
Okay.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:58:42
So I have the question about the drain fields and the study and that removal and then

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:58:49
And then your previous question so um

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:58:51
I'm going to move us to the next part that David can review other comments that came in through PAC members.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:58:58
And then we will get to your questions to make sure that they're answered. And Tony, I'll check back in with you to make sure that we get those answered for you today, okay?

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 17:59:07
Okay, thank you.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 17:59:08
Good.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:59:08
Well, thank you. Thank you, Brandy. And thanks, Tony. We did in our comment themes, we do have an entire slide dedicated in the drain field. So hopefully that'll help.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:59:18
the discussion. So as Brandy mentioned, we have we wanted to provide some information on the PAC feedback

[David Miller - Century West] 17:59:28
So this is pretty general. I mean, let me preface it by saying that

[David Miller - Century West] 17:59:35
these

[David Miller - Century West] 17:59:37
feedback loops, if you will

[David Miller - Century West] 17:59:39
constituted 12 people, 12 of the PAC members provided feedback. So it's not a full pack representation, but this was the group that provided input.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:59:50
And I won't go through them in detail, but just across the board from left to right, I mean, about half the people use the airport, half don't.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:59:57
We asked the question about the alternatives, ranking the alternatives, that was the 1A, 1B, and the 2, and they ended up basically evenly split.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:00:08
And we did down the bottom, we highlighted the sort of the very simplified scoring system we used from a, you know, no response to most preferred. And like I said, we ended up with a pretty even split between the applicants or the respondents rather.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:00:27
On the air side piece, the question was.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:00:30
The question was phrased, which direction should the runway shift in order to meet

C2 standards?

[David Miller - Century West] 18:00:39
So understanding that not everyone believes the airport needs to meet C2 standards, that is the question.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:00:45
More than half of the people that responded

[David Miller - Century West] 18:00:48
on that question, said don't shift at all.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:00:51
Which actually is contained in alternative 1A, the preferred alternative that doesn't shift the runway.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:00:57
And then the remaining four individuals were divided between an east shift and a west shift.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:01:03
On the land side, the general question was if the airport runs out of developable land for landside facilities, once at that capacity, should ODOT consider acquiring additional property?

[David Miller - Century West] 18:01:13
The PAC weighed in on this. It was split, but more people said yes than no.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:01:17
So those were just general bits of feedback.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:01:21
Let's see, sorry.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:01:23
Then we ask questions about, we're trying to get some handle on how the choices were influenced in the alternatives, the ranked alternatives or what concerns ODEV

[David Miller - Century West] 18:01:35
I should consider as they make a recommendation. As you can see, it's very much varied i mean much

[David Miller - Century West] 18:01:42
a wide range of

[David Miller - Century West] 18:01:45
concerns and interests. And I won't go through them all, but when you have a chance to look at the PowerPoint presentation on the website, the project site, you can kind of

[David Miller - Century West] 18:01:54
clean this. And I think the actual pack feedback forms are also incorporated into the response.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:02:01
So that was just a little bit of an overview of the flavor of the input that we received.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:02:08
As far as themes, modification of standards was at the top of a lot of people's list.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:02:15
And as Tim said, I think.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:02:18
we know no differently from our perspective.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:02:21
The FAA's position on modification standards in general

[David Miller - Century West] 18:02:25
has changed over the last number of years. And I'd say certainly since the last master plan was completed.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:02:32
And I don't want to get sidetracked, but the short answer to that is.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:02:36
Even when the FA considers a modification of standards, it's considered to be temporary.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:02:41
And there must be a path to conformance to standards associated with that.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:02:46
The FAA has also moved away from linking modification of standards to ALP approvals.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:02:53
Which is the next point below. Right now, the current direction from FAA, current guidance in their advisory circulars and their orders and technical bulletins.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:03:03
is that modification of the standards are considered the project level. In other words, when you're designing, constructing a project.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:03:11
But there again, they still, even if they consider Ahmad in those situations, they are temporary or interim and they expect that there is a future path to conformance.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:03:25
The next bullet, there was a lot of, I think there was a natural misunderstanding that there was a modification of standards issued in

[David Miller - Century West] 18:03:35
connection with the approval of the 2012 airport layout plan. And in researching it, we find, no, there wasn't. The ALP made a note that Ahmad would be requested.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:03:45
But even in 2012, the modification of standards process was separate from the airport layout plan approval.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:03:52
And approving ALP, even if it suggests the mod would be appropriate, doesn't guarantee that a mod would be issued.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:04:00
There was a question about moving toward conformance by shifting the fence away from the or closer to the highway. And while it could be argued that that could improve safety by adding some separation between the runway and the fence.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:04:16
It still would be in the object-free area for the runway, as is the highway.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:04:21
So relocating both the highway and the fence is really needed to

[David Miller - Century West] 18:04:26
to accomplish that.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:04:31
Then there to the drain field theme, they're

[David Miller - Century West] 18:04:34
There are a lot of questions about that, understandably. So the one question is, why are there no proposed locations for relocating?

[David Miller - Century West] 18:04:41
the drain fields and drain fields, as everyone understands, I think, are privately owned and they're on leased ground on the airport.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:04:51
And they don't meet the C2 standards for runway safety area.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:04:55
compaction and and um

[David Miller - Century West] 18:04:59
design. So the, uh.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:05:02
recommendation is that they would be removed.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:05:04
And the replacement would be the responsibility of the owners of the drain fields.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:05:10
There's a question whether the drain fields were actually approved by the FAA in their current locations at the time of construction.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:05:17
He could not find no record of FAA involvement in a review or an approval, but even if there had been an approval, it appears that at the time of construction.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:05:30
design standards B2 are associated with the runway, not C2.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:05:35
So the grain fields in their locations originally did not conflict with the runway safety area for B2 standards.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:05:45
But they clearly do today.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:05:48
at the south end and they will in the future with the runway extension from North End.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:05:53
Question, and this was, I think, Tony's comment about modifying the drain fields and study to be done. And I think the references in the earlier chapters just indicated that it required additional evaluation and

[David Miller - Century West] 18:06:08
What we have since learned is that structural enhancements have been evaluated. Understanding is ODEP, and if they have looked at that and they found that there are some technical issues that don't meet grade net standards and there's some question about the ability of the drain field to function.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:06:24
So I'm not going to argue engineering on that point, but the point is that it was addressed

[David Miller - Century West] 18:06:31
evaluated, and I'm sure we can obtain additional information on what went into that but also

[David Miller - Century West] 18:06:37
or the direction that

[David Miller - Century West] 18:06:39
Our team has received is the relocation is the best option.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:06:50
then there are questions about the vehicle service road and why is it parallel to the taxiway. And I think this is part coming out of the safety action team's evaluations. But essentially.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:07:02
The simple answer is that a clear line of sight, clear path for vehicles

[David Miller - Century West] 18:07:07
provides a safer operating environment, aircraft and vehicles are going to interact at every option and every every

[David Miller - Century West] 18:07:14
crossing on a taxi lane and the less meandering the road is to say for the operation will be.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:07:25
Then there's the comment, we've covered this in the last two or three meetings about the concern about

[David Miller - Century West] 18:07:32
showing the areas for long-term aeronautic reserve, and it's understood, we understand that. I think ODAB does as well.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:07:40
Simply stated, as we mentioned in the other meetings, the intent here, Biodev is to identify the properties that would be acquired

[David Miller - Century West] 18:07:50
from willing sellers.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:07:52
If and when they become available. And that's simply a way to allow those parcels potentially to be eligible for FAA funding.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:08:01
If they're depicted on the airport layout plan.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:08:04
As I said, that's a situation where that would be initiated and a willing seller situation that would be initiated by the property owner.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:08:12
when it comes to the reserve.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:08:15
Then the other comment about there's a question, could the Hubbard Highway be

rerouted along Boone's Ferry Road? And that's a great question because it's actually, when I mentioned the concept planning.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:08:25
one of the concept ideas that we were kicking around for a while was a fairly dramatic realignment of Highway 551.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:08:34
It was evaluated, but well, it's discarded for a lot of reasons, including the impact on the adjacent properties, which would be much more significant than what we consider a

[David Miller - Century West] 18:08:47
the less

[David Miller - Century West] 18:08:49
dramatic realignment. I know we heard comments in the preliminary alternative stage about concerns about the feasibility of even realigning a small amount of the highway. And I think that a major realignment on Boone's Ferry Road would be even more significant.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:09:04
So that's kind of a wrap on the comment themes and we can probably go on to clarifying questions again.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 18:09:12
Yeah, and David, I'm wondering if um

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 18:09:15
you could stop sharing your screen and then um

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 18:09:19
And then we'll take some questions, clarifying questions about

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 18:09:26
about what David just presented. And then I think we'll probably all need just like a little break

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 18:09:32
I know this is a lot of information to get through and we've been sitting here for an hour straight. So we'll take a little break after clarifying questions before we get into the next agenda item.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:09:40
Yeah.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:09:45
Okay. Thanks, Brandy. Did that work? I pushed the button.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 18:09:48

No, I still see it, but that's okay.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:09:50
Okay. Oh, wait.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:09:54
I'm just…

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 18:09:54
So I see Councillor Linville and then Bruce Bennett so

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 18:09:59
I'm going to go to you, Councillor Linbell.

[Councilor Dr. Joann Linville, City of Wilsonville] 18:10:05
Thank you, Brandy. I put my question in the chat and I think it was overlooked.

[Councilor Dr. Joann Linville, City of Wilsonville] 18:10:13
And it's just to help a reminder again about

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 18:10:14
Okay.

[Councilor Dr. Joann Linville, City of Wilsonville] 18:10:19
And I think David has made this comment a couple of times.

[Councilor Dr. Joann Linville, City of Wilsonville] 18:10:23
So my question was.

[Councilor Dr. Joann Linville, City of Wilsonville] 18:10:26
Would all of these modifications be required?

[Councilor Dr. Joann Linville, City of Wilsonville] 18:10:31
If the airport remained as a b2

[Councilor Dr. Joann Linville, City of Wilsonville] 18:10:35
Rather than moving to a C2.

[Councilor Dr. Joann Linville, City of Wilsonville] 18:10:38
Would all of these things still be required? And it's just to help refresh my memory. Thank you.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 18:10:43
Great. Yeah. Sorry about missing that one earlier.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:10:50
So the simple answer is if the airport was a B2 airport.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:10:55
the requirements would not be the same.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:10:57
But as the FAA indicated prior to our June meeting, the airport is currently a C2 airport. The activity currently supports the C2 and the future activity also supports C2.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:11:10
Those are the standards that we're required to apply.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 18:11:15
Tim, did you want to add anything there?

[Tim House - FAA] 18:11:23
Sorry, again, my…

[Tim House - FAA] 18:11:25
computer setup is strange for me today, so it took me a minute.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 18:11:28
No worries.

[Tim House - FAA] 18:11:30
Okay, you're still showing, so I don't know if I've got my camera on right or not but

[Tim House - FAA] 18:11:36
No, I mean, David said that.

[Tim House - FAA] 18:11:38
Exactly right.

[Tim House - FAA] 18:11:40
So it's

[Tim House - FAA] 18:11:43
the number of operations that have occurred

[Tim House - FAA] 18:11:46
indicate that it is currently a C2 airport. So there is no move to a C2. It is currently a C2.

[Tim House - FAA] 18:11:55
And if we were B2, like David said.

[Tim House - FAA] 18:11:59
the standards that are required would be different.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 18:12:06
Okay, great.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 18:12:09
Okay, Bruce Bennett.

[Bruce Bennett, Airport business & property owner since 1968] 18:12:15
Thank you. I just wanted to say how this is extremely important to me.

[Bruce Bennett, Airport business & property owner since 1968] 18:12:21
You know, my family has owned property out there for 56 years

[Bruce Bennett, Airport business & property owner since 1968] 18:12:25
I've been flying at an airport for 52 years.

[Bruce Bennett, Airport business & property owner since 1968] 18:12:28
And I finally like my life depends on it.

[Bruce Bennett, Airport business & property owner since 1968] 18:12:32
I don't.

[Bruce Bennett, Airport business & property owner since 1968] 18:12:34
a question slash request.

[Bruce Bennett, Airport business & property owner since 1968] 18:12:36
Following up on what Tony said.

[Bruce Bennett, Airport business & property owner since 1968] 18:12:40
is the

[Bruce Bennett, Airport business & property owner since 1968] 18:12:42
the reasonability, the likelihood.

[Bruce Bennett, Airport business & property owner since 1968] 18:12:45
we're talking about $200 million.

[Bruce Bennett, Airport business & property owner since 1968] 18:12:49
And I'm sure it would run significantly more than that knowing that

[Bruce Bennett, Airport business & property owner since 1968] 18:12:55
the value, I don't know if you're aware that there's currently a significant hangar

[Bruce Bennett, Airport business & property owner since 1968] 18:13:00
just beginning construction right now

[Bruce Bennett, Airport business & property owner since 1968] 18:13:03
in that line along with the line of the rest of the hangers.

[Bruce Bennett, Airport business & property owner since 1968] 18:13:07
But my point is.

[Bruce Bennett, Airport business & property owner since 1968] 18:13:08
that uh not

[Bruce Bennett, Airport business & property owner since 1968] 18:13:10
I'm really impressed with ODAL.

[Bruce Bennett, Airport business & property owner since 1968] 18:13:14
with the planner and mostly with everyone that's taking their time

[Bruce Bennett, Airport business & property owner since 1968] 18:13:19
But I think it's the reality check is really important

[Bruce Bennett, Airport business & property owner since 1968] 18:13:25
we've been working on uh

[Bruce Bennett, Airport business & property owner since 1968] 18:13:28
important and safety important safety

[Bruce Bennett, Airport business & property owner since 1968] 18:13:30
correction, but the obstacle clearance for years

[Bruce Bennett, Airport business & property owner since 1968] 18:13:36
and and uh

[Bruce Bennett, Airport business & property owner since 1968] 18:13:38
It's nowhere near what we're talking about now. So I think an impossible plan is really not a plan.

[Bruce Bennett, Airport business & property owner since 1968] 18:13:46
So I'd really ask that we limit

[Bruce Bennett, Airport business & property owner since 1968] 18:13:51
the options, things that are within the realm of possibility

[David Miller - Century West] 18:13:53
Okay.

[Bruce Bennett, Airport business & property owner since 1968] 18:13:56
Not easy, certainly not maybe likely but not likely

[Bruce Bennett, Airport business & property owner since 1968] 18:14:01
But just looking at where we are and what we've done in the past.

[Bruce Bennett, Airport business & property owner since 1968] 18:14:06
the likelihood of ever getting done is

[Bruce Bennett, Airport business & property owner since 1968] 18:14:11
Just like the FA quotes, it has to be something that can happen.

[Bruce Bennett, Airport business & property owner since 1968] 18:14:15
And so that's my strong concern.

[Bruce Bennett, Airport business & property owner since 1968] 18:14:20
And a tiny piece of that kind of big picture

[Bruce Bennett, Airport business & property owner since 1968] 18:14:23
is the the

[Bruce Bennett, Airport business & property owner since 1968] 18:14:26
the vehicle service road

[Bruce Bennett, Airport business & property owner since 1968] 18:14:28
I think it's a terrible idea to put it. I think it's critical that that get added

[Bruce Bennett, Airport business & property owner since 1968] 18:14:34
But I would never put it right next to the runway, right next to the taxiway.

[Bruce Bennett, Airport business & property owner since 1968] 18:14:39
I believe you'll find…

[Bruce Bennett, Airport business & property owner since 1968] 18:14:42
studies will show that the

[Bruce Bennett, Airport business & property owner since 1968] 18:14:45
the VDPs we've had have been vehicles near the

[Bruce Bennett, Airport business & property owner since 1968] 18:14:48
most of them, all of them vehicles, like you said, walking around an airplane, driving around an airplane

[Bruce Bennett, Airport business & property owner since 1968] 18:14:55
And just commuting up and down the airport. And if we could get that as far away from the runway as possible.

[Bruce Bennett, Airport business & property owner since 1968] 18:15:03
on the on the eastern property line along the fence line

[Bruce Bennett, Airport business & property owner since 1968] 18:15:07
that and and the it's already begun.

[Bruce Bennett, Airport business & property owner since 1968] 18:15:10
by private property on the south end with the yellow gate

[Bruce Bennett, Airport business & property owner since 1968] 18:15:15
nicely accessing

[Bruce Bennett, Airport business & property owner since 1968] 18:15:16
every one of the South End businesses.

[Bruce Bennett, Airport business & property owner since 1968] 18:15:19
Continue that north and you've

[Bruce Bennett, Airport business & property owner since 1968] 18:15:22
You're a quarter of the way done with the project.

[Bruce Bennett, Airport business & property owner since 1968] 18:15:25
Thank you very much.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:15:27
Thanks, Bruce.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 18:15:29
Thanks, Bruce. So there are several comments that have come in through the chat as well. And I'm wondering if those

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 18:15:37
One from Tony, and then one from David Malk and so

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 18:15:46
I think those

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 18:15:49
might be addressed in the next

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 18:15:53
section.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 18:15:55
I'm not sure about David's, who is the organization

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 18:16:00
that kicked the other alternative plans to the curb.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 18:16:04
I'm not sure about that. David, we might need to get back to you on that.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 18:16:12
um so

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 18:16:16
Any other clarifying questions for what David presented?

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 18:16:20
I think that Tony's questions will be answered in the next part.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 18:16:28
Okay, so…

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 18:16:32
I'm going to put us all on a little break, you know, stand up, get some blood flowing and we'll come back.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 18:16:42
at 626, it looks like, by my clock in about 10 minutes.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 18:16:48
and um

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 18:16:50
And then we will get started with reviewing the preferred alternatives for the master plan.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 18:16:55
So again, I'll let you all know. Feel free to go off

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 18:17:00
off camera and then we will resume in about 10 minutes.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 18:17:06
Thank you all.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:17:09
Okay.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 18:26:48
All right, everyone, we'll get started here in just a minute.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 18:26:53
So grab your last bite of dinner if you're grabbing something to eat.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 18:26:59
or fill up that coffee cup.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 18:27:02
If you're one of those late night coffee drinkers.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 18:27:07
I am going to resume our recording here.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:27:18
So Brandy, did my screen reappear

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 18:27:21
It does. Yes, we see clarifying questions.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:27:24
Okay, I think that's where we left off, so…

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 18:27:27
Thanks.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:27:27

We can resume when you are ready.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 18:27:29
Okay. Okay. We'll just give it one more minute, make sure everyone comes back from wherever they were.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 18:27:36
hopefully getting the blood to their toes and

[David Miller - Century West] 18:27:40
Okay.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 18:27:40
I know sitting for a long time can be tiring so

[David Miller - Century West] 18:27:44
All right.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 18:27:46
Okay.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 18:27:48
Great. Well, hopefully you've all joined us. I know I can't see all of you. So I'm going with the assumption for those of you who have turned with cameras on.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 18:27:59
Okay, so David, I think we are ready to go to our next section, our next agenda item, which is the

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 18:28:07
preliminary preferred

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 18:28:10
alternative.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:28:10
Okay, so I will spare all the intrigue here and just

[David Miller - Century West] 18:28:16
go cut to the chase.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:28:18
So ODAB, based on all of the input that's been provided by the PAC, the public, and the technical evaluations, also coordination with FAA,

[David Miller - Century West] 18:28:28
has selected alternative 1A as the preferred alternative for the airport master plan.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:28:35

So I just want to mention a couple things before I dive into this. I don't want to get off track, but

[David Miller - Century West] 18:28:40
Just to close a little bit of a loop on the earlier comments about modification standards, I think it was accurately said

[David Miller - Century West] 18:28:47
that the consultant is sort of tasked with interpreting the FAA's advisory circulars and I think, and other technical documents. And that's accurate. Our job is to interpret them.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:28:59
and to apply them as we interpret them. And I think that the

[David Miller - Century West] 18:29:02
coordination aspect of this can't be understated and that um

[David Miller - Century West] 18:29:05
the coordination between our consultant group, ODAV and the FAA has addressed a lot of things.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:29:12
and go back as far, I mean, we could go back and look at the forecast that we're not just approved by the Seattle Airport District Office, but we were reviewed

[David Miller - Century West] 18:29:20
by the Regional Office of FAA and the headquarters of FAA. So the forecasts were thoroughly reviewed and approved on the basis of that level of

[David Miller - Century West] 18:29:28
of FAA involvement. I think

[David Miller - Century West] 18:29:31
My simple response on the interpretation of the modification to standards is that

[David Miller - Century West] 18:29:36
Based on what the faa

[David Miller - Century West] 18:29:39
Documents say and what our conversations with FA staff have been is that we know that a modification of standards in this case is not a solution to the problem.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:29:50
At very best, it could be a temporary

[David Miller - Century West] 18:29:55
interim step on the way to conformance.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:29:58

And people may disagree with that, and that's fine, but we have not been told otherwise by anyone at the FAA.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:30:05
So as Tim mentioned, our obligation, the master plan is to identify a preferred alternative for the department can support a preferred alternative that

[David Miller - Century West] 18:30:16
shows a path to conformance. So I will leave it at that and then move ahead and talk a little bit about alternative 1A. And I think some of the conversation has been really great about the feasibility

[David Miller - Century West] 18:30:28
or having a realistic option. And I think our takeaway on this, and I think ODAP's perspective and when they were making their decision is that option or alternative 1A among a

[David Miller - Century West] 18:30:40
a group of very challenging options is the most realistic to apply going forward.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:30:46
Not that it would be easy in any means or inexpensive.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:30:50
But as we'll see in a couple slides, there are some very distinct phasing opportunities for pieces of this preferred alternative.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:30:58
that can and likely would take

[David Miller - Century West] 18:31:00
many, many years and longer to implement. So this is not a

[David Miller - Century West] 18:31:07
a situation where the ultimate configuration would be occurring in one project in a short period of time.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:31:13
So with that, I'm going to just slide through and talk a little bit about this. So again, this is the 1A graphic.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:31:21
And all the features that we talked about earlier.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:31:24
are identified. The

[David Miller - Century West] 18:31:27
Highlighted improvements are the shift of the Hubbard Highway west slightly the existing runway stays in place.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:31:34
then focused improvements are related to the extension and then the east side features we talked about the

[David Miller - Century West] 18:31:41
parallel a taxi lane and the vehicle service road.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:31:47
So I just want to cover some of the high points.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:31:51
I already mentioned ODAB has reviewed.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:31:55
all pack and public feedback are

[David Miller - Century West] 18:31:57
I think our planning team, our JLA folks and everyone involved in our

[David Miller - Century West] 18:32:02
group have

[David Miller - Century West] 18:32:05
really thoroughly detailed every bit of public input that's been provided and it's documented through the project website.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:32:13
so that

[David Miller - Century West] 18:32:15
That was the basis for Odav's decision, and Tony can jump in and provide clarification as needed.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:32:21
The key takeaways with Alternative 1A, one of the main features is that it does not require a runway shift.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:32:27
And as I mentioned earlier, that was something that

[David Miller - Century West] 18:32:31
PAC members generally did not support a runway shift. So maybe for different reasons, but in essence, keeping the runway where it is simplifies some of the airfield enhancements that would come in the future.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:32:47
this option 1a compared to 1B reduces impact on the west side property owners. As Tony mentioned

[David Miller - Century West] 18:32:56
Tony Hedling doesn't eliminate them, certainly, but it's less of an impact than 1B.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:33:02
So when we're thinking in the context of

[David Miller - Century West] 18:33:05
choices, 1A versus 1B versus 2. This is the sort of thing that Modev weighed.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:33:11
in their deliberations. Also, as I mentioned earlier, this preferred alternative 1A does not require the relocation of the parallel taxiway, I'm sorry, the air traffic control tower.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:33:22
Compared to alternative two, which as an example would be.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:33:26
On the phasing, I think the important pieces of this, and I think we'll get into this a little bit more clear in the next few slides, is that we look at the overall concept, which is pretty enormous when it comes to

[David Miller - Century West] 18:33:41
degree of change. But the reality is that the implementation of a project like this will take

[David Miller - Century West] 18:33:47
Multiple projects over multiple years. And you might even say multiple decades but

[David Miller - Century West] 18:33:54
you know our core

[David Miller - Century West] 18:33:56
task is to get the runway object-free area

[David Miller - Century West] 18:34:00
and the runway safe area up to conformance standards. That's really the most pressing need.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:34:06
In terms of meeting standards.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:34:08
So that is, as you'll see in a moment here, we've got phases to focus on that task.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:34:14
separate phases, not necessarily in sequential order for some of these, but then we could look at the runway extension runway and the parallel taxiway extension as a separate standalone phase.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:34:27
There's also the ability to phase a vehicle service road.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:34:32
Similar with the future parallel taxi lane. And then ultimately reconstructing existing runway is just going to be a function of pavement condition and need, which would happen regardless of the alternative.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:34:44
It's more of a long-term maintenance need and implement

[David Miller - Century West] 18:34:48
incremental maintenance projects can be completed through like the next project, which is basically a mill and overlay

[David Miller - Century West] 18:34:56
to buy some time on that.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:34:59
So with that, I just want to run through very briefly a couple components of project phasing. So again, this is not driven in sort of a timeline sense. It's more driven by accomplishments.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:35:11
So this phase, we're not labeling them or numbering them, but this phase is what we're considering

[David Miller - Century West] 18:35:18
for meeting the runway object free area and the runway safety area standards.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:35:22
And on the right, you can see kind of what the projects would involve to mean the graphic kind of illustrates this.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:35:30
So we talked about the south drain field that's shown at the south end.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:35:34
In this phase, if all the goal is to conform to the standards, then the south drain field

[David Miller - Century West] 18:35:43
would need to be relocated as part of this phase because, as I mentioned, does not conform with the safety area standards.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:35:50
There's also an open ditch along taxiway A that would need to be mitigated.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:35:56
likely covered. The Hubbard Highway shift outside the object-free area

[David Miller - Century West] 18:36:02
And then the fence relocation

[David Miller - Century West] 18:36:04
Kyle Road relocation at the south end, again, to clear the object-free area and protect some of the other surfaces in the

[David Miller - Century West] 18:36:13
the runway protection zone and um

[David Miller - Century West] 18:36:15
go out for some drainage.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:36:18
And then islands, as we talked about in one of our early meetings, islands located, shown in yellow there.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:36:24
between taxiway A and the adjacent southeast apron, this is to um

[David Miller - Century West] 18:36:30
create more efficient flow of aircraft between the apron and the parallel taxiway.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:36:35
So these could be bundled into a phase, essentially. And this is the kind of thing as you'll notice.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:36:42
this particular phase on the property acquisition side, it does include property acquisition on the west side, along the highway right of way, and then of course the highway itself.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:36:53
the southeast corner and then the northeast there's a narrow area that runs along the upper

[David Miller - Century West] 18:37:02
northeast section of the runway object-free area that would need to be acquired

[David Miller - Century West] 18:37:06
for entrepreneurial.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:37:07
But it does not impact the

[David Miller - Century West] 18:37:11
hangars on the southeast section of the airport at this point.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:37:15

so that that's

[David Miller - Century West] 18:37:17
kind of the distinction between this phase.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:37:19
and the others. Another phase is to construct the vehicle service road. And the way this is depicted the road

[David Miller - Century West] 18:37:29
would actually be aligned offset from the parallel taxiway.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:37:34
You can see there's a property acquisition needed to accommodate the VSR.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:37:40
The road itself. And then the drain field between, there's a drain field, small drain field at the north end of taxiway A.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:37:48
that would need to be relocated off the airport as well.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:37:53
And then this

[David Miller - Century West] 18:37:54
component the landside area sort of north of the control tower would accommodate future hangar development based on demand.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:38:08
In the north, we call this phase the north runway extension phase. So as you can see, the 547 foot, or I'm sorry, 497 foot extension

[David Miller - Century West] 18:38:18
of the runway and the parallel attacks here with an aircraft hold area is located up at the

[David Miller - Century West] 18:38:24
existing end of the runway and taxiway. So again, both the parallel taxiway and the runway are maintained in their current locations here.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:38:33
Let's see, with this shift of the runway and at the north end, of course, the drain field that's at the very far north end would then be in the

[David Miller - Century West] 18:38:41
Same situation that occurs with the South Dreamfield. So once the runway safety area is extended.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:38:49

So the way to think about that is until the runway extension project is implemented at North Greenfield is

[David Miller - Century West] 18:38:56
not nonconforming.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:38:58
It would be only associated with the runway extension.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:39:02
And then I mentioned the object-free area earlier, and this gets up into the Columbia helicopter area I mentioned earlier. This is separate from the runway protection zone conversation that we had earlier, but it highlights the area that would need to be

[David Miller - Century West] 18:39:17
acquired and protected. Also, just to reiterate, I don't want to be a dead horse here, but the FAA, for project phasing, the FAA has made

[David Miller - Century West] 18:39:25
have indicated to us and through the team

[David Miller - Century West] 18:39:27
that the runway object-free area and runway safe gear standards would need to be met.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:39:32
prior to any extensions runway.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:39:35
So that's it. I mean, from our perspective, the FAA has given us that direction. So we note that.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:39:45
On this phase, this is the parallel taxi lane construction. And this sort of is a little bit complicated in the sense that you mentioned the vehicle service road initially and i think

[David Miller - Century West] 18:39:58
Depending on the sequencing, of course, we look at the vehicle service road as more of a requirement and the taxi lane is really a goal.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:40:08
And this option essentially

[David Miller - Century West] 18:40:11
replaces the original vehicle service road or what was identified in the other phase as a potential vehicle service road.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:40:18

alignment with the parallel taxi lane and then that requires the vehicle service road

[David Miller - Century West] 18:40:23
to be relocated further east. And that, of course, then begins to impact the apron and the hangars.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:40:32
in the area and kind of magenta there highlights the full impact of that.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:40:37
In terms of existing buildings and apron that would need to be repurposed for that.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:40:43
A lot of it would depend on the sequencing if the

[David Miller - Century West] 18:40:47
Vehicle service road was built first

[David Miller - Century West] 18:40:50
In this phase wouldn't need to be implemented until a later date. They were built at the same time

[David Miller - Century West] 18:40:56
Then, of course, then this would involvement.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:40:58
the property impacts would be

[David Miller - Century West] 18:41:01
related at that time.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:41:04
So that's kind of a quick run through on the phasing, but I just really wanted a lot of the comments had to do with how realistic was the option. And I think that

[David Miller - Century West] 18:41:13
Knowing that there are no easy options. I think realistic is relative. Cost is relative. And I think that

[David Miller - Century West] 18:41:22
working on a phased approach within that

[David Miller - Century West] 18:41:27
$185 million price tag allows the projects to be broken into more bite-sized chunks or still big bites but

[David Miller - Century West] 18:41:36
does that.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:41:39
And then lastly, just to recap on the property acquisition. So again, this is kind of the full build out view

[David Miller - Century West] 18:41:47
of alternative, the peripheral alternative 1A, and essentially the hatched areas

[David Miller - Century West] 18:41:54
our property areas that are needed to be acquired

[David Miller - Century West] 18:41:58
to meet design standards, whether it's the

[David Miller - Century West] 18:42:01
Runway, object-free area, safety area or

[David Miller - Century West] 18:42:05
an adjacent facility like the

[David Miller - Century West] 18:42:08
Vehicle service road or parallel taxi lane.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:42:12
The yellow areas, as mentioned earlier, are the aeronautical reserves that are identified just for the purposes of, you know, if the individual property owners are interested in selling their land, whether developed or undeveloped at some point in the future.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:42:31
depicting these areas on the airport layout plan would allow them to

[David Miller - Century West] 18:42:36
potentially qualify for FDA funding.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:42:38
for purchase.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:42:41
Okay, so that's that.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:42:44
So thank you, buddy.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 18:42:46
Okay, so that was a lot of information. I just want to make sure

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 18:42:51
that as a reminder that we will be posting these

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 18:42:55

slides on the website.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 18:42:58
We would love for you all, I know this is a lot to absorb, and we wanted to make sure that David could walk you through this information. We will be collecting comments through October 29th.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:43:07
Thank you.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 18:43:12
And because we know you all might need some time to digest and give us comments.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 18:43:18
So feel free to email those to me.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 18:43:21
And then I see, Tony, that your hand is up

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 18:43:25
And then I also believe that we need to get back to a few comments that came in through the chat.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 18:43:32
So Tony, we'll go to you first.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:43:37
Well, I've got quite a few questions in the chat already. I can tell you right now, this is a non-starter.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:43:38
Thank you.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:43:43
Okay.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:43:49
Think about PDX, Portland International Airport.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:43:53
They have modifications as standard for their fence in the northeast corner of the airport.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:43:58
That's a huge international airport. There's other airports around the nation that have modifications of standard.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:44:05
The Northwest District just authorized a modification standard for an ILS house

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:44:11
a structure at Tacoma Narrows Airport.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:44:13
They just issued that modification to standard.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:44:17
So I can't buy that modification to standards are not going to be allowed.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:44:24
And we can't plan on them. I mean, part of the FAA guidance says that the purpose of a modification to standard is to deal with pre-existing historical and economic impacting facilities that were in place.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:44:39
And to destroy

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:44:41
I mean, we're talking now that I see what the 1A is the preferred alternative

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:44:47
there are major businesses that are contributing throughout the nation

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:44:52
doing business in the region and the nation that

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:44:55
the state's gonna plan to take their hangers, buy them at fair market value, which is going to be significantly diminished now that this document is moving forward. It's called pre-condemnation light.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:45:08
nobody would be interested in purchasing any of these hangars if they knew that the state has published a document that states that they intend to purchase and tear them down.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:45:17
So that's going to diminish the value of these properties. Furthermore, these companies are doing business throughout the nation and

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:45:27
for emergency response, Lifelight, I mean.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:45:31
that's their hangar. It's Wilson Construction Harriers. We've got crews in Florida right now getting the power back on.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:45:37
It's our hangar. It's this is

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:45:40
This is a horrible plan.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:45:42
It's a misuse of the FAA funding, and I'm just not buying that the FAA is saying that we have to do this because Tim Howe specifically stated earlier that the FAA is not making this master plan. So that's one of my points. Either they are or they're not. And for the consultant, Dave, respected Dave Miller.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:46:02
For Dave, for you to say that we have to do this because the FAA is telling us to.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:46:07
But now we've got the FAA and the state pointing at each other and saying that I have to do this because they're saying I have to do it.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:46:14
So which is it? And neither one of them is in compliance with the ORS statute that says the Oregon Department of Aviation is supposed to protect the investments by private companies, through the fence companies that invested. That statute says that the state of Oregon is supposed to protect those investments.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:46:33
And I'm just not buying this. And I got to tell you, you know, telling us that there's only a little bit amount of time for us to discuss this tonight, three hours, this is the only time we're allowed to discuss it.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:46:44
quite a few of our comments that have been submitted haven't even been addressed

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:46:49
We've provided an alternative that gets all this done without taking the private property. We also submitted a study by somebody who does this kind of work that shows that a modification standard is easily accessible by the FAA and that we meet their risk mitigation. And this is based on the FAA's requirement that they consider a modification to standard.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:47:12
They have to consider it if the state of Oregon will apply for it.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:47:16
And the state is refusing to apply for them.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:47:18
And they're going to base planning on something that's not feasible

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:47:22
not achievable and not affordable.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:47:24

So I'd love to hear

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:47:27
the answers to this, knowing that we're not going to take it.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:47:31
Well, I'll let Tim wade in on the FAA positions. Let me just reiterate a couple things.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:47:39
So the expectation of our consultant team is that we

[David Miller - Century West] 18:47:46
will, as Tim mentioned, we will develop an airport master plan that meets FAA requirements.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:47:52
and the um

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:47:54
The FAA telling you what you're going to do.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:47:55
the excuse me, let me finish, if you would. The endpoint to that is that when the project is at its final approval stage, the FAA

[David Miller - Century West] 18:48:06
Seattle Airport District Office.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:48:08
is expected to sign the airport layout plan.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:48:12
Mm-hmm.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:48:13
So their direction along the way is that on the issue of modification of standards.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:48:19
is that they, as Tim mentioned, in this application, this situation.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:48:25
they will they're not willing to consider a modification standards

[David Miller - Century West] 18:48:30
in lieu of a solution. And I understand that and I've seen Aaron's work and i respect aaron and

[David Miller - Century West] 18:48:38
He touched on some important points, but the main takeaways

[David Miller - Century West] 18:48:43
from the FAA on modification standards

[David Miller - Century West] 18:48:46
Even if they are considered is they are temporary. They are not considered a permanent solution. And I would let Tim elaborate on that.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:48:55
But in terms of

[David Miller - Century West] 18:48:56
You know, as I said, we have coordinated with the FAA and ODA.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:49:02
Throughout the project, we're following published FAA guidelines

[David Miller - Century West] 18:49:08
And the information, everything, including Aaron's memo, is included in the

[David Miller - Century West] 18:49:14
PAC response comments that are also available for FA to review. So gives him an opportunity to weigh in on that at some point if he chooses. But the direction

[David Miller - Century West] 18:49:26
to our team from the FAA on this project really couldn't be any clearer in that there is an expectation

[David Miller - Century West] 18:49:32
that the master plan will find a path to conformance and a modification of standards does not do that.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:49:39
So Tim, before there's another question, maybe if you'd like to clean up anything I messed up, please.

[Tim House - FAA] 18:49:44
I don't think you messed anything up.

[Tim House - FAA] 18:49:47
I think you said it.

[Tim House - FAA] 18:49:50
Very good.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:49:50
Okay, so I just want the record to show that the FAA is telling the state of Oregon that no modifications standard will be allowed.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:49:59

But they're not directing what the state of Oregon is going to send to the FAA. They're not going to direct what the master plan will be.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:50:06
And the state of Oregon is saying that we are going this route because the FAA is telling us

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:50:11
that we have to do it this way.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:50:13
But then the FAA is saying is, no, we're not telling them they have to do it this way.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:50:18
Is that what I'm hearing?

[Tim House - FAA] 18:50:23
you have your

[Tim House - FAA] 18:50:24
understanding of what you've heard.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 18:50:30
Tony, it looks like you wanted to chime in.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 18:50:33
Tony Beach?

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 18:50:35
Yeah, if I can just clarify what Tony Hubland had just said.

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 18:50:38
The FAA has made clear that the airport does need to meet standard

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 18:50:43
And while the FAA does not dictate what the plan for the airport looks like, it does need to meet standard if the airport is going to be

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 18:50:52
eligible for future funding.

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 18:50:54
And so that is the plan that we have put together with the input here from the PAC and from the community.

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 18:51:00
from the public and it is a plan again that

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 18:51:05

that meets the FAA standards.

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 18:51:08
to address the non-standard items and that is so the airport can continue to be improved and maintained.

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 18:51:15
And not go into, as we discussed earlier, into maintenance mode

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 18:51:19
And ineligible for any other

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 18:51:22
federal improvements.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:51:23
But what I would tell you, Tony, and you and I have had this discussion before, I just want it to be on the record so everybody hears us.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:51:30
Tony Beach, Tim House.

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 18:51:32
Correct.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:51:33
Dave Miller, they have no skin in this game.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:51:36
you got nothing to lose.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:51:38
by pursuing this alternative.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:51:41
you are personally not damaged. Your entity is not

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:51:46
damaged.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:51:48
At the same time, the state of Oregon has a legislatively directed responsibility

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:51:54
to protect the private investors.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:51:57
And you're not doing it.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:51:59

that that's what just floors me.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:52:00
Thank you.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:52:02
it.

[Tim House - FAA] 18:52:02
That's not what you're asking for.

[Tim House - FAA] 18:52:05
you're asking for the runway to be extended. You're asking for the airport to be improved.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:52:10
You're 100% correct and that those can be done with modifications of standard.

[Tim House - FAA] 18:52:13
funding, you have to follow the standards

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:52:16
That's correct. And they can be done with modifications as standard. I understand what a standard is, Tim. I think you and I had this on the phone.

[Tim House - FAA] 18:52:22
You're asking for the benefit of multi-million dollars worth of improvement

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:52:24
In Denver, when they rebuilt Denver International Airport.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:52:27
They built it out in the middle of nowhere and everything was perfect. It was in compliance, ROFAs, RSAs, everything was perfect. Setbacks, everything was perfect.

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 18:52:28
Hold on.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:52:38
This airport pre-exists.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:52:40
And the purpose of the modification standard program

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:52:44
is to allow development that is achievable and by doing a very careful risk analysis.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:52:49
to move things forward. And we believe that this can be done and this is a

misapplication of the understanding of the FAA's directives

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:53:00
And we're painting ourselves into a corner.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:53:03
Which is going to, and even though it'll never happen, we know that

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:53:07
But it damages these owners. It damages them.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:53:11
It hurts them in real time to include right now because other people know that this discussion is being had.

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 18:53:20
Tony, we…

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 18:53:22
We have…

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 18:53:24
been painted in the corner for some time with this airport.

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 18:53:28
to meet standards, something has to budge here.

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 18:53:33
ODAV also has a responsibility overall to operate and maintain airports safely and that is

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 18:53:41
our utmost priority to make sure that every aviator in Oregon is

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 18:53:46
is flying in a safe airport.

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 18:53:49
And we…

[David Miller - Century West] 18:53:52
Okay.

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 18:53:53
We are interested in continuing that path with this project and based on the input we received here.

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 18:54:00
This is the direction that we had to decide to go.

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 18:54:04
We've stated before that none of the alternatives

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 18:54:08
We're an easy

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 18:54:10
path, the decision overall is a difficult one.

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 18:54:13
But we do appreciate all of the PAC member input and we understand the concerns and the challenges ahead.

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 18:54:20
We do believe that this alternative, as David mentioned, especially with the phasing.

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 18:54:25
is feasible. It is realistic.

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 18:54:28
And we can get there and have a better Aurora Airport, not just for all of the airport users, but for the surrounding communities as well.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:54:37
We agree to disagree on that one.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 18:54:42
Okay, thank you, Tony.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 18:54:45
Tony Hubbling

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 18:54:47
Do you have additional questions or should we, I see Councillor Linville has her hand up

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 18:54:52
And then I think there were a couple of questions that came through the chat.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:54:55
No, go ahead. It's just, like I said, I'm very, very concerned that

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 18:54:57
Okay.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:55:00
we can't talk to ODAV about this stuff outside of these PAC meetings, but it seems like this is a huge, huge undertaking

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:55:08
And this decision to now we're going to go with alternative 1a

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:55:13
before we really had a chance to really discuss it it just

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:55:17
It just seems like this thing is being railroaded through and and

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:55:22
Yeah, I'm done.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 18:55:24
Okay, we'll check back in with you, Tony.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 18:55:28
Okay, Councillor Linville.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 18:55:30
Thank you.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:55:33
Thank you.

[Councilor Dr. Joann Linville, City of Wilsonville] 18:55:36
So Tony Heebling, I appreciate your frustration.

[Councilor Dr. Joann Linville, City of Wilsonville] 18:55:40
I think we've shared some of that as well.

[Councilor Dr. Joann Linville, City of Wilsonville] 18:55:44
So I am going to just go back again to

[Councilor Dr. Joann Linville, City of Wilsonville] 18:55:49
Hopefully with David and Tim's

[Councilor Dr. Joann Linville, City of Wilsonville] 18:55:53
Clarification. I'm back again into

[Councilor Dr. Joann Linville, City of Wilsonville] 18:55:57
the working paper and into the data

[Councilor Dr. Joann Linville, City of Wilsonville] 18:56:02
that um

[Councilor Dr. Joann Linville, City of Wilsonville] 18:56:04
brought us to the point of the c2

[Councilor Dr. Joann Linville, City of Wilsonville] 18:56:08
rate for the airport.

[Councilor Dr. Joann Linville, City of Wilsonville] 18:56:10
And I just want to be sure that I'm reading this correctly and this is

[Councilor Dr. Joann Linville, City of Wilsonville] 18:56:15
what the FAA was presented with

[Councilor Dr. Joann Linville, City of Wilsonville] 18:56:18
In order for them to come back and say you do not have an option to stay at a B2, the airport is a C2. And as such.

[Councilor Dr. Joann Linville, City of Wilsonville] 18:56:29
Here are the safety standards and modifications that and

[Councilor Dr. Joann Linville, City of Wilsonville] 18:56:37
safety issues that need to be addressed.

[Councilor Dr. Joann Linville, City of Wilsonville] 18:56:40
The data indicates that

[Councilor Dr. Joann Linville, City of Wilsonville] 18:56:43
At least on this page, on page 216 of the

[Councilor Dr. Joann Linville, City of Wilsonville] 18:56:47
I think it's in the chapter two.

[Councilor Dr. Joann Linville, City of Wilsonville] 18:56:51
It shows the operations of C and D jets

[Councilor Dr. Joann Linville, City of Wilsonville] 18:56:56
From 2012,

[Councilor Dr. Joann Linville, City of Wilsonville] 18:56:58
through 2021.

[Councilor Dr. Joann Linville, City of Wilsonville] 18:57:01
And I understand, if I'm correct, that the

[Councilor Dr. Joann Linville, City of Wilsonville] 18:57:04
that the tipping point number

[Councilor Dr. Joann Linville, City of Wilsonville] 18:57:08
for the categorization is 500.

[Councilor Dr. Joann Linville, City of Wilsonville] 18:57:13
operations.

[Councilor Dr. Joann Linville, City of Wilsonville] 18:57:15
And as I look at this, it looks like

[Councilor Dr. Joann Linville, City of Wilsonville] 18:57:19
that category of aircraft

[Councilor Dr. Joann Linville, City of Wilsonville] 18:57:22
C and D.

[Councilor Dr. Joann Linville, City of Wilsonville] 18:57:25
From 2012,

[Councilor Dr. Joann Linville, City of Wilsonville] 18:57:28
Through 2019,

[Councilor Dr. Joann Linville, City of Wilsonville] 18:57:30
exceeded the level of 500 operations. Only in 2020 which was

[Councilor Dr. Joann Linville, City of Wilsonville] 18:57:39
COVID, was it below the 500 mark

[Councilor Dr. Joann Linville, City of Wilsonville] 18:57:42
And in 2021, it was 640 operations.

[Councilor Dr. Joann Linville, City of Wilsonville] 18:57:47
Am I correct in that that was the data

[Councilor Dr. Joann Linville, City of Wilsonville] 18:57:51
that was presented to the faa

[Councilor Dr. Joann Linville, City of Wilsonville] 18:57:54
that moved the categorization

[Councilor Dr. Joann Linville, City of Wilsonville] 18:57:58
from a B2 to a C2.

[Councilor Dr. Joann Linville, City of Wilsonville] 18:58:01
rating for this airport. And so that's the one question and the other is

[Councilor Dr. Joann Linville, City of Wilsonville] 18:58:08
Is it that the airport allowed

[Councilor Dr. Joann Linville, City of Wilsonville] 18:58:11
that many c and d many c

[Councilor Dr. Joann Linville, City of Wilsonville] 18:58:14
aircraft operations and now

[Councilor Dr. Joann Linville, City of Wilsonville] 18:58:17
Because they were allowed, we are now at a C2 level for this airport.

[Councilor Dr. Joann Linville, City of Wilsonville] 18:58:23
So two questions.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:58:24
Okay, thank you. Those are very thoughtful questions. Appreciate them. With reference to Table 216, that would have been in the inventory chapter, existing conditions so all the

[David Miller - Century West] 18:58:34
data that went into the evaluation of the critical or designed aircraft is contained in Chapter 3, the forecast chapter.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:58:44
So, um.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:58:46
the if you recall, the forecast, the updated forecasts

[David Miller - Century West] 18:58:51
is 2021, I believe, is our base year.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:58:55
So part of the answer to your question is it was that data, the TFMSC or the instrument flight plan data.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:59:03
that provided documentation of instrument flight plan activity at Aurora State Airport.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:59:10
So our starting point

[David Miller - Century West] 18:59:12
in our base year was clearly, as you pointed out, in the C2 realm. And then that

[David Miller - Century West] 18:59:21
for planning purposes verified

[David Miller - Century West] 18:59:24
confirmed, if you will, the critical aircraft, the existing critical aircraft

[David Miller - Century West] 18:59:29
or design aircraft for the runway.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:59:31
With regard to the future, that was

[David Miller - Century West] 18:59:35
determined by the projections, the forecast of growth.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:59:38
So we started out, as you pointed out, Councillor, above the threshold and the

[David Miller - Century West] 18:59:44
projections call for some anticipate continued growth of that so

[David Miller - Century West] 18:59:50
I think that answered your question, both questions it was

[David Miller - Century West] 18:59:54
The basis was, in fact, for the critical aircraft

[David Miller - Century West] 18:59:58
definition because to point out, I think we've said this before many times, the air traffic control tower data itself, which counts takeoffs and landings.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:00:07
does not categorize activity to that degree. We do not know how many C2

[David Miller - Century West] 19:00:13
or D2 or B2 jet operations occur just based on air traffic control power data. So that's why we use the

[David Miller - Century West] 19:00:21
the FAA's instrument flight plan data

[David Miller - Century West] 19:00:24
So 2021, I believe, was our base year and then

[David Miller - Century West] 19:00:28
go from there.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:00:33
Did that answer your question?

[David Miller - Century West] 19:00:35
Questions?

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:00:36
It looks like Councillor Linbell, you raised your hand again so maybe

[Councilor Dr. Joann Linville, City of Wilsonville] 19:00:40
Yeah, I did. I just had a clarification follow up for that. So how much of

[Councilor Dr. Joann Linville, City of Wilsonville] 19:00:48
that d cmd aircraft operation

[David Miller - Century West] 19:00:55
Oh.

[Councilor Dr. Joann Linville, City of Wilsonville] 19:00:55
approval is up to ODAV or the airport

[David Miller - Century West] 19:01:01
Okay, yeah, I apologize. I missed that part of your question. I'll let Tony, as the airport manager, weigh in on some of that, and then Tim could probably offer some opinions.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:01:14
In general, I'll just say this generically, and I think it applies at all airports.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:01:18
An airport doesn't restrict its traffic by its design category. In other words, if an airport is a B2 runway, for example, and a C2 aircraft comes in, that's permitted. It's really the pilot's determination of

[David Miller - Century West] 19:01:35
Whether the runway is adequate for their needs, both in runway length

[David Miller - Century West] 19:01:39
strength, et cetera. And as you kind of

[David Miller - Century West] 19:01:43
gleaned in your comments, the airport transitioned over time from B2 to C2. So even at a period of time where the airport was

[David Miller - Century West] 19:01:52
clearly in the B2 category.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:01:54
it was accommodating limited operations perhaps or growing numbers over time of those C2 and B2 aircraft.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:02:03
So that's normal and that's seen at every airport I've ever worked at.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:02:08
There are limitations on weight, and Tony can address that in the

[David Miller - Century West] 19:02:12
But again, it's important to remember that not all C-2 aircraft would require

[David Miller - Century West] 19:02:19
waivers on weight. A lot of those aircraft

[David Miller - Century West] 19:02:22
are well below the threshold for the waiver. So it's a combination of the things. And I'll let tony or

[David Miller - Century West] 19:02:30
Jim weigh in if they feel like they should.

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 19:02:35
Yeah, thanks, David. The FAA has stated the

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 19:02:40
In fact, the only

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 19:02:42
factor that we can restrict aeronautical uses is by weight. So we do that through a waiver.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:02:43
Okay.

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 19:02:49
process. We restrict aircraft that are overweight

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 19:02:53
But no, we do not have the ability to restrict

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 19:02:57
aircraft that are higher than our design aircraft.

[Councilor Dr. Joann Linville, City of Wilsonville] 19:03:06
Yeah.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:03:06
Hold on, Councillor.

[Councilor Dr. Joann Linville, City of Wilsonville] 19:03:06
So do we know how many of these

[Councilor Dr. Joann Linville, City of Wilsonville] 19:03:10
are wavered aircraft versus pilot, just pilot decisions

[Councilor Dr. Joann Linville, City of Wilsonville] 19:03:17
When that data was collected or analyzed.

[Councilor Dr. Joann Linville, City of Wilsonville] 19:03:22
Do we know that? And what I'm getting at is

[Councilor Dr. Joann Linville, City of Wilsonville] 19:03:27
What I'm getting at is that

[Councilor Dr. Joann Linville, City of Wilsonville] 19:03:31
you know sharing some of Tony's concerns

[Councilor Dr. Joann Linville, City of Wilsonville] 19:03:35
that if ODAV has allowed waivers

[Councilor Dr. Joann Linville, City of Wilsonville] 19:03:42

to allow this to get over that number

[Councilor Dr. Joann Linville, City of Wilsonville] 19:03:46
Because not only are they c2 or d

[Councilor Dr. Joann Linville, City of Wilsonville] 19:03:50
CRD level uh or um

[Councilor Dr. Joann Linville, City of Wilsonville] 19:03:54
categorized aircraft

[Councilor Dr. Joann Linville, City of Wilsonville] 19:03:56
But they're heavier than they're

[Councilor Dr. Joann Linville, City of Wilsonville] 19:03:59
the runway is constructed to

[Councilor Dr. Joann Linville, City of Wilsonville] 19:04:03
withstand.

[Councilor Dr. Joann Linville, City of Wilsonville] 19:04:05
And that has been allowed by ODAV, then we've got ODAV creating this issue for us for this airport.

[Councilor Dr. Joann Linville, City of Wilsonville] 19:04:15
And now, as Tim has said, you can't go back

[Councilor Dr. Joann Linville, City of Wilsonville] 19:04:22
And so that's my concern is what

[Councilor Dr. Joann Linville, City of Wilsonville] 19:04:25
You know, is the pilots making the decisions or it is waivers

[David Miller - Century West] 19:04:36
Tony, do you want to respond?

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 19:04:38
Yeah, if I'll just add a little clarification, it's not

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 19:04:41
waivers necessarily, but as David and Tim mentioned earlier it is

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 19:04:47
the aircraft that use the facility that determine the

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 19:04:52
facility requirements and the and the

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 19:04:55
design aircraft

[David Miller - Century West] 19:04:57
Thank you.

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 19:04:57
As discussed in Chapter 3. And when you have that threshold of 500 operations.

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 19:05:03
then that is what determines the design aircraft. And that is again what

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 19:05:08
sets the requirements for the facility for the next 20 year throughout the planning period.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:05:17
Okay, so there's a couple of questions that have come in through the chat, I think, around this topic.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:05:22
David Malk just asked, what's the level of design aircraft used that determines need?

[David Miller - Century West] 19:05:30
Okay, I think the question to that answer or that is the uh

[David Miller - Century West] 19:05:34
But the FAA establishes, as the counselor mentioned, a design aircraft threshold or critical aircraft threshold is 500 annual takeoffs and landings.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:05:45
and that that's

[David Miller - Century West] 19:05:46
the level at which the FA considers

[David Miller - Century West] 19:05:48
it to be regular use.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:05:50
So that's the threshold. And as stated in the comments, questions, the airport has.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:05:56
regularly been above that 500 threshold of C&D aircraft for much of the last 10 years.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:06:04
Great.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:06:07
Tony Hubling also asks a question in the chat.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:06:10
is the airport's division at the FAA requiring all sponsors to meet ROFA standards or just Aurora Airport?

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:06:18
also have the rules changed for mod of standards

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:06:21
If not, why are other airports

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:06:23
allowed to have modif standards, but Aurora is not.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:06:29
Jim, you want to jump in on that?

[Tim House - FAA] 19:06:32
Yeah, you know, I don't uh

[Tim House - FAA] 19:06:36
know offhand, you know, which airports do have modifications or standard for their ROFA.

[Tim House - FAA] 19:06:45
you know what and what

[Tim House - FAA] 19:06:48
But, you know, I know that is clearly

[Tim House - FAA] 19:06:51
outlined

[Tim House - FAA] 19:06:53
in any of the master plans that we do.

[Tim House - FAA] 19:06:57
any extension, any extension

[Tim House - FAA] 19:07:01
widening that is being proposed at this time.

[Tim House - FAA] 19:07:06
that those are

[Tim House - FAA] 19:07:10
You know, very, very hard

[Tim House - FAA] 19:07:12
considerations looking at those situations.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:07:19
Tim, could you comment? There have been several questions about

[David Miller - Century West] 19:07:28
a modification of standards being a suitable alternative to any of the alternatives that have been presented.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:07:33
I've made the point that our direction has been

[David Miller - Century West] 19:07:37
the direction we've been provided by FAA throughout this master plan is that

[David Miller - Century West] 19:07:43
the ultimate recommendation, the master plan needs to lead to conformance with standards.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:07:49
modification does not conform to standards. Did I get any of that wrong or

[Tim House - FAA] 19:07:53
No.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:07:53
Can we clarify the interpretation of how much

[David Miller - Century West] 19:07:57
latitude we have, from my perspective as a planner, I'd say we have zero attitude.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:08:01
I mean, we're working with the rules and the procedures as outlined in all the FAA publications.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:08:08
And the guidance, more particularly through the different branches of FAA. So again, I don't want to get too far down on the loop.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:08:15
Pull me back.

[Tim House - FAA] 19:08:16
No, I think you stated it very well. You demonstrated a clear understanding.

[Tim House - FAA] 19:08:21
of what the requirements are.

[Tim House - FAA] 19:08:24
and the

[Tim House - FAA] 19:08:25
you required some of this master plan to meet the standards you know we

[David Miller - Century West] 19:08:29
Yeah.

[Tim House - FAA] 19:08:29
you can't we can't show c2

[Tim House - FAA] 19:08:33
And the plan is we're going to have a modification standard from now until the end of time. It doesn't meet what is needed to be able to progress.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:08:39
Yeah.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:08:42
Yeah, that was, I think that, and I know it's not what people want to hear, but that's the message we've been provided by FAA consistently. It's also been mentioned, not tonight, but in earlier meetings, a lot of example airports and one that comes up quite often because people are

[David Miller - Century West] 19:08:56
familiar with it, is the airport in Sun Valley, Idaho at Friedman Memorial.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:09:01
And that airport does have modification to standards for a whole host of issues.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:09:09
But when they analyzed it, and this is an older master plan, when they analyzed it, they

[David Miller - Century West] 19:09:17
The justification for the mod to standards

[David Miller - Century West] 19:09:21
modification of standards was that they would be interim

[David Miller - Century West] 19:09:25
approvals and that the ultimate

[David Miller - Century West] 19:09:28
remedy for the non-standard condition would be to relocate the airport.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:09:32
So there is no get out of jail card free for that airport.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:09:36
They have active mods, and I don't know if Tim wants to weigh in on that but

[David Miller - Century West] 19:09:40
In reviewing the airport layout plan and some of the memos that were done on that, I think it might be easy to think, well.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:09:47
Freeman got away with it, so why can't Aurora? What they…

[David Miller - Century West] 19:09:52
bought into is a commitment by the owner of the airport to consider moving the airport.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:09:58
And I worked on a project at that airport 30 plus years ago to relocate it.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:10:03
And I think since that time, there have probably been five failed efforts to relocate the airport.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:10:08
And another failed environmental impact statement to relocate the report. So they're still working on that problem, but the mods are still considered interim.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:10:16
So don't want to get off topic, but

[David Miller - Century West] 19:10:18
They are usually more complicated than they seem.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:10:23
Okay. I know Tony Helpling has his hand up. I do want to check with a couple of comments that have been typed through. I do want to check with others and just make sure that I'm not missing anyone. I know there are a lot of comments that are coming through amongst the panelists.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:10:40
And so I just want to check in with you all.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:10:44
We will, I see a hand is raised in for the public attendees. We will get to public comments at 740.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:10:51
So we have about 30 minutes until that time for the PAC to continue this conversation. You can always type anyone attending from the public can type a question or comment in the Q&A area on your screen.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:11:09
Okay, so I think I gave everyone enough. Oh yeah, Ted Belar, your hand is raised. I see you.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:11:18
Great. You should. I just sent you a little note. You should unmute.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:11:21
There you go.

[Ted Millar, AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:11:25
Yeah, thanks for having me on.

[Ted Millar, AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:11:27
I'm a little concerned because we've tried

[Ted Millar, AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:11:30
to set up a work session with ODAV and we were told that we're not allowed to do that. Our comments have to be handled

[Ted Millar, AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:11:38
in this public session.

[Ted Millar, AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:11:41
I paid…

[Ted Millar, AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:11:42
Wendy Killington's firm and Aaron Fagery's firm.

[Ted Millar, AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:11:46
to submit an 86 page

[Ted Millar, AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:11:50
document.

[Ted Millar, AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:11:51
that shows another alternative

[Ted Millar, AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:11:54
towards things that pose here.

[Ted Millar, AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:11:57
And nobody will talk about, nobody submitted it

[Ted Millar, AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:12:01
We think it's very viable.

[Ted Millar, AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:12:04
And the aeronautical stakeholders alternative that we submitted

[Ted Millar, AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:12:09
is fully justified

[Ted Millar, AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:12:11

the MOS must be included. No justification for any alternatives that wipes out any aeronautical uses.

[Ted Millar, AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:12:20
Highway 551 can be moved west

[Ted Millar, AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:12:24
within existing right-of-way

[Ted Millar, AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:12:26
At the end of the master plan.

[Ted Millar, AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:12:28
period with minimal private property impacts.

[Ted Millar, AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:12:33
wiping out any errand nautical use is simply

[Ted Millar, AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:12:37
unacceptable.

[Ted Millar, AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:12:39
And it's contrary to ORS

[Ted Millar, AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:12:41
836-640.

[Ted Millar, AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:12:44
642, every odev

[Ted Millar, AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:12:47
And the entire point of this master planning effort

[Ted Millar, AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:12:51
to serve aeronautical uses.

[Ted Millar, AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:12:54
Believably, there is no justification for each alternative demanding that the septic tank

[Ted Millar, AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:13:01
Grayfield of the south be moved to some unknown location

[Ted Millar, AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:13:05
that may not even be feasible.

[Ted Millar, AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:13:08
as the Gent technical report that we submitted

[Ted Millar, AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:13:12

clearly demonstrates that modest improvements to that drain field

[Ted Millar, AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:13:17
make it compliant with FAA standards.

[Ted Millar, AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:13:20
Nothing justifies moving it.

[Ted Millar, AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:13:22
And I can't understand. It's like a kangaroo court.

[Ted Millar, AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:13:26
We're not giving a chance to say

[Ted Millar, AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:13:29
What really needs to be done is just brushed over.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:13:39
Okay. Well, thanks, Ted, for the comments. I think a couple points. Aaron's memo that you highlighted is in the public in the PAC review comment material package that is being provided to FAA.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:13:50
So Tim and his

[David Miller - Century West] 19:13:53
group at the Seattle ADO will have an opportunity to review that.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:13:57
I would say if they

[Ted Millar, AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:13:59
Thank you.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:13:59
see anything in that that persuades them that there may be another path to consider.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:14:04
that they can they can

[Ted Millar, AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:14:07
Thank you.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:14:07
you know, weigh in on that.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:14:09
I think the same would be true with the technical report on the drain field.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:14:15

I'm not

[David Miller - Century West] 19:14:17
I wasn't personally involved in the coordination between ODAV and FA on the drain field, but I assume that it touched on some of the same technical issues.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:14:24
might be covered. So if the technical memo in the drain field was included in your

[David Miller - Century West] 19:14:30
your submittal on comments, then it would be in the record as well.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:14:34
If it hasn't been, then I think it could be added perhaps so

[Ted Millar, AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:14:38
In fact, there's even a feasibility study that

[Ted Millar, AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:14:43
Fagery and Associates submitted

[Ted Millar, AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:14:46
that justify

[Ted Millar, AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:14:48
that they have to analyze the risk analysis to any of these modifications and modifications of standards

[Ted Millar, AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:14:56
have been always done that it can be done safely according to certain standards.

[Ted Millar, AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:15:01
And we submitted a full page report that shows how this is being done

[Ted Millar, AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:15:06
And nobody will talk about it. You're not submitting it into the records. You're not talking about it.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:15:12
Well, I believe that is the report that was attached in your comment, so it is in the

[David Miller - Century West] 19:15:19
public or PAC input.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:15:22
record so it is in the record and it is available for everyone. Correct me if I'm wrong, Brandy, but it will be all of that will be available on the project website and certainly available for FAA on.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:15:35
That's correct. Yeah, so we have got that captured, Ted um and

[David Miller - Century West] 19:15:36
Okay.

[Ted Millar, AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:15:36
Thank you.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:15:41
And so we will be posting that to the website.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:15:44
Yeah. And I don't want to belabor the point, but the modifications that I mentioned that were approved by FAA for the Sun Valley Airport

[David Miller - Century West] 19:15:54
also included the same risk analysis approach, the methodology, and they were deemed acceptable, but they were still identified as interim solutions, not permanent solutions. So I think, again, I'm getting into Tim's territory there in terms of

[David Miller - Century West] 19:16:10
FA determinations, but I think that that's

[David Miller - Century West] 19:16:13
pretty consistent with what I've seen at other reports.

[Ted Millar, AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:16:17
And did you read our risk analysis that we submitted? Because it shows this couldn't happen according to your risk analysis for over 300 years.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:16:18
Thank you.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:16:26
I saw it.

[Ted Millar, AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:16:26
And they use 100 years as a standard.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:16:29
Right. You know, I went through the memo and it's part of the record now. But again, provided it's uh

[David Miller - Century West] 19:16:35
It's the information we've been provided from the FAA, and if they have a

[David Miller - Century West] 19:16:42
something more to add to that, they can certainly

[David Miller - Century West] 19:16:45
let our team know.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:16:47
No doubt.

[Ted Millar, AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:16:48
My question is, why won't you share that with the rest of the PAC members so that we can all be talking off

[Ted Millar, AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:16:54
the same sheet of music.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:16:58
Well, again, I think the memo was not provided to us directly by Aaron. It was attached to your comment letter, which is perfectly fine. But that is contained in the record of PAC comments. So that's

[David Miller - Century West] 19:17:14
That's how it was.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:17:17
acquired by our team and that's how it's being presented back out to the public, PAC members and public alike. It's all available on the project website.

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 19:17:26
Right. Just to follow up on that, David, it will be published on the website for the project where everyone can see it and including

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 19:17:36
our comments addressing everything that we received.

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 19:17:42
And we have taken a look at that and we considered that in

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 19:17:45
the selection of our preferred alternative.

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 19:17:49
I do want to reiterate that the FAS made it clear that we do have to have a plan to meet standards.

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 19:17:56
that has to be an end result with this master plan.

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 19:17:59
And we cannot get a mod as part of the master planning process.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:18:08
Yeah, I think I would just tack on to that. That last point Tony made is the same

point that Tim made, I think, earlier, and I think it's really important. And I touched on this. The FAA process for considering and approving modification standards has changed.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:18:22
In recent years, and it no longer is attached to the master planning process.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:18:29
in the actual development of a new airport layout plan.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:18:32
It's going to be a project-specific approach so

[David Miller - Century West] 19:18:36
To Tony's point, getting the airport layout plan approved

[David Miller - Century West] 19:18:41
still requires a path

[David Miller - Century West] 19:18:42
to compliance.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:18:49
Ted, I just want to check in. Please wave your hand if you'd like to uh

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:18:55
clarify anything there.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:19:01
Okay, great. Thank you.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:19:05
Okay.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:19:05
And so again, we will be

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:19:08
posting those comments that we've collected and have been shared with the entire team that will include the responses as well. And so we will be posting that

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:19:18
hopefully next week.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:19:21
So I can make sure that we email the PAC members when that's posted so that you can all then see

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:19:28
those comments and things that you've submitted.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:19:32
So thanks.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:19:34
TED for raising that again here in this meeting.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:19:45
I want to check in. I think that

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:19:51
Tony Hubbling wrote

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:19:53
that your hand is still up and we're asking for the hard consideration. Tim House just mentioned that is the whole point.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:19:59
the ODAB needs to be on the side of the airport defending the airport and make the hard ask.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:20:09
David Malk also added, we have actual data every day and it's well below that number for the

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:20:15
design aircraft

[David Miller - Century West] 19:20:17
Okay.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:20:18
numbers.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:20:21
I'm not and then um

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:20:25
Okay, and then i think i i think i got

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:20:27
So those are the two comments that came in that I saw.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:20:34
I'm not sure if we want to answer that um i think

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:20:38
David, your comment was just a comment.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:20:41

And I guess Tony's was as well. Tony, do you

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:20:44
Tony Hubbling, would you like to elaborate on that? Okay, let me unmute you.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:20:52
Yeah, can you hear me? Okay. First off, I had a really nice conversation with Tim House here a month and a half ago

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:20:53
Yes.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:21:02
Uh-oh, you muted.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:21:04
And

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:21:04
Can you hear me now?

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:21:05
Okay, yes.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:21:07
Okay, had a real nice conversation with Tim House here a couple months ago, and I have a lot of respect for you, Tim. I hope you can hear me say that. That's the second time in the last 20 seconds I've said it. So first time you didn't hear me.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:21:19
I feel like we're dripping water and maybe the ice is starting to melt um

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:21:24
I heard Tim say that, yes, requests for modification standards do come in for projects like a runway extension or stuff like that.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:21:34
And those are hard to look at and the FAA will look at them.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:21:39
I guess, and that's what we're asking David Miller and Tony Beach to do is step up and make that hard ask.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:21:47
It brings me to the information that we provided as a result of the request for feedback on the preliminary refined alternatives.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:21:57
And we submitted a lot. I know there was an 87-page document that came from our team

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:22:03
to them. And Ted talked about it

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:22:06
Because I've sent a lot of stuff in.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:22:09
But what I guess is bothersome

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:22:13
is it seems like

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:22:16
the ODAV team and the consultants

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:22:19
They receive it and they tell everybody it's in the record.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:22:21
But it's not made been brought up for discussion

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:22:24
In the only places where Kenji said we can discuss these things.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:22:28
So it's very, very frustrating

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:22:31
Because it's like Ted said.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:22:33
it seems like there's a predetermined outcome of how this is all going to go.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:22:37
And the FAA and the ODAB are pointing at each other saying, we're not directing it. They have to do it. But these guys are saying the FAA is telling us we have to do this.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:22:47
So it is really, really frustrating.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:22:51
I did hear, I think it was dave

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:22:55
You said that the FAA modification program system has changed

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:23:00
please share the document that shows that changed or that that

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:23:06
their way to consider

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:23:07
modifications the standard has changed because the basis upon which Aaron did his study was the most recent modification to standard requirements and what it shows

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:23:20
is the FAA is required, and that's why i asked that

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:23:23
question of Tim, the legal question earlier it says the

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:23:28
FAA must. It is not a

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:23:30
should. It's a must

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:23:33
consider a modification to standard request.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:23:36
And just like you said, Free Memorial Airport in Sun Valley is never going to move. We all know it.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:23:41
Portland is not going to move their fence. We know it too, but it's still a modification to standard. So is the FAA not going to give PDX any money for a runway improvement because they won't move their fence?

[David Miller - Century West] 19:23:42
See?

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:23:52
And why are we taking this

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:23:55
as Aurora Airport, what's so special about Aurora that says we can't ask for a modification to standard when the FAA

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:24:02
entertains them, as Tim said

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:24:04
And you even said Friedman isn't moving for 30 years.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:24:07
you worked on it or worked on it over 30 years ago, still hasn't moved. What's wrong with having a modification standard

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:24:14
for Aurora State Airport for a highway, a windsock, and an antenna.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:24:19
or buildings.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:24:22
On the other side when

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:24:23
That's the way the program is designed for historical and economic benefit of

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:24:30
that the airport's serving.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:24:32
That's what I'm really having a hard time wrapping my head around and hoping you should shed some light on that.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:24:38
Well, I'll try. Last point first. I'm not predicting that Friedman Airport is not moving.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:24:43
I think Tim could, you know.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:24:44
He's not moving.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:24:47
I'm not going to say that because I think the FAA expectation with the airport, I'm not involved in that, but my understanding and reading through the

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:24:48
Thank you.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:24:57
and kind of loosely following over the years is there is still an expectation that that airport will either meet standards or move.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:25:04
And there was a comment buried on the airport layout plan that the offending highway in Friedman and Haley is very much like the 551, and there would be potentially an option for realigning it outside the OFA, which doesn't solve all the problems.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:25:21
Point is, there's a lot of work that still needs to be done, but by no means is the mod considered

[David Miller - Century West] 19:25:29
open-ended in that sense.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:25:31
My comment about the method, and Tim can weigh in here, but my comment about the method that modification standards are considered

[David Miller - Century West] 19:25:39
was really to point out that when the last master plan was done and it was routine.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:25:45
for the FAA to or for modifications of standards to be attached

[David Miller - Century West] 19:25:52
to the master planning, if you will. And I think my point is that the current

[David Miller - Century West] 19:25:58
guidance and I apologize if I know in responding to your comments in writing

[David Miller - Century West] 19:26:04
that we sourced the advisory circulars and the FA orders that are currently in force.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:26:09
And what came from that is, and some of these have been updated as recently as I believe 2023

[David Miller - Century West] 19:26:17
So Aaron probably did review those, but they are very clearly project specific, not planning driven.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:26:23
So I think that's where I would lean over to Tim and say, straighten me out if I got that wrong.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:26:29
Again, we're talking about the ability, and I don't know. I mean, I would defer to FAA on that.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:26:35
But I think the information we've been provided is that planning is not the vehicle, if you will.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:26:44
for the mob application so

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:26:47
Well, I guess let me jump in here, Dave. What I'm trying to explore with you, because I met with ODOT,

[David Miller - Century West] 19:26:48
Jim?

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:26:55
And they said that they can

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:26:58
Oregon Department of Aviation can buy property from the Oregon Highway Trust.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:27:04
And they can move that highway within what would be the remaining right of way. And we wouldn't have to purchase the homes on the other side.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:27:12
And that would give us a wider ROFA. And we can all do that. I guess what I'm looking at is

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:27:19
figuring out a way where, you know.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:27:22
ODAV, the aeronautical stakeholders, where we can work together collaboratively to come up with a creative solution.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:27:31
to solve this. But right now, we're not working collaboratively

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:27:35
I mean, we're getting this and who's caught in the middle right here

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:27:39
is us, the people who have skin in the game.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:27:43
And it's not acceptable.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:27:45
It isn't. And I can tell you, we're not going to sit back and just do nothing.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:27:50
And I don't want to

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:27:52
The last thing I want to do is fight with our partners at Aurora.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:27:57
We all want to operate our aircraft or our businesses safely and with respect to our neighbors, to Ben Williams and to the mayor up in Wilsonville. I mean, the last thing I want to do as a pilot is fly over built up areas. If I lose an engine, I want to be over a golf course. I want to be over a farm field.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:28:15
But what's happening is we're not working collaboratively with each other. We're presenting ideas and concepts

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:28:21
that are going to go counter to the ORS statute that ODAV is supposed to protect private investment.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:28:28
and is going to damage companies. And when you take these companies hangers, however they transfer over the next 10, 15 years, because I've been with this company for almost 30 years.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:28:40
I can guarantee you when this starts to happen, you are going to lose a significant tax base at the airport, and you're going to lose these businesses.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:28:51
It's just going to happen. And it's because of of

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:28:56
people's refusal to work collaboratively together to find a solution.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:29:01
And everybody can hold up a regulation and duck behind it and say, hey, I have to do this because this regulation says I has to.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:29:07
But you don't have to. In the front of every regulation, there'll be an opportunity for people to work

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:29:15
outside the regulation or ask for variances or that kind of thing. And that's all we're asking you to do is work with us instead of presenting stuff to us, telling us that this is the way it's going to be. And then we're not allowed to really have input because

[David Miller - Century West] 19:29:24
Thank you.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:29:28
it was already decided and now we're just going to give it to you in a public meeting.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:29:33
I'm done.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:29:35
Okay. Well, I think

[David Miller - Century West] 19:29:40
I don't know if I want to go back into the conformance issues, but I think, as you pointed out you know

[David Miller - Century West] 19:29:47
even a minor shift of the highway within the right-of-way wouldn't address the east side issues with the vehicle service road and the taxi lane.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:29:56
you know there there could be some easing of impact on the properties to the west. But I would just say that information like that that was part of

[David Miller - Century West] 19:30:07
Part of the discussion earlier in previous PAC meetings, I know we talked about things like that. I know that that was part of

[David Miller - Century West] 19:30:14
ODABs.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:30:16
consideration when they were weighing the options that were available

[David Miller - Century West] 19:30:19
Trying to find that most feasible

[David Miller - Century West] 19:30:22
option. So I don't know, Tony, would you like to weigh in or Kim? I don't know there's more that I can say about that. We are providing options that

[David Miller - Century West] 19:30:33
are capable, meaning FA standards. It's really the

[David Miller - Century West] 19:30:36
the challenge for the airport owner to find a way to navigate that going forward.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:30:43
Tony?

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 19:30:46
Yeah, I really don't have a lot to add other than, you know, I mentioned earlier that we recognize that all three of the refined alternatives

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 19:30:54
do require a substantial

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 19:30:57
amount of work to to

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 19:30:59

bring the airport into standard.

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 19:31:02
And so, like I said, this was a very difficult decision for us to make. And we want to do what's best for the airport.

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 19:31:11
for the airport users, for the pilot community.

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 19:31:14
And for our local communities.

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 19:31:17
Again, this was really, really difficult challenge decision and we know that

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 19:31:22
You know, each one of them had

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 19:31:26
some…

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 19:31:28
set of

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 19:31:30
unintended consequences or impacts that we certainly would not intend on

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 19:31:36
on anyone. But again, we are looking at what

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 19:31:40
best for the airport and for the airport

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 19:31:43
Again, the airport users and the community for the long term.

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 19:31:46
So that we can continue to maintain this important transportation facility

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 19:31:51
and serve

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 19:31:53
not just the local community, but also oregon

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 19:31:57
and the nation as a whole.

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 19:32:00
That's really all I wanted to add. But Kenji is also on, our director, and I just

wanted to shout out if there's anything else that he'd like to add to that.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:32:14
Oh, Kenji, sorry, let me unmute you.

[Kenji Sugahara, ODAV] 19:32:21
Okay. Hey, so yeah, absolutely. And you know, one of the things that I want to add too is

[Kenji Sugahara, ODAV] 19:32:27
The biggest thing is the whole mod standard, that's the big issue that we see

[Kenji Sugahara, ODAV] 19:32:34
And it's led to a lot of things. We had good conversations with the f

[Kenji Sugahara, ODAV] 19:32:39
And they're pretty adamant, especially if they're spending that much money

[Kenji Sugahara, ODAV] 19:32:44
whether it's a reconstruction or not, their point is

[Kenji Sugahara, ODAV] 19:32:47
If they're going to spend money, they wanted to adhere to standard. That's their biggest thing.

[Kenji Sugahara, ODAV] 19:32:52
But, you know, when we talk about sort of the impacts of businesses.

[Kenji Sugahara, ODAV] 19:32:56
That actually is very important to me as well.

[Kenji Sugahara, ODAV] 19:33:00
You know, that's all part of the calculus and we want to make sure

[Kenji Sugahara, ODAV] 19:33:04
that we're taking a balanced approach and

[Kenji Sugahara, ODAV] 19:33:09
It's a difficult decision, right? And we're sitting here with a bunch of

[Kenji Sugahara, ODAV] 19:33:16
really not

[Kenji Sugahara, ODAV] 19:33:17
Not the best options.

[Kenji Sugahara, ODAV] 19:33:20
And we have to make a decision.

[Kenji Sugahara, ODAV] 19:33:22

And with in mind.

[Kenji Sugahara, ODAV] 19:33:25
It's the future growth of the airport. It's the safety, it's the adherence to standards.

[Kenji Sugahara, ODAV] 19:33:31
And we did talk to a lot of folks higher up at the FAA. They're like, no, you have to adhere to standards so

[Kenji Sugahara, ODAV] 19:33:37
That's what we're left with. And it's the best that we can come up with. And I know that Wendy and everybody put in a lot of thought into sort of the alternatives. But again, it requires modification standards, which we just can't do.

[Kenji Sugahara, ODAV] 19:33:51
So, but…

[Kenji Sugahara, ODAV] 19:33:53
everybody's input into the entire process has been fantastic.

[Kenji Sugahara, ODAV] 19:33:57
And every single piece that everybody's talked about

[Kenji Sugahara, ODAV] 19:34:00
has been weighed very carefully by

[Kenji Sugahara, ODAV] 19:34:02
by staff as weighed by the consultants.

[Kenji Sugahara, ODAV] 19:34:06
and

[Kenji Sugahara, ODAV] 19:34:07
there's been a thorough process to make sure that everyone is heard. So I just want to make sure that these decisions are not taken lightly.

[Kenji Sugahara, ODAV] 19:34:14
And that we do think about economic impact. Because as you know, as the director, I come from private industry, one of the most important things is

[Kenji Sugahara, ODAV] 19:34:21
is making sure that businesses succeed. But at the same time, they have to balance with community interests and

[Kenji Sugahara, ODAV] 19:34:27
what is required by the FAA and other stakeholders as well. So I just want to just put that out there.

[Kenji Sugahara, ODAV] 19:34:34

And just to let everybody know that there's been a lot of thought put into this.

[Kenji Sugahara, ODAV] 19:34:38
And this conversation is still continuing. It's not over. We're putting out there what the preferred alternative is. There's still a lot to go.

[Kenji Sugahara, ODAV] 19:34:46
Just take that to heart and uh just

[Kenji Sugahara, ODAV] 19:34:50
Thank you for being part of this process.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:34:55
Great. Thank you, Kenji.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:35:00
I do want to note that we have posted the PowerPoint from tonight's presentation onto the website. So thank you, Jen, for doing that.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:35:11
So again, we will try to

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:35:13
be able to put all of your information up on the website as soon as we can.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:35:19
And so if you do want to go back and look at those slides, you can.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:35:26
I think that there was another question that came through

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:35:31
I see.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:35:34
I see Ted. Ted, you raised your hand.

[Ted Millar, AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:35:40
And just one thing to add on to what Tony had originally said, if we can just work

[Ted Millar, AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:35:46
collaboratively with collaboration with

[Ted Millar, AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:35:48
Dave and the consultants and ODAV, there are a lot of low-hanging fruit things that can be done. Like, for instance, that internal circulation road

[Ted Millar, AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:35:58
through the South End Air Park, it's already in

[Ted Millar, AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:36:01
It's already installed. It's already paid for.

[Ted Millar, AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:36:04
And it's been offered as a

[Ted Millar, AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:36:08
way of creating internal circulation mode that'd be way away from the airport that would very limit

[Ted Millar, AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:36:17
limit the opportunities for anybody to have a runway incursion.

[Ted Millar, AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:36:21
They would take a very little amount of

[Ted Millar, AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:36:24
just to extend that.

[Ted Millar, AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:36:26
Yellow Gate Road to Stenbach, and that serves almost two-thirds of the airport

[Ted Millar, AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:36:33
And it doesn't cost anybody anything.

[Ted Millar, AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:36:37
There's other things like tony mentioned

[Ted Millar, AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:36:39
working with ODOT to move the runway or move the road eventually

[Ted Millar, AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:36:45
still stay within the runway mount or the runway boundary

[Ted Millar, AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:36:49
which requires no taking of any of the properties

[Ted Millar, AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:36:53
on the west side of Highway 51.

[Ted Millar, AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:36:56
So there's a lot of little things

[Ted Millar, AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:36:58
that could be done if you'll just work with us.

[Ted Millar, AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:37:03
But we're not allowed to have a work session unless it's in this public hearing.

[Ted Millar, AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:37:08

And it doesn't get a chance to be talked about correctly.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:37:16
Thank you, Ted.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:37:19
And I see Tony helping, you added in the spirit of collaboration and path forward after the master plan is done with this preferred alternative, would the FAA then entertain

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:37:30
a modification of standards so we could avoid the loss of businesses.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:37:37
I think that might be a

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:37:40
Tim, question?

[David Miller - Century West] 19:37:42
Yeah, is Tim still with us?

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:37:45
Yeah.

[Tim House - FAA] 19:37:49
You know, that's the only time that modification standards are considered is when they are project based so

[Tim House - FAA] 19:37:56
I'm not sure exactly

[Tim House - FAA] 19:37:58
As far as your loss of business, exactly what that's referring to.

[Tim House - FAA] 19:38:03
That, as David explained

[Tim House - FAA] 19:38:06
we do not consider modification of standards as a part of the master planning process.

[Tim House - FAA] 19:38:11
So after the master plan is complete and we're trying to implement projects, that's when modifications and standards come into play.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:38:20
Okay, Tony, I've unmuted you.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:38:23

Hey, Tim, Tim, that's exactly where I'm going.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:38:26
Because this…

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:38:27
how to explain this to go talk to owners and tell them that, hey, this is the pervert alternative. The state's going to buy your hangar and tear it down.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:38:35
But I mean, that means a huge interruption to these aviation businesses.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:38:41
I mean, and we're talking lots and lots of money. I think even, I mean, if Kenji, you're still on here in Tony Beach.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:38:48
the air the

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:38:50
states plan aviation report

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:38:52
shows that Aurora State Airport

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:38:54
the economic impact of the airport per year is over a half a billion dollars

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:39:00
And I would tell you that a significant portion of it

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:39:04
is going to be affected

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:39:06
by the drain field issue and the destruction or the purchase and the displacement of the businesses that are in those front row hangars. Because those are the companies that are employing those people and making that contribution, not only in real dollars, but think about the tax base that's going into the Aurora Fire District.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:39:26
the North Marion School District and to the state as a whole because

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:39:30
we're through that we own the private property. It's not

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:39:33
the state doesn't pay the state of Oregon taxes for the property that the airport

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:39:39

owns and

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:39:41
that goes away. But by thinking collaboratively and outside the box, you know, by maybe

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:39:48
committing to modifications of standard applications after the master plan is accepted

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:39:53
then those are kind of things that we could work with. You know, Tim, work with you and work with Kenji and come up with solutions.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:40:00
And to how we can move this thing forward rather than

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:40:04
have stuff rammed down our throats that

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:40:07
you know, we're told it's just not going to change. And then I thank you, Brandy. I see your comment, but I guess the point is, is this is the only time Kenji will let us talk with you guys.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:40:17
We've asked for work sessions, but we're not allowed to have them.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:40:20
But this is the time we can.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:40:23
we can come up with these ideas. And that's my point. If we had the time to, I mean, sit in a room, you know, get Ben Williams there and the mayor of wilsonville

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:40:34
let's all get in a room and kind of come up with some absolutely crazy ideas. And I think you'd be surprised with how successful we could all be.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:40:45
I don't know if anyone wants to respond to that.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:40:48
Okay.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:40:54
Okay, well, I

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:40:55
take that as a no.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:40:57
Well, I would leave that to the…

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:40:58
um

[David Miller - Century West] 19:41:00
our ODAV folks to respond to

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:41:03
Yeah.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:41:03
process.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:41:07
Okay, Tony Beach or Kenji, sorry, Kenji, you might not be able to unmute. Sorry.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:41:16
Here.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:41:21
Okay, well, Tony, thank you. We will definitely consider this and um

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:41:27
and circle back.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:41:30
I do want to be respectful of the public who've been waiting to potentially speak.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:41:37
Please raise your hands if you would like to speak. I see two hands are already raised.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:41:43
We'll give you each two minutes to speak.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:41:46
And we don't we

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:41:48
we want to make sure that PAC members, you don't need to respond to comments because we want to leave as much time as possible for the public comments.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:41:59
And then, um.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:42:01
I see…

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:42:02
Mayor Asher, I see you've raised your hand as well. So why don't we start with you and then we'll go to, we have Neil and then Wendy, and then I can read a few of the comments that have come through in the Q&A.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:42:17
So Mayor Asher, you can go ahead.

[Brian Asher, City of Aurora] 19:42:21
Thank you. Appreciate all of what's going on up there.

[Brian Asher, City of Aurora] 19:42:29
During this whole time, the City of Aurora has been left out all your conversations from your airport talkers there, everybody up there, all your business people.

[Brian Asher, City of Aurora] 19:42:38
We talk about having a meeting with the city of wilsonville

[Brian Asher, City of Aurora] 19:42:42
Never anything about Aurora.

[Brian Asher, City of Aurora] 19:42:45
We are your closest neighbor.

[Brian Asher, City of Aurora] 19:42:49
And we have city store and water services that are going to be online enough to help you out.

[Brian Asher, City of Aurora] 19:42:55
And you refuse to come to

[Brian Asher, City of Aurora] 19:42:58
communicate with us about possibly working that out.

[Brian Asher, City of Aurora] 19:43:02
So that's my comment.

[Brian Asher, City of Aurora] 19:43:03
But when you do talk about other cities around you, I appreciate that you

[Brian Asher, City of Aurora] 19:43:08
Remember that we are your closest neighbor.

[Brian Asher, City of Aurora] 19:43:11
Thank you.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:43:13
Thank you.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:43:17
Okay, I'm going to go to Neil.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:43:21
Okay, Neil, you should be able to unmute.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:43:30
Let me try again. There should be something that pops up and you can just, you should be able to just click it.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:43:48
Let's see here.

[Neal] 19:43:51
Can you hear me?

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:43:53
Yes, thank you.

[Neal] 19:43:53
Just a question that was also raised by Columbia Helicopter is that why has the extension to the south

[Neal] 19:44:02
been abandoned.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:44:05
Okay, great, Neil. Thank you.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:44:08
David, do you want to take that?

[David Miller - Century West] 19:44:10
Yes, I think that when I talked about the process of screening alternatives, I think that a lot of all the input provided throughout the early PAC meetings

[Brian Asher, City of Aurora] 19:44:19
Okay.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:44:20
Up until the up through the preliminary alternative stage in June, there were a number of issues related to that that were raised. And I think that, as I mentioned earlier, two factors that were significant in terms of considering the North versus the South.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:44:37
One was that the North Runway extension does not require any property acquisition to accommodate the runway.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:44:44

And the actual runway itself. And then secondly, the south extension options

[David Miller - Century West] 19:44:51
would have impact on EFUs on land. So I know there was a lot of concern

[David Miller - Century West] 19:44:56
Both the public, community members and on the PAC about protecting EFU land.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:45:03
So those are two reasons. I know there are other issues related to the grading at the south end of the runway and so on, but those were the two main factors considerations. I know that, as Tony said.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:45:16
ODAV considered all of the input and their own experience with the site, making their uh their

[David Miller - Century West] 19:45:24
their decision on which options to move forward with. And that's how the North Extension

[David Miller - Century West] 19:45:29
was move forward.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:45:33
Great. Thank you, David. Okay, so Wendy is next.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:45:41
Wendy, oh, yep.

[Wendie Kellington] 19:45:43
Wendy Kellington representing airport stakeholders. Look, this agency does not exist in an echo chamber.

[Wendie Kellington] 19:45:50
And ODAP's decision has to be based on substantial evidence in the record. And number one, the only evidence in the record is that the drain field in the south can be improved to meet

[Wendie Kellington] 19:46:01
FAA standards, and therefore there is no lawful basis for

[Wendie Kellington] 19:46:07
ODEV to threaten.

[Wendie Kellington] 19:46:09
or propose to force its removal to somewhere else.

[Wendie Kellington] 19:46:13
Number two, this whole idea about modifications of standards

[Wendie Kellington] 19:46:18
Look, an airport master plan is a blueprint

[Wendie Kellington] 19:46:22
for how the airport is going to develop over 10 or 20 years.

[Wendie Kellington] 19:46:25
And one of the fundamentals of that is to sequence the timing of events. And there can be no dispute that the runway extension is gravely needed right now for pilot and passenger safety so people don't die.

[Wendie Kellington] 19:46:41
And so there is no law out there, I can promise you, that says that that runway cannot be extended right now on a modification to standard for Highway 551 that is premised on a master plan proposal

[Wendie Kellington] 19:46:56
that says when we get the funding, we are going to move Highway 551 32 feet to the west to avoid the ROFA.

[Wendie Kellington] 19:47:04
Nothing says you can't do that. And people who say otherwise are not telling you the truth. And as a matter of fact, right now, you haven't heard FA say that's not allowed.

[Wendie Kellington] 19:47:14
All you've heard them say is come up with a plan for compliance. Here's a plan for compliance. Expand the runway now.

[Wendie Kellington] 19:47:21
and plan to move the highway 32 feet over the master plan planning period. Three, all of this talk about airport safety and improvement and all of that and that ODAB wants to buy up, if it can, the privately owned properties outside of the boundary.

[Wendie Kellington] 19:47:43
requires ODAB to expand the airport boundary to include those properties. And so far, nothing has been said about that. We've had comments about it. And so far ODAV has not even remotely proposed it. Let's propose

[David Miller - Century West] 19:47:56
Okay.

[Wendie Kellington] 19:47:58
to expand the airport boundary if you're also going to have this idea of ODAP sitting in the wings thinking it's going to buy up private property.

[Wendie Kellington] 19:48:06
Because when the airport boundaries expanded, that's what allows the airport to plan to do airport things.

[Wendie Kellington] 19:48:15
Thank you.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:48:16
Great. Thank you so much, Wendy.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:48:16
Thank you.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:48:21
Okay, I see David has a question. If we get through these public questions and comments, I'll circle back with you, David. Otherwise, please type it in the chat so that we have it recorded.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:48:34
So I see a question from Jason.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:48:38
Paolo about does option 1a and 1B include the cost for ODOT to relocate the Hubbard Highway? David, I believe you said that it

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:48:48
did include the cost.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:48:48
Yes, that's correct. That is correct, Miss.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:48:51
Okay. And then…

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:48:53
Jason also asked.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:48:56
Our business relocation costs included in these option estimates

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:48:59
due to not being able to operate after reduced property footprint as a result of ODA Aurora Airport property acquisition.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:49:10
Okay, if I understand the question, what is included in the cost estimate is the

[David Miller - Century West] 19:49:16
property value, that is the land in the improvements. So straight from the Marion County assessor site so

[David Miller - Century West] 19:49:24
The cost associated with relocating businesses and other related costs are not

included in the cost estimates.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:49:32
So that is an issue that would need to be addressed by

[David Miller - Century West] 19:49:36
the airport and the team.

[Wendie Kellington] 19:49:38
It's just so much fun. I really hate it.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:49:39
Okay, great. And then…

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:49:43
There are several comments in here from Wendy, but Wendy, I believe that you covered them all.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:49:50
Bruce Bergman asks, why are a vehicle access road and second taxiway considered mandatory? We have a workable plan for a vehicle access road already and living with a single taxiway instead of destroying public property seems like a better idea.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:50:12
Okay, I guess I can respond and let Tony Beach weigh in, but essentially the recommendation on providing a

[David Miller - Century West] 19:50:20
an enhanced vehicle service road

[David Miller - Century West] 19:50:23
my understanding came from recommendation from the Runway safety action team

[David Miller - Century West] 19:50:28
And, um.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:50:30
I think that the other proposed concepts that have been around for a while, I think the

[David Miller - Century West] 19:50:38
ODA, O'Dav.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:50:40
folks have reviewed those, and I think they considered that in their decision. But Tony, or if I got any of that wrong.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:50:47
Please clarify.

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 19:50:51
Yeah, thanks, David.

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 19:50:54
You're exactly right. The vehicle service road

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 19:50:58
was a recommendation from Runway Safety and also

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 19:51:02
It was a suggestion that we had from the PAC.

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 19:51:05
And I understand, you know.

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 19:51:08
Some PAC members are not interested in having the vehicle service road.

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 19:51:13
along the taxiway, but this is done at several airports and

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 19:51:18
As we described earlier in the master planning process, this is a facility plan for the aurora state airport

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 19:51:25
And so we're looking at improvements on

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 19:51:29
state property as part of this planning process.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:51:34
Okay. And then…

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:51:36
George Van, sorry, I probably said that wrong. Question for the FAA representative with the just disclosed preferred alternative, is it possible that the FAA would grant or

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:51:50
retain a request for a waiver modification to the design standards to allow the runway extension to happen first with other more expensive and difficult phases to follow.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:52:02
note, I think most pilots would agree that the one change that would most positively impact airport safety

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:52:08
is the contemplated 497 foot runway extension.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:52:15
And so I'm not sure if you can answer that right now.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:52:18
Tim, but I know that we will include responses in our meeting summary.

[Tim House - FAA] 19:52:24
I think that's best. I mean, we pretty well addressed that as we were discussing it so

[Tim House - FAA] 19:52:29
But yeah, we can

[Tim House - FAA] 19:52:32
work together to get answer in writing.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:52:35
Great. Okay. And then I don't see any other hands raised from

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:52:41
public members, but just wanted to put one last call and then I will address there's two questions that have come in from PAC members.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:52:53
Okay, so David Malp asks, who is in the room when the alternative plans are considered and decided upon?

[David Miller - Century West] 19:52:55
Lovely.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:53:04
Well, from the consultant perspective, I can tell you that

[David Miller - Century West] 19:53:08
work is collaborative, both internally and with our client.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:53:13
And adding the FA to the mix so

[David Miller - Century West] 19:53:16
I think that we work through the process and as far as when the

[David Miller - Century West] 19:53:21
Tony could speak to their internal process in terms of evaluating the options that were developed and making a decision.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:53:29
the process of leading those, developing those alternatives, refining those alternatives.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:53:35
presenting that information to ODAV.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:53:39
That's been an open process and then

[David Miller - Century West] 19:53:42
Tony, I mean…

[David Miller - Century West] 19:53:45
you're coordinating elements and i think

[David Miller - Century West] 19:53:50
the department's decision on a preferred alternative was made fairly recently, I think, based on all of the review of the input provided to date. So I don't know, Tony, can you

[David Miller - Century West] 19:54:00
add anything to that?

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 19:54:02
Yeah, it wasn't one room and it wasn't one conversation. This is a lengthy process that we've been working on this master plan for

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 19:54:12
Nearly three years now and

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 19:54:16
Going back to when we shared the first preliminary alternatives back in June.

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 19:54:22
And we've been looking over all the comments we've been receiving, not just

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 19:54:27
from the preliminary alternatives, but from the very beginning of this project and

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 19:54:33
The people at ODAV that are

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 19:54:36
We're in the introductory part of this presentation.

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 19:54:40
Management ODAV and

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 19:54:42
Including other staff.

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 19:54:46

We're all part of conversations leading up to

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 19:54:49
the evaluation of all the feedback we've received and the selection of our preferred alternative.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:54:57
I would just add to that. I mentioned earlier in sort of the summary of the recent activities, our consulting team also

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:54:58
Okay.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:55:05
was invited to provide a briefing to the board, the aviation department board in September. So I know that

[David Miller - Century West] 19:55:14
is also added to the

[David Miller - Century West] 19:55:16
information that was considered and feedback that the board provided so

[David Miller - Century West] 19:55:20
Just mention that.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:55:24
Okay, great. I see that um

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:55:28
Tony Hubbling has another question, and then I'm not sure if we answered your question earlier, Councillor Linfield, about the cost estimates being presented to the ODAP board.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:55:41
and their concerns

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:55:43
So, um.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:55:47
Did we answer that question for you, Councillor Lindell? Okay, okay, great.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:55:52
So Tony Hubbling, if you can

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:55:57
We do have some next steps slides that we'd like to get through.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:56:02

Go ahead.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:56:02
Again, this is the only time Kenji lets us talk.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:56:07
A couple of things. First, apologies to Brian Asher. You're a great guy. We need to make sure that the city of Aurora is in the room. We're the mill for the city of Aurora because the city of Aurora

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:56:17
I mean, doesn't have really much industry to speak of does have some, but we're the mill for the one mill town for the city of Aurora and the city of Aurora is important to us. And we do value the relationship. Sometimes it doesn't seem that way, especially when the city's suing us, but

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:56:33
we do value them and they should be at the seat of that table too

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:56:37
One of the points I made was this Zoom meeting thing

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:56:41
This is a leftover and the reason we started doing this is because this started three years ago during covid

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:56:47
why we have continued to do this when previous master plans, all of them

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:56:51
Previous to this one were done in person where we could have collaboratively work together and challenge each other, ask questions and have meaningful input with drawings out on tables and citizens in the room with us.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:57:04
where we could see their emotions i can't see

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:57:07
George Van Humenson's face. This is not the way we should be conducting something that is north of $200 to $300 million. This is not the way to do this. That's number one.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:57:20
But I do have a question.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:57:22
Somebody brought up the point, who's going to pay for the costs associated with moving these businesses?

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:57:28

And the interruptions to businesses. David said that that wasn't considered in the factor, that it was only the Marion County, what the things were on the tax rolls. We all know that the tax rolls are less than what our values are real market values. We all know that. The county will tell you that. That's number one. But number two, there are easements in perpetuity associated with access to the airport, to the runways from the south end air park.

[Wendie Kellington] 19:57:46
Hold on.

[Wendie Kellington] 19:57:51
We'll just…

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:57:52
And also for the drain fields.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:57:54
And I'm curious.

[Wendie Kellington] 19:57:54
what's his

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:57:58
how from the consultant's point of view or the FAA's point of view or ODev's point of view.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:58:02
How do we navigate

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:58:06
those easements in perpetuity. I mean, those were deals that were made in good faith

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:58:11
So that we could operate businesses

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:58:13
We gave up property once before, but the promise was made. We'd still have access. The promise was made. We could put our drain filled here. So we invested in that. We put our personal money into that with the easement in perpetuity, we could use it. And now the proposal is from the same people that signed the deal that, oh, yep, you can have it there forever. Or say, nope, nope.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:58:35
We're going to take it.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:58:38
So, and you're on your own.

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:58:39
So I'm just curious how the state proposes

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:58:43
or the FAA or the consultants deal

[Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:58:45
with the easements in perpetuity.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:58:49
I'm not sure, David, if you can answer that now, but I think that's a good question, Tony, for us to flag for the

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:58:57
summary. David, can you answer that now or should we

[David Miller - Century West] 19:58:59
Yeah, well, I would agree. I think that question deserves a written response. It's complicated. It falls into the legal realm, not the airport planning realm.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:59:07
So I'm not going to even venture into what

[David Miller - Century West] 19:59:10
actions or discussions need to happen or the path, but Tony may be able to eliminate us a little bit. But without a doubt, I think that

[David Miller - Century West] 19:59:19
Implementation.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:59:20
of any project this complex is going to be complicated and we'll

[David Miller - Century West] 19:59:25
lots of legal issues. So I think that's understood going in.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:59:31
And I'd leave it to Tony if he has something

[David Miller - Century West] 19:59:33
to add on that.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:59:36
Okay.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:59:37
Tony, I'm not sure if you want to add anything. Ted, I see your hand is raised.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:59:42
I do want to go, Tony Beach to let you finish and then wrap up our final couple slides about next steps. And then I know there is a lot of additional comments, questions.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:59:57
And so

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 19:59:59
We may just need to follow up with you all and

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 20:00:03
continue this conversation through email. So Tony, go ahead.

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 20:00:07
Yeah, thank you. I agree. We can put a written response together and

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 20:00:12
you know easements, other legal documents would have to be handled on a case-by-case basis. So we can't comment

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 20:00:20
here in this meeting but um

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 20:00:22
But we will provide an additional follow-up in writing.

[David Miller - Century West] 20:00:28
Thank you.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 20:00:28
Okay, so David, I'm wondering if you can go to the next slide and we can get through the next steps really quickly. And then Ted, if we can have your

[David Miller - Century West] 20:00:32
Sure.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 20:00:38
question or comment verbalized, and then we can get back to you and follow up with you.

[David Miller - Century West] 20:00:43
Okay.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 20:00:43
After this.

[David Miller - Century West] 20:00:45
Okay, just to wrap up. So as we mentioned earlier, the next PAC meeting is scheduled for December 12th.

[David Miller - Century West] 20:00:52
the tasks ahead of us with the preferred alternative identified is to, with the runway

[David Miller - Century West] 20:00:59
configuration identified future existing and future both.

[David Miller - Century West] 20:01:04
to run the noise analysis.

[David Miller - Century West] 20:01:07
And then we will detail out, build off the cost estimates for the preferred alternative components.

[David Miller - Century West] 20:01:13
and develop a capital improvement program for the next 20 years, identify

[David Miller - Century West] 20:01:19
on a more granular detail level, project by project, individual projects.

[David Miller - Century West] 20:01:24
And then get a sense of timing as well. Not all projects would be completed in the near term.

[David Miller - Century West] 20:01:31
or the intermediate term, some would be long-term projects. And there's obviously sequencing required

[David Miller - Century West] 20:01:36
for something like a project that would require property acquisition before any construction. So things like that would need to be sort of

[David Miller - Century West] 20:01:44
broken out that way, detailing the airport layout plan drawing set with both the existing conditions and the preferred alternative details.

[David Miller - Century West] 20:01:53
And then that along with all of the other materials developed through the chapters and working papers.

[David Miller - Century West] 20:01:58
are pulled into the draft final report. I'm anticipating that with the document, the final document, we'll end up with

[David Miller - Century West] 20:02:07
a technical report and at least a fairly significant appendix.

[David Miller - Century West] 20:02:12
and maybe more than one that includes

[David Miller - Century West] 20:02:16
both PAC and public comments.

[David Miller - Century West] 20:02:18
So there will be a full record of all the information that's been provided.

[David Miller - Century West] 20:02:23
And it's not insignificant.

[David Miller - Century West] 20:02:25
And as I said, there'll be some conversation in the December meeting about ODAB's responsibilities under

[David Miller - Century West] 20:02:33
OAR 738, so it's been mentioned a few times, and I know that that's something that the

[David Miller - Century West] 20:02:38
department has been in consultation with their legal folks on. So that's also conversation for December.

[David Miller - Century West] 20:02:46
And I guess the only other point, I don't want to go too far off field here, but I just want to

[David Miller - Century West] 20:02:51
There's been a lot of great conversation, a lot of discussion. I just want to encourage everyone to review the material that will be provided on the website.

[David Miller - Century West] 20:03:00
both the

[David Miller - Century West] 20:03:01
the presentation denied and then in the responses that we provided to the earlier input.

[David Miller - Century West] 20:03:08
And really take advantage of the comment period to provide your input on the preferred alternative. If you can disagree with it, you can

[David Miller - Century West] 20:03:17
there's really no limits to what you can say. All of that will be factored in. And then I think

[David Miller - Century West] 20:03:25
Once the initial comment period is ended, then we'll have a little bit of time between then and the

[David Miller - Century West] 20:03:34
December PAC meeting to anticipate how

[David Miller - Century West] 20:03:37
report back on that. So there's been a lot of great comments and suggestions and

[David Miller - Century West] 20:03:42
I know that Tim at the FAA and Tony and Kenji and others at Odev

[David Miller - Century West] 20:03:48
are interested in sort of pulling this conversation together so

[David Miller - Century West] 20:03:53
I would just say that. So don't hold back i think

[David Miller - Century West] 20:03:57
you know this is a good opportunity.

[David Miller - Century West] 20:03:59
to provide some detailed

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 20:04:04
Okay, thanks, David.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 20:04:07
I do want to um

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 20:04:08
get to Ted so that we can make sure that your comments and questions are captured and that we can make sure that we

[Ted Millar, AABC/TLM Holdings] 20:04:11
That's all.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 20:04:16
address them. So go ahead, Ted.

[Ted Millar, AABC/TLM Holdings] 20:04:19
I'd like to just add one thing. Tony Beach just a minute ago said

[Ted Millar, AABC/TLM Holdings] 20:04:24
that his team

[Ted Millar, AABC/TLM Holdings] 20:04:26
was trying to do what is best for the airport and that they have decided

[Ted Millar, AABC/TLM Holdings] 20:04:32
what needs to be done. But I think I need to point out just one last time to everybody here.

[Ted Millar, AABC/TLM Holdings] 20:04:39
the cities of Aurora.

[Ted Millar, AABC/TLM Holdings] 20:04:40
Wilsonville.

[Ted Millar, AABC/TLM Holdings] 20:04:43
state economic development people and everybody

[Ted Millar, AABC/TLM Holdings] 20:04:46
that every major employer

[Ted Millar, AABC/TLM Holdings] 20:04:48
It has hangars along the runway

[Ted Millar, AABC/TLM Holdings] 20:04:51
of the Aurora airport

[Ted Millar, AABC/TLM Holdings] 20:04:54
that contributes to all those.

[Ted Millar, AABC/TLM Holdings] 20:04:56
1,200 or more salaries

[Ted Millar, AABC/TLM Holdings] 20:05:00
all have offices

[Ted Millar, AABC/TLM Holdings] 20:05:02
and other adjoining states.

[Ted Millar, AABC/TLM Holdings] 20:05:04
and that if you

[Ted Millar, AABC/TLM Holdings] 20:05:07
say that removing all those

[Ted Millar, AABC/TLM Holdings] 20:05:10
headquarters of those major

[Ted Millar, AABC/TLM Holdings] 20:05:12
Officers like my flight.

[Ted Millar, AABC/TLM Holdings] 20:05:14
We're also construction, Columbia Helicopters, helicopter transport.

[Ted Millar, AABC/TLM Holdings] 20:05:20
And all of the others

[Ted Millar, AABC/TLM Holdings] 20:05:22
automatic aviation. You take those away, you're taking two and a half

[Ted Millar, AABC/TLM Holdings] 20:05:27
billion dollars

[Ted Millar, AABC/TLM Holdings] 20:05:29

of economic development impact

[Ted Millar, AABC/TLM Holdings] 20:05:32
for the area and any one of these companies or all of them

[Ted Millar, AABC/TLM Holdings] 20:05:36
if they have to then you just you take their business away

[Ted Millar, AABC/TLM Holdings] 20:05:40
They're moving to an adjacent state.

[Ted Millar, AABC/TLM Holdings] 20:05:44
And so you say, is that to the good of the airport to wipe them out, to take them out of there?

[Ted Millar, AABC/TLM Holdings] 20:05:50
I don't think so. That may be their vision.

[Ted Millar, AABC/TLM Holdings] 20:05:52
of how they want the airport to be owned and run.

[Ted Millar, AABC/TLM Holdings] 20:05:56
But that's not for the best of the community.

[Ted Millar, AABC/TLM Holdings] 20:05:58
And that's going to wipe out the

[Ted Millar, AABC/TLM Holdings] 20:06:02
total reason for having the airport in the first place.

[Ted Millar, AABC/TLM Holdings] 20:06:06
And this growth that's been at the airport has done at the recommendation of the oregon state

[Ted Millar, AABC/TLM Holdings] 20:06:13
Economic Development Department.

[Ted Millar, AABC/TLM Holdings] 20:06:15
And we've done exactly what they asked us to do.

[Ted Millar, AABC/TLM Holdings] 20:06:18
for 20 years, you take this away, you're going to lose that economic

[Ted Millar, AABC/TLM Holdings] 20:06:24
And think about that because it's serious.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 20:06:28
Great. Thank you so much, Ted.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 20:06:32

I see a lot of comments. Thank you, Tony, Helbling for putting those in the chat.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 20:06:39
And then Councillor Linville, I see that you also have your hand raised. And I just want to note we are over time. So I just want to be respectful for you all. And I do want to make sure, Tony, I'll read your comments in just a second, but I want to make sure Councillor Lindville's gets on the record as well.

[Councilor Dr. Joann Linville, City of Wilsonville] 20:06:55
Thank you. Thank you, Brandy. As it relates to the next steps.

[Councilor Dr. Joann Linville, City of Wilsonville] 20:07:01
I'm wondering, isn't there going to be an environmental analysis that will be done in addition?

[David Miller - Century West] 20:07:13
Yeah, I've got to go back and double check the scope. I believe that the environmental review, which is not a standalone environmental study, I think that

[David Miller - Century West] 20:07:22
Got to check on that, and I believe…

[David Miller - Century West] 20:07:25
that would be incorporated into the noise analysis element.

[David Miller - Century West] 20:07:28
So we will get back to you on that.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 20:07:32
Okay, great. Thank you, Councilor Linville. And so just to read Tony Hubbling's comments um

[David Miller - Century West] 20:07:34
Thank you.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 20:07:39
what is happening right now is exactly what we're talking about, preferred alternatives are being decided upon when we've not considered the admitted complexities of the path being taken.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 20:07:48
we're doing this wrong. We need to bring this thing to a hold so we can figure out a path forward that we can collaboratively produce.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 20:07:56
Why are next steps being presented? Why are they already decided upon?

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 20:08:00
proof that OJAB consultants and FAA have already decided where this is going.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 20:08:05
We're asking to stop and hold so we could figure out a way to collaborate.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 20:08:09
Strongly recommend ODAB and the consultants take a long, hard look at the ORS statute that is being flatly

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 20:08:16
flat out being ignored.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 20:08:19
So thank you, Tony. Thank you, everyone, for your comments. I know this is a lot of information, a lot of discussion today.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 20:08:28
I want to just close out the meeting. Tony, Tim, Kenji, anything that you'd like to add as we close out tonight?

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 20:08:36
One thing before we start closing out, there was a direct message to me from Councillor Linville, and I just wanted to make sure that we included that and got a response to it.

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 20:08:47
The question related to the preliminary alternatives was

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 20:08:51
If we withdraw the request to extend the runway, does this all go away?

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 20:08:55
And we have explained earlier through the master, I'm sorry, through the preliminary alternative process and earlier in this presentation.

[David Miller - Century West] 20:09:03
Okay.

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 20:09:03
when we were discussing how we developed the preliminary alternatives that conceptually the no action

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 20:09:11
alternative was not considered to be viable

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 20:09:16
Even if we didn't extend the runway, but just cut things as they were because

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 20:09:20
they would not address the

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 20:09:23

the standards requirements from the FAA, as David explained earlier.

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 20:09:28
And for the same reason that he explained, you know, going back to b2

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 20:09:32
was not an option either.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 20:09:37
Okay, thank you, Tony, for making sure that we got that on the record.

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 20:09:39
Thank you.

[David Miller - Century West] 20:09:41
Wow.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 20:09:43
Okay.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 20:09:45
Thank you, everyone. We really do appreciate your feedback and getting this to ODAV and so

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 20:09:53
We will be posting the recording of this meeting in the next

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 20:09:56
few, you know, probably usually we can post it within the next day. Hopefully we can do that again

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 20:10:03
And then again, when we post the comments that we've collected and that have been considered in the previous conversations by the team, we will be posting that next week.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 20:10:13
So with comments, and so we'll make sure to post that and send you an email when that is up there.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 20:10:21
the PowerPoint from tonight is up on the website.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 20:10:24
And we will continue to put information on the website as we get it.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 20:10:30
So thank you all. This concludes our meeting. So thanks for staying a few minutes late.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 20:10:37
And, um.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 20:10:39
And I think that that is all for our evening. So thank you all.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 20:10:45
for joining us.

[David Miller - Century West] 20:10:48
Thank you.

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 20:10:48
And if I can, just before we sign off completely, I just want to reiterate that thank you all to everyone on the pack and

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 20:10:56
in the public for attending these meetings, for all your contributions and input.

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 20:11:00
throughout the entire process, we really do value it.

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 20:11:04
And we do you know understand

[Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation] 20:11:07
all the concerns and will continue to try to address those and answer your questions throughout the rest of this process. So please do continue to log in for future meetings and look forward to the next meeting. Thank you.

[David Miller - Century West] 20:11:21
Yeah. Thank you, everyone.

[Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA] 20:11:21
Thank you, everyone.

Chat

16:57:41 From Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA to Hosts and panelists:
Welcome! If you'd like to test your audio or video, feel free to do that now.
16:57:49 From Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA to Hosts and panelists:
We'll get started at 5 pm
16:58:13 From Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA to Everyone:
If you are a PAC member and are in the attendee section, please let me know.
17:01:29 From Ted Millar to Hosts and panelists:
Ted Millar is on

17:06:20 From Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation to Hosts and panelists:
I can't unmute
17:07:20 From Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA to Everyone:
Just a reminder that we'll be recording the meeting. The recording will be posted to the website in the next 48 hours; the meeting summary will be posted when it is complete https://publicproject.net/AuroraAirport. Public comments should be submitted through the website.
17:12:48 From Councilor Dr. Joann Linville to Hosts and panelists:
Will the slides of the alternatives be available to the PAC member at the end of this meeting?
17:16:17 From Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA to Everyone:
The presentation slides will be posted to the project website following this meeting.
17:28:05 From Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association to Hosts and panelists:
did I miss the part in the agenda where David was going to review feedback form results? There was significant feedback!
17:28:28 From Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA to Hosts and panelists:
Thanks Tony, that is our next agenda item.
17:30:51 From Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA to Hosts and panelists:
Just a reminder that you can submit comments and questions through the chat. These all will be included in the meeting summary.
17:30:59 From Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association to Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA(direct message):
I do have a question but don't know how to raise my hand - sorry.
17:31:12 From Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA to Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association(direct message):
No worries Tony. I'll call on you next.
17:32:05 From Bill Graupp, Aurora CTE to Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA(direct message):
Are these 2025 cost estimates or is there some CPI index cost based on a 10 year outlook?
17:32:46 From Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA to Bill Graupp, Aurora CTE(direct message):
Thanks Bill. I will read this question for you to the larger group.
17:33:05 From David Mauk, Charbonneau to Hosts and panelists:
What's average cost for Oregon State airports for their most recent plans? And what is highest cost of an ODAV project & FAA project in Oregon or Washington?
17:33:07 From Bill Graupp, Aurora CTE to Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA(direct message):
Should I message the larger group for next questions?
17:33:48 From Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA to Bill Graupp, Aurora CTE(direct message):
If you'd like, either way is fine.
17:34:15 From Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA to Bill Graupp, Aurora CTE(direct message):
It will be included in the meeting summary either way.
17:34:40 From Councilor Dr. Joann Linville, City of Wilsonville to Hosts and panelists:
Have the cost estimates been presented to the ODAV Board and if so, what has

been their concerns?
17:38:19 From Ben Williams, Friends of French Prairie to Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA(direct message):
	To Tim's last comment, who is THEY are following advisory circulars? Tim House is the person who communicated that reversion to B-II alternatives would not be accepted.
17:39:50 From Ben Williams, Friends of French Prairie to Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA(direct message):
	So no one above Tim House in the FAA Regional Office or Washington office is making these decisions? They are being made locally at the Regional level by House in consultation with ODAV and Century West??????
17:40:46 From Dave Tibbetts, Columbia Helicopters to Hosts and panelists:
	Brandy I have a question as well
17:48:17 From Councilor Dr. Joann Linville, City of Wilsonville to Hosts and panelists:
	To Tim House - would the airport still be out of compliance with FAA standards and require these modifications if the airport was not rated as C-II?
17:48:29 From Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA to Everyone:
	Here is Ben William's comment which was sent just to me: To Tim's last comment, who is THEY are following advisory circulars? Tim House is the person who communicated that reversion to B-II alternatives would not be accepted.
	So no one above Tim House in the FAA Regional Office or Washington office is making these decisions? They are being made locally at the Regional level by House in consultation with ODAV and Century West??????
17:54:33 From David Mauk, Charbonneau to Hosts and panelists:
	Who as in what organization kicked the other alternative plans to the curb?
17:56:37 From Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA to Everyone:
	Here is the FAQ: https://publicproject.net/files/2024-01/Aurora-Airport/updated/uao-amp-faq-022024.pdf?6218398d13
18:06:27 From Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association to Hosts and panelists:
	what we are hearing toight is very different than has ben stated to the public todate Path to conformance is not eh same as the runway cant be extended until the ROFA is perfectly met. Which is how ODAV has presented the FAA position to date. Was the state basis for the take it or leave it alternatives presented to the PAC as driving alternatives? FAA absolutely allows the runway to be extended and FAA is required to consider a MOS and the aviation stakeholders have present a comprehensive MOS for teh32 feet of HWY 551 in the ROFA. What we are hearing now is the FAA will allow the runway to be extended and the ROFA to be what it is - ostensibly based upon the Faegre MOS and then at the end of the planning period the HWY moves 32 feet west if there is funding. That was NEVER presented. Question then - will ODAV consider an alternative that extends the runway now based upon the Faegre MOS and then plan in the MP to move the HWY 32 feet in ROW at the end of the planning period?
18:09:48 From Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association to Hosts and panelists:
	if ODAV and FAA have denied the study provided on the drainfield - we'd like to have info provided showing WHY an improved drainfield installation will not be acceptable.

18:16:34 From Councilor Dr. Joann Linville, City of Wilsonville to Hosts and panelists:
Where is the data that the FAA used to get to the C-II rating?
18:17:43 From Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA to Everyone:
We will come back in 10 minutes. I'll give you a few minute warning.
18:22:34 From Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association to Hosts and panelists:
So ODAV's consultants says that their "refined preliminary alternatives" are based on what they were told by FAA personnel as to what is permissible; and then the FAA personnel state that the FAA is not dictating what is in the master plan. So perhaps the consultants misunderstood the input from the FAA and the consultants should go back to reconsider potential alternatives, even if they would not produce a design that would meet 100% of design standards.
18:23:46 From David Mauk, Charbonneau to Hosts and panelists:
The number of operations by large aircraft do not justify a B-II categorization. Well over 85% is lightweight aircraft. The number of large operations is actually declining. It costs FAA & ODAV 0$ for large aircraft to use Salem or McMinnville airports & return Aurora to B-II.
18:25:30 From Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA to Everyone:
We'll get started in a few minutes
18:38:06 From Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA to Everyone:
Just a reminder that we'll post these slides on the project website following this meeting tonight.
18:43:06 From Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association to Hosts and panelists:
My hand is up!
18:43:21 From Jen Winslow | JLA to Everyone:
If anyone watching the meeting would like to provide comments, please do so on our "contact us" page at https://publicproject.net/AuroraAirport The meeting summary will include answers to all questions raised during the meeting.
19:03:37 From Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association to Hosts and panelists:
Is the airports division at the FAA requiring all sponsors to meet ROFA standards or just Aurora Airport? Also - have the rules changed for Mod of Standards - if not - why are other airports allowed to have Mod of Standards but Aurora is not?
19:05:08 From David Mauk, Charbonneau to Hosts and panelists:
What's the level of design aircraft use that determines need?
19:06:17 From David Mauk, Charbonneau to Hosts and panelists:
We have actual data everyday & it's well below that. Well below.
19:08:33 From Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association to Hosts and panelists:
hand is up - we're asking for the "hard consideration" Tim House just mentioned!!!! THAT IS THE WHOLE POINT! The ODAV needs to be on the side of the airport!!! Defending the airport and make that "hard" ask.
19:24:16 From Jen Winslow | JLA to Everyone:
Here's a link to tonight's presentation: https://publicproject.net/files/2024-10/aurora-pac-meeting-7-10.15.24-final-.pdf?efc37f086f
19:37:07 From Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association to Hosts and

panelists:
In the spirit of collaboration - path forward - after the MP is done (with this preferred alternative) - would the FAA then entertain a Mod of Standard so we could avoid the loss of businesses?
19:38:07 From Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association to Hosts and panelists:
un mute me
19:40:04 From Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA to Everyone:
We'll open up for public comments in a minute. Please raise your hand if you'd like to provide verbal comments. Anyone in attendance may have up to 2 minutes to speak; you will be muted at 2 minutes. We ask that only one representative from each organization speaks. We may not be able to hear from everyone. PAC members should not respond to comments, to ensure that the full time is given to the public.
19:41:53 From Brian Asher, City of Aurora to Hosts and panelists:
please let me in
19:43:08 From Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association to Hosts and panelists:
This is a comment for the record - this "zoom meeting" methodology is a leftover from COVID days - we could be so much more effective as a collaborative group if we were allowed to be in a room together - and make sure we include Aurora!!!
19:44:51 From Kenji Sugahara, ODAV to Hosts and panelists:
I'm back. Sorry. Had to take a brief break. 😄
19:48:02 From Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA to Everyone:
Thank you Wendie
19:48:17 From David Mauk, Charbonneau to Hosts and panelists:
I have a question
19:49:17 From David Mauk, Charbonneau to Hosts and panelists:
Who is in the room when the alternative plans are considered & decided upon?
19:52:05 From Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association to Hosts and panelists:
I do have another question about legal easements in perpetuity granted by the state of Oregon...
19:54:01 From David Mauk, Charbonneau to Hosts and panelists:
Decision making not process
19:54:22 From Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA to Kenji Sugahara, ODAV(direct message):
I just made you a co-host so you can unmute as needed
20:01:45 From Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association to Hosts and panelists:
What is happening right now is exactly what we're talking about... preferred alternatives are being decided upon when we've not considered the ADMITTED complexities of the path being taken. We're doing this wrong... we need to bring this thing to a hold so we can figure out a path forward that we can collaboratively produce.
20:03:22 From Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association to Hosts and panelists:
Why are next steps being presented - why are they already decided upon? proof that ODAV, Consultants and FAA have already decided where this is going!!! We

are asking to STOP and HOLD so we could figure out a way to collaborate.
20:05:31 From Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association to Hosts and panelists:
Strongly recommend ODAV and the Consultants take a long hard look at the ORS statute that is being flat out being ignored.

Q&A

Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA (You) 05:25 PM
Private answer
Thank you for your request, Wendie. The primary PAC member will be on the Panel, and in the event they are unavailable then their Alternate would be on the Panel. Our belief is that you represent Ted Millar and he is on the Panel tonight.

Wendie Kellington 05:26 PM
Please have David Miller speak up snd clearly. His last comment on Alt 2 impacts were inaudible.

Bruce Bennett, Airport business & property owner since 1968 05:29 PM
good point!

Jason.Paolo 05:30 PM
does option 1a and 1B include the cost for ODOT to relocate the Hubbard hwy?
This question has been answered live

Wendie Kellington 05:31 PM
to meet the ROFA requires HWY 551 move just 32 feet and that is entirely within the existing ROW as confirmed by ODOT. On what basis does ODAV conclude that private property must be taken for Alternative 1A or B?

Jason.Paolo 05:51 PM
Are business relocation costs included in these option estimates due to not being able to operate after reduced property footprint as a result of ODA/Aurora airport propery aquisition?
This question has been answered live

George Van Hoomissen 05:57 PM
So ODAV's consultants says that their "refined preliminary alternatives" are based on what they were told by FAA personnel as to what is permissible; and then the FAA personnel state that the FAA is not dictating what is in the master plan. So perhaps the consultants misunderstood the input from the FAA and the consultants should go back to reconsider potential alternatives, even if they would not produce a design that would meet 100% of design standards.

Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association 06:22 PM
Private answer
I'm entering this in the panelist section as one of my questions....

Wendie Kellington 06:16 PM
The last chat I am aable to see is Brandy with FAQs. Please post chat for all to see.

George Van Hoomissen 06:42 PM
Question for the FAA representative – with the just disclosed preferred alternative, is it possible that the FAA would grant (or entertain a request for) a waiver/modification to the design standards to allow the runway extension to happen first, with other more expensive and difficult phases to follow? Note, I think most pilots would agree that the one change that would most positively impact airport safety is the contemplated 497’ runway extension.

George Van Hoomissen 06:44 PM
Please post the presentation on the website now, so that we can look back at the slide presented earlier. I want to be able to see the slides during the meeting, not after. Thank you.

Brandy Steffen, facilitator | JLA (You) 07:26 PM
The presentation has been posted here: https://publicproject.net/files/2024-10/aurora-pac-meeting-7-10.15.24-final-.pdf?efc37f086f

Wendie Kellington 07:18 PM
All the FAA statements about their requirements are wholly consistent with the following: (1) extend the runway now on the Faegre MOS for HWY 551 (READ "TEMPORARILY" or as an "INTERIM MEASURE"and 2) plan to move the hwy west 32 feet in the existing ROW at the end of the planning period when funding is made available. Therefore, what exactly is the reason that is not being proposed? It is obvious that it is not FAA demanding the runway wait to be extended until the hwy ROFA is met.

Neal 07:12 PM
Why has expansion to the South been abandonded ?
This question has been answered live

Bruce Bergman 07:31 PM
Why are a vehicle access road and second taxiway considered mandatory. We have a workable plan for a vehicle access road already and living with a single taxiway instead of destroying public property seems like a better idea.
This question has been answered live

OREGON DEPARTMENT OF AVIATION

AURORA STATE AIRPORT
MASTER PLAN UPDATE - COST ESTIMATES
DRAFT

ALTERNATIVES 1A, 1B AND 2 SUMMARY

October 15, 2024

No.	Project Description	Estimated Cost
ALTERNATIVE 1A - SHIFT HIGHWAY WEST		
1	Realign Hubbard Highway	$ 33,271,000.00
2	Septic Drainfield Removal in ROFA By Others (Drainfields: Keil Rd, Columbia, & Wylee)	$ 1,407,000.00
3	Fill Taxiway Drainage Ditch	$ 3,603,000.00
4	Relocate AWOS, Windcone, and Segmented Circle	$ 1,726,000.00
5	Realign Keil Road	$ 3,162,000.00
6	Property Acquisition - Southeast Side Aeronautic Parcels - Phase I*	$ 3,966,000.00
7	Property Acquisition - Southeast Side Aeronautic Parcels - Phase II*	$ 61,087,000.00
8	Property Acquisition - Northeast Side Aeronautic Parcels*	$ 6,475,000.00
9	Property Acquisition - West Side Hubbard Highway*	$ 16,582,000.00
10	Property Acquisition - Keil Road Realignment*	$ 1,184,000.00
11	Construct Vehicle Service Road	$ 2,638,000.00
12	Septic Drainfield Removal By Others (TEC Equipment)	$ 345,000.00
13	Runway 17 RPZ Clearance	$ 3,087,000.00
14	Extend Runway/ Extend Taxiway A	$ 7,060,000.00
15	Reconstruct ADG II Parallel Taxilane and Connectors (Taxilane South of Main Apron)	$ 6,485,000.00
16	Reconstruct ADG I Parallel Taxilane and Connectors (Taxilane North of Main Apron)	$ 4,802,000.00
17	Remove Existing Hangars in Flight School Area	$ 1,309,000.00
18	Construct New Flight School Apron	$ 2,651,000.00
19	Rehablitate and Reconfigure Main Apron Taxilanes and Tie Downs	$ 821,000.00
20	Remove Existing Hangars on South Hangar Area	$ 12,781,000.00
21	Construct South Apron	$ 11,125,000.00
	ALTERNATIVE 1A - SHIFT HIGHWAY WEST	**$ 185,566,000.00**

CENTURY WEST ENGINEERING

OREGON DEPARTMENT OF AVIATION

AURORA STATE AIRPORT
MASTER PLAN UPDATE - COST ESTIMATES
DRAFT

ALTERNATIVES 1A, 1B AND 2 SUMMARY

October 15, 2024

No.	Project Description	Estimated Cost
ALTERNATIVE 1B - SHIFT HIGHWAY AND RUNWAY WEST		
1	Realign Hubbard Highway	$ 33,715,000.00
2	Septic Drainfield Removal in ROFA By Others (Drainfields: Keil Rd, Columbia, & Wylee)	$ 1,407,000.00
3	Fill Taxiway Drainage Ditch	$ 3,603,000.00
4	Relocate AWOS, Windcone, and Segmented Circle	$ 1,726,000.00
5	Realign Keil Road	$ 3,162,000.00
6	Property Acquisition - Southeast Side Aeronautic Parcels - Phase I*	$ 3,048,000.00
7	Property Acquisition - Northeast Side Aeronautic Parcels*	$ 1,891,000.00
8	Property Acquisition - West Side Hubbard Highway*	$ 21,662,000.00
9	Property Acquisition - Keil Road Realignment*	$ 1,184,000.00
10	Construct Vehicle Service Road	$ 2,638,000.00
11	Septic Drainfield Removal By Others (TEC Equipment)	$ 345,000.00
12	Construct Taxiway A	$ 12,002,000.00
13	Runway 17 RPZ Clearance	$ 3,259,000.00
14	Construct Extended Runway/ Extend Taxiway A	$ 23,264,000.00
15	Reconstruct ADG II Parallel Taxilane and Connectors (Taxilane South of Main Apron)	$ 6,485,000.00
16	Reconstruct ADG I Parallel Taxilane and Connectors (Taxilane North of Main Apron)	$ 4,802,000.00
17	Remove Existing Hangars in Flight School Area	$ 1,309,000.00
18	Construct New Flight School Apron	$ 2,651,000.00
19	Rehablitate and Reconfigure Main Apron Taxilanes and Tie Downs	$ 821,000.00
20	Construct Helicopter Parking Apron	$ 2,507,000.00
	ALTERNATIVE 1B - SHIFT HIGHWAY AND RUNWAY WEST	**$ 131,480,000.00**

CENTURY WEST ENGINEERING

OREGON DEPARTMENT OF AVIATION

AURORA STATE AIRPORT
MASTER PLAN UPDATE - COST ESTIMATES
DRAFT

ALTERNATIVES 1A, 1B AND 2 SUMMARY

October 15, 2024

No.	Project Description	Estimated Cost
ALTERNATIVE 2 - SHIFT RUNWAY EAST		
1	Septic Drainfield Removal in ROFA By Others (Drainfields: Keil Rd, Columbia, & Wylee)	$ 1,407,000.00
2	Fill Taxiway Drainage Ditch	$ 3,603,000.00
3	Relocate AWOS, Windcone, and Segmented Circle	$ 1,726,000.00
4	Realign Keil Road	$ 3,162,000.00
5	Property Acquisition - Southeast Side Aeronautic Parcels - Phase I*	$ 5,825,000.00
6	Property Acquisition - Southeast Side Aeronautic Parcels - Phase II*	$ 61,539,000.00
7	Property Acquisition - Northeast Side Aeronautic Parcels*	$ 9,274,000.00
8	Property Acquisition - Keil Road Realignment*	$ 1,184,000.00
9	Construct Vehicle Service Road	$ 2,638,000.00
10	Septic Drainfield Removal By Others (TEC Equipment)	$ 345,000.00
11	Reconstruct Taxiway A	$ 12,088,000.00
12	Runway 17 RPZ Clearance	$ 3,087,000.00
13	Reconstruct and Extend Runway/ Extend Taxiway A	$ 23,179,000.00
14	Reconstruct ADG II Parallel Taxilane and Connectors (Taxilane South of Main Apron)	$ 6,566,000.00
15	Reconstruct ADG I Parallel Taxilane and Connectors (Taxilane North of Main Apron)	$ 4,823,000.00
16	Remove Existing Hangars in Flight School Area	$ 1,309,000.00
17	Construct New Flight School Apron	$ 2,651,000.00
18	Rehablitate and Reconfigure Main Apron Taxilanes and Tie Downs	$ 767,000.00
19	Relocate Air Traffic Control Tower	$ 21,008,000.00
20	Remove Existing Hangars on South Hangar Area	$ 12,781,000.00
21	Construct South Apron	$ 11,179,000.00
	ALTERNATIVE 2 - SHIFT RUNWAY EAST	**$ 190,140,000.00**

Preferred Alternative


Project Update 10/15/2024

Refined Preliminary Alternative 1A was selected as the preferred alternative following an extensive review of all feedback provided by the FAA, members of the PAC, airport users, and the public throughout the planning process. The preferred alternative identifies a path to conformance to correct the existing non-standard ROFA and RSA as required by the FAA, and it offers advantages over the other preliminary alternatives including:

- It maintains the runway in its current location compared to Refined Preliminary Alternatives 1B and 2.
- It reduces the impacts on west residential properties compared to Refined Preliminary Alternative 1B.
- It does not require relocation of the ATCT as required in Preliminary Alternative 2.
- It provides phased opportunities for the flexible implementation of projects to conform to standards, improve efficiency, and improves safety. The phases of these projects are in no specific order of implementation; however, based on FAA input, the phase to extend the runway would not occur until the phase to meet ROFA and RSA standards are completed. The phases of the preferred alternative include:
  - » Figure 1: Preferred Alternative Overview
  - » Figure 2: Phase for projects needed to meet ROFA & RSA conformance standards
  - » Figure 3: Phase for addition of a vehicle service road (VSR)
  - » Figure 4: Phase for runway and parallel taxiway extension
  - » Figure 5: Phase for the addition of a parallel taxilane
  - » Figure 6: Property Overview

PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE


Figure 1: Overview



CENTURY WEST ENGINEERING


PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE

Figure 2: Meet ROFA & RSA Conformance Standards



PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE


Figure 3: Addition of a Vehicle Service Road (VSR)



CENTURY WEST ENGINEERING


PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE

Figure 4: Runway and Parallel Taxiway Extension




PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE

Figure 5: Addition of a Parallel Taxilane



PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE

Figure 6: Property Overview



AURORA STATE AIRPORT MASTER PLAN

COMMENTS ON THE REFINED ALTERNATIVES

This document includes all Project Advisory Committee (PAC) member and public questions and comments regarding the refined alternatives, which were presented during the Aurora Airport Master Plan PAC Working Session 3 on July 30, 2024. Responses are provided to the PAC emails, as well as the public questions/comments.

- PAC Feedback Forms, starting on page 2
- PAC Emails, starting on page 7
- Public Questions/Comments and Responses, starting on page 24
- Attachments, starting on page 33

On August 5, 12, 16, 19, and 28, PAC members were emailed requests to complete a feedback form to answer the questions below. The deadline for submitting the feedback form was extended from August 20 to September 3 (as outlined in the August 19 email). A final reminder to submit PAC feedback was sent September 3rd.

PAC Feedback Forms

The following PAC members completed feedback forms by September 3, 2024:

1. Benjamin Williams, Friends of French Prairie
2. City Councilor Dr. Joann Linville, City of Wilsonville
3. Commissioner Tootie Smith, Clackamas County
4. Dave Mauk, Charbonneau Country Club
5. David Waggoner, Willamette Aviation
6. Jamie Stickel, City of Canby
7. Ken Ivey, Aurora Butteville Barlow Community Planning Organization
8. Michael Weimer, Life Flight Network
9. Pam Barlow Lind, Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians
10. Patrick Donaldson, Wilsonville Chamber of Commerce
11. Trent Brownlee, Atlantic Aviation (formerly Lynx Aviation)
12. Tony Helbling, Aurora Airport Improvement Association
13. Ted Millar, AABC/TLM Holdings

The questions in the feedback form:

- Do you currently use the airport?
- Please rank the alternatives based on your preference for the Aurora Airport from most to least preferred:
    - Refined Alternative 1A – Shift Hubbard Highway West and Extend Runway North to 5,500 feet
    - Refined Alternative 1B –Shift Runway and Hubbard Highway West and Extend Runway North to 5,500 feet
    - Refined Alternative 2 - Shift Runway East and Extend Runway North to 5,500 feet
- What influenced your choice for your highest ranked alternative?
- What concerns would you like ODAV to consider as they make a recommendation on a preferred alternative?
- Landside: Should ODAV consider property acquisition, beyond what is required to meet runway safety standards to accommodate hangars or aircraft parking once existing airport property is at capacity?
    - Yes – I support property acquisition to support future hangars and aircraft parking needs.
    - No – I do not support property acquisition to support additional hangars and parking.
- Airside: To meet C-II design standards which direction should ODAV shift the runway?
    - I prefer to not shift the runway, balancing impact to both aeronautical and non-aeronautical properties/development (as seen in Refined Alternative 1A)
    - I prefer a west shift to minimize impact on existing aeronautical uses/development, requiring Hubbard Highway to be shifted/realigned a greater distance (as seen in Refined Alternative 1B)
    - I prefer an east shift to minimize impact on non-aeronautical property, resulting in a loss of hangars, apron, and relocation of the air traffic control tower (ATCT) (as seen in Refined Alternative 2)

SUBMISSION DATE	NAME	DO YOU CURRENTLY USE THE AIRPORT?	PLEASE RANK THE ALTERNATIVES BASED ON YOUR PREFERENCE FOR THE AURORA AIRPORT FROM MOST TO LEAST PREFERRED:				WHAT CONCERNS WOULD YOU LIKE ODAV TO CONSIDER…	LANDSIDE	AIRSIDE
			REFINED ALTERNATIVE 1A	REFINED ALTERNATIVE 1B	REFINED ALTERNATIVE 2	WHAT INFLUENCED YOUR CHOICE ….			
9/3/24	Michael Weimer	Yes	Least	Least	Least	Amount of right-of-way (ROW) to be acquired (by acre) Impact to property/ businesses/ hangars at the airport	Farmland impacts (EFU) Impacts to economic development (businesses supported by the airport) Increase in traffic/operations at the airport Impacts to existing roads outside of the airport property	Yes	
9/3/24	Ted Millar	Yes	None	None	None	Impact to property/ businesses/ hangars at the airport	Amount of property acquisition needed Impacts to economic development (businesses supported by the airport) Increase in traffic/operations at the airport [lack of] Impacts to existing roads outside of the airport property	No	I prefer a west shift
9/3/24	Jamie Stickel	Yes	Least	Most	Somew hat	Other	Impacts to economic development (businesses supported by the airport) Increase in traffic/operations at the airport Impacts to existing roads outside of the airport property	Yes	I prefer a west shift
9/3/24	Pamela Barlow Lind	No	Most	Somewhat	Least	Amount of right-of-way (ROW) to be acquired (by acre) Impact to local homes (by number of residential properties) Impact to property/ businesses/hangars at	Noise to local homes and businesses Impacts to economic development (businesses supported by the airport) Impacts to existing	Yes	I prefer to not shift the runway

						the airport Impact to Air Traffic Control Tower (ATCT)	roads outside of the airport property		
8/30/24	Dave Mauk	Yes	Least			Amount of right-of-way (ROW) to be acquired (by acre) Impact to the Hubbard Highway Impact to local homes (by number of residential properties) Impact to property/ businesses/hangars at the airport Impact to local businesses west of the Hubbard Highway (by number of commercial properties) Impact to local farmland (EFU) outcome remains constrained airport	Noise to local homes and businesses Farmland impacts (EFU) Amount of property acquisition needed Impacts to economic development (businesses supported by the airport) Increase in traffic/operations at the airport Impacts to existing roads outside of the airport property unchanged as constrained airport	No	I prefer to not shift the runway
8/28/24	Tony Helbling	Yes	None	None	None	Amount of right-of-way (ROW) to be acquired (by acre) Impact to the Hubbard Highway Impact to local homes (by number of residential properties) Impact to property/ businesses/hangars at the airport Impact to local businesses west of the Hubbard Highway (by number of commercial properties) Impact to Air Traffic Control Tower (ATCT)	Amount of property acquisition needed Impacts to economic development (businesses supported by the airport)	No	None – Keep runway in place and seek modification to standards as allowed by FAA policies & regulations.
8/21/24	Patrick Donaldson	No	Least	Least	Least	Amount of right-of-way (ROW) to be acquired (by acre) Impact to the Hubbard Highway Impact to local homes (by number of residential properties) Impact to property/ businesses/hangars at the airport Impact to local businesses west of the Hubbard Highway (by number of commercial properties) Impact to local farmland (EFU) Impact to Air Traffic	Amount of property acquisition needed Impacts to economic development (businesses supported by the airport)	Yes	I prefer to not shift the runway

						Control Tower (ATCT) Impact to aircraft parking (tiedown) areas Cost			
8/20/24	City Councilor Dr. Joann Linville	No	Least	Least	Most	Amount of right-of-way (ROW) to be acquired (by acre) Impact to the Hubbard Highway Impact to local homes (by number of residential properties) Impact to local businesses west of the Hubbard Highway (by number of commercial properties) Impact to local farmland (EFU) Only Refined Alternative 2 keeps current Airport footprint as-is without moving State Hwy 551, which is an unreasonable expansion. City does Not support any of the current alternatives; City supports keeping Airport as an ARC B-II airfield, because C-II operations never reach 500 operations which is the critical threshold.	Noise to local homes and businesses Farmland impacts (EFU) Amount of property acquisition needed Increase in traffic/operations at the airport Impacts to existing roads outside of the airport property Impacts to local-area residents in terms of noise and low-flying aircraft.	No	I prefer an east shift
8/19/24	Ken Ivey	No	Least	Least	Most	Amount of right-of-way (ROW) to be acquired (by acre) Impact to the Hubbard Highway Impact to local homes (by number of residential properties) Impact to local farmland (EFU)	Noise to local homes and businesses Farmland impacts (EFU) Amount of property acquisition needed Increase in traffic/operations at the airport Impacts to existing roads outside of the airport property	Yes	I prefer an east shift
8/19/24	Trent Brownlee	Yes	Most	Somewhat	Least	Amount of right-of-way (ROW) to be acquired (by acre) Impact to property/ businesses/hangars at the airport Impact to Air Traffic Control Tower (ATCT) Impact to aircraft parking (tiedown) areas	Impacts to economic development (businesses supported by the airport)	No	I prefer a west shift

8/15/24	Tootie Smith	No	Least	Least	Most	Impact to the Hubbard Highway Impact to local businesses west of the Hubbard Highway (by number of commercial properties) Impact to Air Traffic Control Tower (ATCT)		Yes	I prefer to not shift the runway
8/7/24	David Waggoner	Yes	Most	Somewhat	Least	Impact to property/businesses/hangars at the airport Impact to local farmland (EFU)	Noise to local homes and businesses Farmland impacts (EFU) Amount of property acquisition needed Impacts to economic development (businesses supported by the airport) Impacts to existing roads outside of the airport property	Yes	I prefer to not shift the runway
8/7/24	Benjamin Williams	No	Least	Least	Least	Amount of right-of-way (ROW) to be acquired (by acre) Impact to the Hubbard Highway Impact to local homes (by number of residential properties) Impact to property/ businesses/hangars at the airport Impact to local businesses west of the Hubbard Highway (by number of commercial properties) Impact to local farmland (EFU) Impact to Air Traffic Control Tower (ATCT)	Noise to local homes and businesses Farmland impacts (EFU) Amount of property acquisition needed Impacts to economic development (businesses supported by the airport) Impacts to existing roads outside of the airport property	No	I prefer to not shift the runway

PAC Emails

PAC members also had the opportunity to send emails directly to the project team. On September 3, individual phone calls and emails were made to PAC members that hadn't yet submitted the feedback form. The following PAC members sent emails through September 12, 2024:

- Austin Barnes, Marion County Planning Department
- Ben Williams, Friends of French Prairie
- Beth Wytoski, Regional Solutions
- Bruce Bennett, Aurora Airport Improvement Association
- David Knowles, Helicopter Transport Service (alternate)
- David Waggoner, Willamette Aviation Service
- Melissa Ahrens, Oregon Dept of Land Conservation and Development (alternate)
- Naomi Zwerdling, ODOT
- Ted Millar, AABC/TLM Holdings (through Wendie Kellington, Kellington Law Group)
- Tony Helbling, Positive Aurora Airport Management
- Whitney Stewart, Oregon Office of Emergency Management
- Dave Mauk, Charboneau Country Club

DATE	NAME	QUESTION/COMMENT	RESPONSE
09/04/24	Austin Barnes	Regarding the alternatives, Marion County Planning doesn't necessarily have a preferred one. We aim to stay neutral in these situations as we must process the land use permits that will follow after this master planning is done. Because of that, we were not going to vote on a preferred choice and see what the PAC, ODAV, FAA and Airport users felt like was the best option.	Thank you for participating in this important public process. Your comments have been received and included in the public record.
09/12/24	Ben Williams	Chair Stephens; I'm sure that burned into your memory, as it is the memories of all of us who were on the Teams call for the State Aviation Board (SAB) meeting last week, was among the final comments made by Board member Jim Knight: "What a conundrum." As you subsequently pointed out when you agreed to carry the Aurora State Airport Master Plan agenda item forward to the October SAB meeting for continued discussion: "Those of us operating airports understand that there are finite resources for airport improvement projects and there's just not enough money to go around… Millions and millions of dollars going to a general aviation airport would take away funds from other airports across the entire system."	**RESPONSE 1** A detailed public involvement process was created at the start of the master planning project to ensure that ODAV included representatives from the communities, agencies, and users of the airport. The Planning Team and ODAV appreciate the input that was received throughout the process and have used the feedback to better inform the PAC and public on the master plan process, make necessary changes in the draft working papers, and help steer decision making processes. **RESPONSE 2** Members of the public were invited to attend and comment at all PAC meetings. Please see the meeting

DATE	NAME	QUESTION/COMMENT	RESPONSE
		The sad reality is that once again as a master plan process for the Aurora State Airport draws to a conclusion, the options are appalling and terribly expensive. I would point you to page 9 of draft Chapter 5 of the master plan which states: "Aurora State Airport is located on a constrained site." This fundamental reality was a recurring theme in the 2010–2012 master plan process. One that was acknowledged in the recommendation by ODAV and the engineering consultant to select a No Build alternative. That recommendation was overruled by Chair Gardener and the SAB, which led to over a decade of pursuing unattainable expansion alternatives and incurring huge, budget-busting legal expenses to defend those illegal expansion decisions at the Land Use Board of Appeals and the Court of Appeals and the Supreme Court — where each government body ruled against ODAV's expansion plans as a violation of state laws. I write this letter to you and the Aviation Board not just to recapitulate the history of the last master plan process of which you were not a part, but also to correct some of the statements, inferences and implications made to the Board at last week's meeting by Century West and ODAV personnel. After the PAC was assembled for the current master plan and the first meeting was held, I sent the following to then-Chair Meeker and the Board on December 2, 2021: *My comments have to do with the Public Advisory Committee, whose first meeting on November 16 [2021] kicked off the current master planning process for the Aurora State Airport.* *In case you are not aware of the contents of that meeting, I want to share with you what was presented to the PAC by the lead Century West consultant on a slide titled "Decision-Making Process":* *· PAC will provide input at key decision points in an advisory level; as a sounding board. No recommendations will be made* *· ODA staff will be the final decision-making authority* *I am here to say to you that this is a travesty. It is quite evident that no one at OAB or Century West or JAL, the facilitator, owns a dictionary or knows how to use one.*	summaries on the project website, which include public comments received. **RESPONSE 3** ODAV and the Planning Team followed the same public notification process for each public meeting including the open house on June 13th. A 30-day public notice was submitted in the Pamplin Media, Statesman Journal, GovDelivery notification, and emails to the PAC members. Additionally, a Postcard was mailed to residents within a 1-mile radius of the airport and the project website included the open house details. Copies of the postcards and public notices will be included in the public record. The Planning Team appreciates the City of Wilsonville reaching out to their community and participating as a member of the PAC representing their community's interests. **RESPONSE 4** Work products presented in PAC meeting were presented as draft documents. Input received at the meetings was collected and incorporated into the draft chapters after the meetings including any data correction required. The preliminary alternatives received varied feedback, often with contrasting opinions. The Planning Team and ODAV reviewed all input and made refinements that met FAA standards as well as improved the safety and operations of the airport. **RESPONSE 5** Prior to the PAC meeting on June 11th and the public open house on June 13, FAA reviewed the preliminary alternatives and provided an email from Tim House (FAA) dated Friday June 7, 2024 stating that based on the current activity levels at the Airport, the B-II alternatives were not viable. Based on FAA's input, the B-II alternatives

DATE	NAME	QUESTION/COMMENT	RESPONSE
		Because if you look it up, you will learn that Recommendation is a synonym of Advice. *So, the notion that you can have an "Advisory" committee that will make no recommendations is a contradiction in terms and outlandish.* I share this to make sure you understand that some of the PAC members are on record noting that the PAC was not intended to provide recommendations, but only to be a sounding board. **SEE RESPONSE 1** This is important given the implications of what the Board was told last week. Matt Rogers, Century West project manager, spoke of "Extensive public involvement" and listed 6 PAC meetings, 2 Open Houses and 3 Work Sessions. For the record, the earliest PAC meetings had no public involvement because the Zoom calls were limited to PAC members. Then after complaints, members of the public were allowed to participate, but they had to pre-register before the meeting in order to attend. Finally, members of the public were allowed to speak in the public comments section at the end of the meeting. **SEE RESPONSE 2** ODAV appears to have failed to promote the ONE Open House event held on June 13, 2024; however, due to a massive mailing by the City of Wilsonville alerting the public to the Open House event, public attendance was high, but then JLA Public Involvement ran out of public comment forms after about one hour into the three-hour event, thereby preventing a majority of attendees from providing written public comment. **SEE RESPONSE 3** The implications made by David Miller of Century West were that PAC input specifically shaped the draft chapters in the master plan, and particularly the iterations of the alternatives. That is not the case. The draft chapters were presented to the PAC as completed documents in lecture format,	were discarded as they would not be approved by FAA. **RESPONSE 6** After the elimination of the B-II concepts, four preliminary alternatives remained and were presented at the public open house on display boards and handouts: 1. Shift the highway west and extend the runway north 2. Shift the highway west and extend the runway south 3. Shift the runway east and extend the runway north 4. Shift the runway east and extend the runway south **RESPONSE 7** The AAC/ADG (formerly ARC) classifications are dependent on airport activity. The Airport currently has over 500 operations by aircraft of AAC C or higher and ADG II or larger. As such the Airport must meet C-II standards. FAA has stated that alternatives that artificially downgrade to AAC/ADG B-II do not reflect the current or forecasted operational environment at the Airport and they are not viable options.

DATE	NAME	QUESTION/COMMENT	RESPONSE
		and the only adjustments made were after the fact following challenges to data and data errors pointed out. **SEE RESPONSE 4** In early June, draft Chapter 5 was provided to the PAC with 7 alternatives, four that promoted C-II ARC designation and three that maintained the current “as built” reality of B-II. Then, just prior to the Open House held at North Marion on June 13, the PAC was notified that the three alternatives to maintain B-II had been withdrawn and would no longer be considered “after coordination with FAA.” You can imagine the surprise! The majority of PAC members and the public arrived at the Open House event to learn that nearly half of the alternatives had been removed from consideration. **SEE RESPONSE 5** Then at the next PAC meeting on July 30, 2024, the members were informed that the four alternatives that remained and were on display at the Open House had been unilaterally reduced to three—all done without consultation with the PAC. **SEE RESPONSE 6** To summarize, the PAC has been informed (and mainly after the fact) from start to finish, but never consulted or asked for recommendations. Additionally, the fundamental flaw of trying to force not just a C-II ARC designation (per an FAA approved airport layout plan) but airfield build out to C-II standards continues to ignore the fundamental reality noted above: this is a constrained site. That very reality in addition to a decade of legal battles and now the “conundrum” that the three final alternatives will cost “hundreds of millions of dollars” and negatively impact the regional aviation system cries out for the recognition of reality. Accompanying that recognition of reality would be a formal revision to B-II and ceasing the futile efforts to expand the	

DATE	NAME	QUESTION/COMMENT	RESPONSE
		Aurora State Airport into something it can never be. **SEE RESPONSE 7**	
08/19/24	Beth Wytoski	I just wanted to connect because, while I am serving on the PAC, I am a representative of the Governor's Office. I am not necessarily providing my own feedback to impact direction, but to participate in the process for awareness. I just didn't want folks to be waiting on my feedback or wondering if I am receiving the reminders.	Thank you for participating in this important public process. Your comments have been received and included in the public record.
08/31/24	Bruce Bennett	Thank you for your work to sustain and improve the Aurora Airport by planning. I know there has been a lot of anti-airport/anti-improvement input and feel that this is due to the unfortunate misunderstanding that increasing the runway length will somehow draw an imaginary class of "bigger/louder" aircraft. This letter is my requested feedback/response (before the Sept 3 deadline) as a PAC member for the Airport Master Plan that is underway now. This feedback is in the form of a letter rather than the website form as my recommendation is for other that any of the "alternatives" listed on that form. Besides my qualifications as a PAC member my feedback is based on my family's history running an aviation business which included an FAA-approved (FAR 141) flight school and commercial air charter (FAR 135) service which was open 7 days a week and ownership of property on the Aurora airport since 1968, my experience flying off the Aurora Airport for over 50 years (except 3 years serving in Army Aviation) with 13,860 flight hours exclusively off Aurora, as well as my flight training off Aurora leading to my ATP pilot certificate including Commercial pilot seaplane, instrument/multi-engine flight instructor and six jet type ratings. I currently own property with a commercial hangar as well as managing and flying a business Jet off Aurora. My input follows. First, I have read and completely agree and support Ted Millar's letter,	Thank you for your participation. **RESPONSE 1** Standard FAA methodology has identified a justified future runway length of 5,500' - an increase of 497'. An additional 500' extension is not justified and would not be eligible for FAA funding assistance **RESPONSE 2** The intent of the vehicle service road (VSR) depicted in the Refined Alternatives is to provide a delineated dedicated route for ground vehicles to navigate across the airport separately from taxiing aircraft. Many of the recent Vehicle or Pedestrian Deviations (VPD)s reported by Air Traffic Control (ATC) involved vehicles entering movement areas as they go around parked aircraft on the apron. The VSR as depicted provides a safe and clear path free of parked aircraft for ground vehicles to operate. Locations where the VSR crosses active taxiways or taxilanes will include appropriate markings to warn drivers of the active surfaces. The 2012 ALP "internal surface road" routes vehicles east of the private hangar areas forcing drivers to enter the area at gates and drive across active aprons and taxilanes to reach their destinations in the interior of the properties. Once drivers enter the interior of the properties they are much more likely to remain on

DATE	NAME	QUESTION/COMMENT	RESPONSE
		Second are my recommendations, pieces of which are in the responses form. lengthen the runway to the North, I would prefer the 1000 feet improvement that has been needed (only) to serve the aircraft that have been using the airport since the master plan first recommended it in 1976, but any lengthening will improve safety and would have my support. **SEE RESPONSE 1** Develop a vehicle/pedestrian airport access road but NOT on the west/taxiway-runway side of the airport as I am convinced that would decrease safety and lead to more VPDs. This road has already been constructed at the south end and labeled "yellow gate". Just by continuing over currently undeveloped land it would service all properties and operations between Keil rd. and Stenbock lane from there it could continue north before turning east to run parallel to airport rd. then turn back west to avoid existing hangars and continue north as far (east) away from the taxiway as possible without disturbing any existing hangars. **SEE RESPONSE 2** I Strongly disagree with plans to take any private property from unwilling owners. This "through the fence" development at Aurora is the key to the Aurora Airports incredible success including hundreds of millions of dollars spent by local businesses and individuals developing the privately owned airport property that makes up most of the aurora airport. **SEE RESPONSE 3** This development has cost the government nothing and pays very high property taxes as well as providing excellent jobs that support the local economy as well as helping put out forest fires, save lives, and provide electricity across the country in addition to beginning careers and the hundreds of other huge benefits. Protecting, increasing, and enhancing the public short-term aircraft parking and movement areas should be a high priority	property and cut across the active surfaces to reach additional locations in the area or to attempt to find their way in cases where they get lost. This is the type of situation where drivers enter into the movement area and a VPD occurs. A properly delineated dedicated VSR outside of object free areas that parallels the movement area line provides a clear visual cue to drivers on where it is safe to drive, keeping them out of the movement area and away from aircraft. **RESPONSE 3** It is ODAV's intention to acquire the properties identified for aeronautical reserve from willing sellers if and when they become available. **RESPONSE 4** We believe that by “exceptions to policy” you are referring to a modification of standard (MOS). The FAA Seattle ADO has clearly and repeatedly stated that the airport master plan must identify a “path to conformance” based on the C-II standards defined by the current and future critical aircraft represented in the FAA-approved master plan forecasts for the Airport. The FAA has also indicated that any potential modification of standards (MOS) that it may consider, would be temporary, would not support future runway improvements (e.g., runway extension), and would be an interim step toward implementing a preferred alternative that is capable of meeting C-II standards.

DATE	NAME	QUESTION/COMMENT	RESPONSE
		for this plan as these areas have shrunk due to FAA spacing changes and are absolutely critical to safety and operations. On this subject there is currently approximately one-acre available midfield (full disclosure, this property is owned by myself) that is contiguous with the property that my family sold to ODAV in 1985 and that the control tower is located on. This 1985 sale was due to the FAA's request of ODAV and the additional acre would connect ODAV's parcel to taxiway A significantly improving aircraft flow and safety. This parcel was created at ODAV's request in 1995. For the benefit of the Airport and the users, I recommend ODAV now purchasing this parcel. I do not believe any of the options affect EFU land in any way but i believe all of them include huge costs and disturbance of real estate that could make safety improvements economically unfeasible. My firm recommendation is to leave the runway where is has been since 1943 and work with the FAA for the extremely small exceptions to policy that are now needed since changes in their rating of the airport. **SEE RESPONSE 4** I believe it is important realize that the neighboring communities have exploded with growth in the time that the Aurora Airport has been here with approximately one million cars and trucks passing through Wilsonville every week while the airport has still not filled the footprint it has had since 1943 and that as multiple studies have shown, the vehicle traffic to and from the airport is completely negligible. Again, thank you and please contact me with any questions.	
8/30/24	David Knowles	My name is David Knowles and I am the General Manager of Helicopter Transport Services, LLC located at the Aurora airport at 14497 Keil Rd Ne. Our facility is 210k sq feet on 28 acres and we operate super heavy lift sky crane helicopter (11) and various other large helicopter in the fields of fire fighting, construction and exploration. Thank you for the professional job and seeking my input. The closest option I see is number 1B but that support is 100%	Thank you for your comments.

DATE	NAME	QUESTION/COMMENT	RESPONSE
		conditional on the airport not delaying other safety improvements to wait for the highway relocation. It is also conditional on the vehicle access road being on the east side of the property as depicted in the approved 2012 ALP not the West side as depicted on one B. If you have any questions, or would ever like a tour, although this time of the year everything is out working for USFS, CALFIRE & ODF, feel, free to contact me. We have a very impressive facility and operation at the Aurora airport.	
08/11/24	David Waggoner	I'm not sure who is the proper person is to get this in the Master Plan conservation and to the other PAC members for consideration. If it is not you, please let know where to send this thought. Could we consider an option to moving Hubbard Highway west as recommended in Refined Alternatives 1A and 1B? Instead of shifting the Hubbard Highway west could Hy 551 be rerouted over the existing Boones Ferry Rd NE? Using Boones Ferry Rd as the location for Hy 551 I believe has several advantages over moving the current highway west. First, it would eliminate the need acquire the approximately 39 or 43 acres of property. It would also eliminate the disruption of causing the relocation of residents and business. Secondly, it is possible the cost of making the additions required for the Boones Ferry Rd/Hy 551 corridor would cost less than moving and rebuilding the old highway. Thirdly, it would eliminate the sections of Hy 551 that are in the north and south RPZ.	Thank you for your comments. That concept was evaluated and discarded due to necessary ROW acquisition, costs to construct road and reconstruct existing road to meet capacity needs of Highway 551, and environmental concerns with relocating a major thoroughfare through an existing residential area (as opposed to the current alignment along one edge of the neighborhood).
08/30/24	David Waggoner	Aurora Airport Master Planning Committee, In light of new information, I wish to amend my input for the Aurora Master Plan Alternatives. I very much support the runway extension. The 500' extension will enhance the local community business that rely on the airport, utilization, improve the airport's function and safety. All the Refined Alternatives presented in the PAC Feedback Form #2 will have significant negative impacts on the neighboring communities as well as the business and tenants of the airport.	Thank you for your comments. The FAA Seattle ADO has clearly and repeatedly stated that the airport master plan must identify a "path to conformance" based on the C-II standards defined by the current and future critical aircraft represented in the FAA-approved master plan forecasts for the Airport. The FAA has also indicated that any potential modification of standards (MOS) that it may consider, would be temporary, would not support future runway

DATE	NAME	QUESTION/COMMENT	RESPONSE
		I recommend the Master Planning Committee pursue the Proposed Modification of Runway Object Free Area (ROFA) Design Standards presented by Aron Faegre as an alternative. If these modifications are available, the airport's ability to support the local community in the event of a natural disaster or emergency will be enhanced. The tax revenues and fees from the private businesses on the airport, local business that rely on income from the airport and the Public – Private partnerships will continue without causing the negative impacts to the local communities.	improvements (e.g., runway extension), and would be an interim step toward implementing a preferred alternative that is capable of meeting C-II standards.
09/03/24	Melissa Ahrens	DLCD appreciates being a part of the PAC and the engagement efforts that are ongoing as part of the master planning process overall. That said, stating a preference for one of the current alternatives is outside of what we see as our participatory role. We are available to describe the land use process that will eventually be required for various options and to provide input on Statewide Planning Goals as they may relate to the alternatives. We can also state that we support consideration of all the concerns that are listed in the feedback form, as well as other Goal related topics that have come up in the PAC meetings or comments. I am planning to attend the next PAC meeting, and we would like to continue to participate in the master planning process, however, we won't be submitting a feedback form for the record at this time, per the explanation and background above.	Thank you for participating in this important public process. Your comments have been received and included in the public record.
08/29/24	Naomi Zwerdling	Greetings Tony, Below are ODOT's high-level comments from the Region 2 Access Management Engineer and District 3 Manager regarding your Aurora State Airport - Potential for Hubbard Highway Shift inquiry: Alternatives 1 and 2 both include realignment of OR-551 (Wilsonville-Hubbard Hwy). Each shows work beginning on OR-551 north of Arndt Road (about MP 1.3) and ending south of Keil Road (about MP 3.15). It would be about 2 miles of realigned highway. Not sure how much of the SB lanes could be reused as NB lanes. A 35' shift to the west indicates	Thank you and everyone at ODOT who looked over our alternatives and provided the feedback below. It is very helpful. I have forwarded your comments to our planning team, and we will be back in touch if we have any questions. Thanks again, Tony Beach

DATE	NAME	QUESTION/COMMENT	RESPONSE
		that at least some of it could be reused where there is a 3 or 4 lane section, but not where there is only a 2 lane section. Arndt Road is a signalized intersection which would require a significant investment to move the equipment and bring it up to current standards. Keil Road is stop controlled. Alternative 1 doesn't shift the Keil alignment, but Alternative 2 moves it about 400' south. There are up to 5 private approaches (depending on what the permit research finds) and 2 public approaches in this stretch. Each would need to be rebuilt. The private approaches would need some level of coordination with the property owners. The good news is that it's pretty flat so matching the grades will not be too difficult. We would need an agreement between the Airport/FAA and ODOT. Clackamas County, Marion County, or both would need to be brought in for the work at the Arndt intersection (not sure which county has jurisdiction). There is about 200' of ROW out there today. It seems like the airport would want to acquire the 35' shift from ODOT on the east side of the ROW. The refined alternatives significantly increase the highway shift to 80' and 175'. Shifts of this magnitude will have a much greater impact of realigning the highway and will increase the distance on either side of the affected intersections needed to accommodate the shift in alignment. Please make sure you are accounting for providing ODOT with current Right-of-Way widths as we currently have through this stretch of highway. This would be required to keep the Highway Trust Fund Whole. Timeline: The agreement will be the longest process. Plan on 6-9 months. The plan review will take a few months of back and forth since many disciplines will need to review it. Staff review from Signals, Electrical, Signs, Striping, Hydraulics, Roadway, Pavement, Maintenance, Traffic Control, ROW, and Access Management will be required. There could be other staff review required depending on what is requested. It will be very expensive to shift OR-551 (Wilsonville-Hubbard Highway) mainly because of the signal work and the extent of	

DATE	NAME	QUESTION/COMMENT	RESPONSE
		the new roadbed. ODOT has no design and construction funding for the potential shift in the highway improvements. ODOT staff need to review engineered plans before determining the feasibility of shifting the highway. In addition, ODOT does not have jurisdiction of the county facilities and there are requirements for affected property owners so more coordination will be required. Please contact me if you have additional questions.	
09/03/24	Ted Millar, c/o Wendie Kellington, *Kellington Law Group*	Please see the attached letter and forthcoming exhibits reflecting the comments of PAC Member Millar, TLM and AABC (collectively Millar) concerning the July 30, 2024, draft Aurora Airport Alternatives. Please include this letter and its exhibits in the record of the Aurora Airport Master Plan proceedings. Please confirm receipt. Please also note that due to the size of this transmission it will be coming in nine (9) parts. To summarize the attached and forthcoming transmittals with Millar's comments: None of ODAV's three "alternatives" for the airport are tenable, although Millar notes that Alternative 1B is the least bad and that Alternative 2 is completely devastating to aviation at the airport. Alternative 2 effectively condemns the airport with ODAV acquiring all or most of it so ODAV can essentially start over – costing taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars to implement (dollars that do not exist and ODAV does not show otherwise), significant loss of tax revenue, loss of good jobs, loss area tourist revenue, loss of an extremely important state and regional natural disaster asset, all to gain some 27' of separation between the runway and Highway 551, when federal standards allow imperfect compliance with that standard, if ODAV merely asks. To aid ODAV in that regard, a fully supported "Modification to Standards" prepared by an airport professional is Exhibit B to Millar's submitted materials. There is little doubt that FAA will approve it. We note FAA approved such minimal imperfection when it approved the 2012 ALP. If "incremental progress" toward perfection is desired, Millar's Exhibit A alternative suggests merely working with ODOT to move the perimeter fence closer to the ODOT ROW.	Thank you for your comments. Responses to the letter referenced are included as a separate document attached to this meeting summary.

DATE	NAME	QUESTION/COMMENT	RESPONSE
		All ODAV alternatives spring from unsupported and, respectfully, unlawful assumptions – those incorrect assumptions unsurprisingly led to incorrect alternatives. Using assumptions that are supported by law and the only evidence, an alternative is possible that extends the runway, does not hold the runway extension hostage to finding the hundreds of millions of dollars that does not exist to move Highway 551 and in the process condemn numerous homes and businesses, does not require ODAV to "remove" all or mostly all of the 200 million dollar plus in aeronautical investment at the airport including business jet hangar space, Atlantic's FBO and Life Flight, Wilson Construction, Vans Aircraft, HTS (largest helicopter transport company in the world), Columbia Helicopters, etc.; does not "remove" the septic drainfields that the airport relies upon to function at all, does not feature an internal circulation road parallel and next to the active taxiway and runway, and does not require anyone to "move" the air traffic control tower. See Millar's Exhibit A, supported by the Exhibit B technical analysis. The airport boundary should be adjusted to include the only remaining undeveloped through the fence property (owned by TLM) so that property can reasonably be put to aeronautical use as it is has been planned to be used by all planning documents prepared by ODAV and adopted by the county since the adoption of the Aurora Airport 1976 master plan. As you know, TLM has arranged to provide electrical capacity on its property to support electric aircraft, which are the aircraft of the future. In the absence of including the TLM property in the airport boundary, ODAV's alternatives make no provision and there is no room for, the aeronautical innovation that all experts agree will land during the life of the forthcoming airport master plan. We look forward to working with ODAV concerning a reset with reasonable alternatives like Exhibit A, for the airport.	
08/28/24	Tony Helbling*	This email and attachments (2) constitute my single allotted feedback to the proposed alternatives associated with the Aurora Airport Master Plan. I prefer none of the presented alternatives. All are unacceptable.	Thank you for your comments. Responses to the letter referenced are included as a separate document attached to this meeting summary.

DATE	NAME	QUESTION/COMMENT	RESPONSE
		Both ODAV and the FAA can allow Modifications of Standard as are historically and presently allowed throughout the nation. It is understood there is a desire to bring airports into some level of compliance. However, the economic cost of doing so is exorbitant and as such, will never happen. At the same time, the needed safety improvements at Aurora State Airport are held hostage to a plan that will never take place. ODAV has clear direction from the Legislature under ORS 836.642 "Program for Through the Fence Operations". None of the proposed alternatives serve to forward, support, or preserve the items called out in the legislation. The proposed alternatives call for the purchasing of private property, effectively eliminating "Through the Fence Operations". I find this completely and totally unacceptable, as do many of the private property owners at the airport. Finally, the expenditure of the FAA Grant money to develop a Master Plan that does not promote General Aviation is a waste of valuable federal dollars.	
8/30/24	Wendie Kellington, *Kellington Law Group*	We'd like to schedule a 20-minute zoom meeting with you this coming Tuesday or Wednesday to discuss KUAO. As you know, the aeronautical interests at the airport are justifiably quite concerned about the master plan alternatives and it has gotten the attention of national interests as well. We want to be sure that you understand the concerns and we would like to understand your thinking for advancing them. Please let me know what works.	Thanks for reaching out to ODAV to talk about the comments that you provided on behalf Ted Millar, TLM and AABC concerning the refined alternatives presented to the PAC on July 30, 2024. I also appreciated the opportunity to speak directly with the communities that are and will be affected by ODAV's planning efforts for UAO. It's always important to listen to stakeholders about their concerns and their wishes. I hope our conversation was helpful in understanding ODAV's role in this planning phase and in particular our hope to select an alternative that FAA will support and ultimately agree to extend federal funds to help implement. Like I mentioned in my response to your request for a meeting, I'll be ensuring that all ODAV's communications with its stakeholders are made part of the record. This this email is intended to provide a high-level summary of our discussion today in which you, Anthony Beach, Alex Thomas , Stacy

DATE	NAME	QUESTION/COMMENT	RESPONSE
			Posegate of DOJ and I attended by teams. As I explained in our meeting, Chuck Garrison, Director of the Northwest Mountain Region for FAA, has made clear to ODAV that FAA will not fund future projects if the Aurora Airport master plan does not include an ALP that will bring components of the airport up to FAA's standards of compliance. The primary areas of concern, as we have discussed, are the ROFA which extends over and above the Hubbard Highway, OR 551, and the drainfield within the Runway Safety Area supporting your clients' businesses. I understand that you are asking ODAV to consider another alternative airport layout plan, which you describe in more detail in your letter. You have explained that this alternative should be preferable because it would not require additional real property or moving OR 551. You have also stated that the current alternatives are unrealistic or unnecessary because they seek to obtain "perfect compliance" with FAA standards. But that, in your opinion, perfect compliance is not required. Rather, FAA has an obligation to consider any modifications requested by the ODAV. You also explained that your clients are extremely concerned with the investment that they have put into this airport and their relationship with ODAV. We take all input and comments seriously. Please know that the agency's consultant does intend to prepare a response to your letter which will be added to the record for the next PAC meeting. But, also, as we discussed, we hope that some of your concerns are alleviated as we explained that any project would be phased, meaning that some of the proposed improvements in the selected alternatives could be built as funding is secured for that phase. We also attempted to clarify that ODAV has no present intention of acquiring by

DATE	NAME	QUESTION/COMMENT	RESPONSE
			condemnation the areas that are marked “reserve” in any of the alternatives. Rather, these are designated as reserve so that ODAV may apply to FAA for federal funds to acquire these properties, should they become available to be used for a future aviation use. Finally, we attempted to explain that FAA has worked with ODAV to identify the standards that ODAV must comply with and it is apparent that FAA will not approve a modification. As Tony explained, FAA has denied ODAV’s attempts to seek modifications in the past. Furthermore, any modification would be temporary and would not present a permanent solution to the need for new development at the airport. As promised, we will locate the documents pertaining to ODAV’s application to FAA and its response and provide you with copies!
09/03/24	Wendie Kellington, *Kellington Law Group*	Can we please schedule a brief meeting? Please let me know. Thank you.	Please see above correspondence of the meeting.
09/03/24	Whitney Stewart	OEM is participating in these meetings in an emergency management advisory capacity, as well as from an informational standpoint for our preparedness and response planning. The agency does not have any feedback to provide related to appropriate site planning options, and supports the pathways that our involved partners recommend.	Thank you for participating in this important public process. Your comments have been received and included in the public record.
08/30/24	Dave Mauk, Charbonneau Country Club	Submitted as attachment to the online survey form: Addendum to PAC Feedback Form: Problematic Elements of Refined Alternatives in Aurora Airport Master Plan • all of the refined alternatives are unsuitable for the constrained site & MAP • refined alternatives are not reasonable when existing constrained site remains a constrained site • refined alternatives inadequately address future noise exposure & mitigation • refined alternatives are not compliant with state land use laws & invite costly litigation	Thank you for participating in this important public process. Your comments have been received and included in the project record.

DATE	NAME	QUESTION/COMMENT	RESPONSE
		• refined alternatives as well as larger & more frequent aircraft are not supported by local community • insufficient data provided to demonstrate that airport operations are self-sufficient & sustainable without state & federal funding, while funds from the general fund are budgeted for operations • Aurora State Airport operates at a loss where self-generated revenue is insufficient • LUBA rulings & ongoing legal issues are costly, time consuming & adversarial • acquiring private land currently zoned for agriculture is adversarial & litigious • relocating state highway (551) & other surface roads is unfeasible, adversarial, impractical & costly • MAP did not follow procedures in its forecasting, where statistics fail to show basis of need • expansion is unnecessary when over 85% current use is small aircraft that fit the constrained site • cost, inconvenience, ROI of relocating existing private hangers is adversarial & impractical • impact of adjusting take-off & landing fees, & fuel pricing as factors is not taken into account • insufficient data regarding safety, noise & surface traffic impact of higher number of larger aircraft • insufficient due diligence in not considering unused capacity at existing regional airports with superior facilities & infrastructure already in place as an alternative option • lack of transparency regarding airport finances calls into question the validity of MAP • inadequate accounting of local citizens' negative input especially in light of general fund usage • local municipalities' & other interests' input unaccounted for & not sufficiently documented • lack of assessment for alternative of runway addition divided on both north & south ends • inadequate assessment of negative impact on nearby residential neighborhoods & residents	

DATE	NAME	QUESTION/COMMENT	RESPONSE
		• state of water, sanitation, fire suppression, & emergency services onsite is deficient • insufficient assessment on local surface transportation based on refined alternatives • deficient assessment of environmental factors & public health • MAP documentation with respect to the airport's 10-15 year safety record is inadequate • failure of applying reasonable standards to high cost/limited benefits of refined alternatives • imprudent that ODAV's current budget is partially funded from the general fund with $250,000 budgeted for litigation legal fees at Aurora Airport while planning costly refined alternatives • insufficient due diligence without comparative analysis in use of funds for an alternative project at a different airport that has existing facilities & meets runway specifications for larger aircraft • deficient documentation identifying specific airport stakeholders & aircraft benefiting from MAP • reparation for stakeholders who are disadvantaged by refined alternatives is not taken into account • inadequate explanation why Aurora airport isn't candidate or eligible for modified C-II certification • insufficient explanation why Aurora airport can't return to B-II certification with current use 85% small aircraft, after shifting higher-rated aircraft to regional airport with C-II or higher certification	

Public Questions/Comments and Responses

The following comments referenced the same form letter (below). Any additional text, changes to text, or specific email comments are called out in the table below.

- Ken Meuser
- Lukas Nickerson
- Jeff Schreiber
- John Dixon
- Paul Bazeley
- John Timothy Warren
- Bruce Bergman
- William Granewich

Ladies and Gentlemen,

This letter is written on behalf of the direct airport stakeholders whose aviation related businesses are located at, and rely upon, the Aurora Airport. Please include this letter in the record of the 2023-2024 Aurora Airport Master Plan proceedings.

On July 30, 2024, the Oregon Department of Aviation (ODAV) presented three alternatives for the development of the Aurora Airport for the next 20 years and invited comment on those alternatives. **The direct airport stakeholders strongly OBJECT to all of those proposed alternatives: 1A, 1B and 2.**

Objection to Process

At the July 30, 2024 meeting, PAC members were invited to comment on the proposed alternatives via checking a box on an online form to identify which of ODAV's three alternatives they preferred. Participants had no way to offer meaningful comments or explain why none of the alternatives were acceptable. The undersigned strongly objects to ODAV's process as it is not reasonably calculated to solicit input from stakeholders as required by federal law to determine a preferred alternative. Reserving that objection, the Aurora Airport direct airport stakeholders present the following comments on the July 30, 2024 ODAV proposed master plan alternatives.

General Objection – the Alternatives Present a False Choice: Sacrifice the Safety of the Aurora Airport in the Name of Safety

Under ODAV's "alternatives" the runway extension that is well-documented to be badly needed now for safety, is held hostage to prerequisites that will take a decade or more (if they can even happen at all) and hundreds of millions of dollars that no one has. In other words, ODAV's alternatives ensure that the runway safety improvement will never happen or will happen only if the airport is less safe, all in service of perfect prerequisite compliance with design standards. This is a false choice and one that FAA does not and in fact cannot demand and ODAV should not demand this false choice either. The false choice is not only contrary to the very purposes of aviation master planning and federal law but also ORS 836.600-642 and ODAV's mission.

Alternatives Proceed from False Assumptions

For the alternatives to have legitimacy, they must proceed from accurate assumptions. The proposed alternatives do not proceed from accurate assumptions. To the contrary, each of the three proposed alternatives proceed from false premises.

The first false assumption is that FAA will not allow the airport to "maintai[n] current non-standard conditions" and if the airport has any "non-standard conditions," then FAA will place the runway "in maintenance only mode ***."[1]

The second false ODAV assumption is that it is necessary for ODAV to acquire the privately owned "through the fence" properties adjacent to the airport "to ensure [their] continued long-term aeronautical use."

Starting with the second false assumption, we note that there is nothing to support the assumption that if ODAV owned the undersigned's private aviation related properties they would be bettered assured to remain in aeronautical use. Respectfully, there are a lot of reasons to believe ODAV ownership of our property would have a contrary result. It is we, the private through the fence owners, who have the strong incentive to maintain robust aviation use of our adjacent private property because it is suitable for no economic use other than aeronautical use and we have invested and continue to invest ***millions of dollars*** to assure the success of our aviation related uses there.

Conversely, we have not seen evidence that ODAV is committed to growing and supporting aeronautical use of our properties at the Aurora Airport. We have pushed for more than a decade for ODAV to remove trees that are a hazard to aviation. ODAV hasn't gotten around to doing that. We have pushed for decades for ODAV to extend the airport's runway for safety, but ODAV hasn't gotten around to doing that, despite the runway extension being approved on the 2012 airport ALP. ODAV told the airport's opponent's that the 2012 airport master plan had not been finally adopted when ODAV had clearly adopted it (otherwise there would have been no 2012 ALP), inviting years of litigation that resulted in a remand of the 2012 master plan on land use grounds. ODAV did not bother to respond to that remand of the 2012 master plan, as it should have.

In all respectfully, the only evidence is that the private through the fence owners have the great documented interest in the continued aeronautical use of their property – they (we) have invested millions of dollars to support aviation use at the Aurora Airport and we continue to do so, our properties are useful for nothing but aviation related use in fact. There is simply nothing to support ODAV's "assumption" that ODAV needs to buy our property to ensure its continued aeronautical use. We note that this second premise is also contrary to the legislative command in ORS 836.640-642 that ODAV **support** the private through the fence ownerships and their economic development, not buy them out. ODAV is constrained by this legislative command. The second "assumption" is simply a nonstarter.

With respect to the first erroneous assumption, the assumption's referenced "non-standard conditions" are primarily the Runway Object Free Area (ROFA) required separation for C-II design aircraft between the runway and Highway 551. [2] The law does not support ODAV's first erroneous premise that FAA always requires that airports meet all design standards. The law and FAA's decades of practice is exactly the opposite.

In this regard, federal law expressly provides FAA with authority to issue modifications to standards "when necessary to meet local conditions" so long as the "modification will provide an acceptable level of safety, economy, durability and workmanship." 14 CFR 152.11(b). FAA staff lacks authority to override that federal law that recognizes that "non-standard conditions" happen and can be allowed to continue in the right circumstances, as presented here.

The truth is that FAA routinely approves modifications to standards where the modification provides the requisite "acceptable level of safety." FAA has approved modifications at airports from Renton where 737's takeoff and land daily at a B-II airport, to SJC which has modifications to standards for many FAA requirements. This happens frequently enough that, as required by Congress, FAA in conjunction with the National Transportation Research Board and National Academies of Sciences, published a technical handbook entitled "**Risk Assessment Method to Support Modification of Airfield Separation Standards"** that goes to a lot of trouble to explain exactly how to assess whether a modification to an airport design standard will provide an acceptable level of safety. Contrary to the July 30 ODAV "assumptions" and August 1 ODAV "recognition", this federal risk assessment publication states that "**FAA does accept requests from airports for modifications to standards**."

Following federal law and the FAA Risk Assessment publication, respected airport planner, Aron Faegre prepared such an analysis under the FAA published risk-assessment methodology that **concludes maintaining the existing ROFA between the runway and Highway 551 provides an acceptable level of safety.** In other words, were ODAV to merely ask (and Mr. Faegre has done the work to support that ask), a modification to the ROFA would be granted. Which means contrary to ODAV's "assumptions" underpinning the three alternatives ODAV revealed on July 30, 2024, FAA would approve maintaining the existing non-standard conditions at the airport. This should not be a surprise because FAA approved the exact ROFA modification for a C-II design aircraft that Mr. Faegre demonstrates meets modification standards, when it approved the 2012 ALP for the airport.

FAA Approved the Modification for the ROFA - Separation of the Runway to Highway 551 – in the 2012 ALP under Airport Design Standards for a C-II Airport

The approved ALP that currently governs the airport shows that FAA approved the runway extension to the south with a ROFA modification to standards for the C-II design aircraft for the separation between the runway and Highway 551.

That means there is no reason to think that the same ROFA modification to standards cannot be approved here. ODAV should apply for it and FAA almost certainly will grant it.

Proper Assumptions for this Master Planning Effort

With all due respect, there are proper assumptions for this master planning effort. The direct airport stakeholders urge ODAV to adopt the following assumptions and goals for the Aurora Airport Master Plan:

- ODAV can and should apply for modifications to C-II design standards for existing conditions at the airport that would otherwise require unachievable prerequisites to the runway extension.
- ODAV should grow and support the through the fence aviation operations as it is instructed to do in ORS 836.640-642. Accordingly, ODAV should expand the airport boundary to enable the last undeveloped through the fence areas shown on the draft master plan to grow and flourish.
- ODAV has an obligation to manage the Aurora Airport to safely support the general aviation that has grown to rely upon it and the Oregonians who rely upon that general aviation.
- ODAV should support the Aurora Airport as an economic powerhouse for the region being responsible for thousands of jobs and millions of dollars in payroll and visitor spending.
- ODAV should support the Aurora Airport that is known to be a resiliency center in the event of natural disasters – whether they be wildfire disasters or the Cascadia Subduction Event.

- ODAV should support the Aurora Airport that is home to Life Flight that provides important air ambulance service to needy Oregonians and delivers organs for transplant that saves lives.
- To the extent ODAV is privately planning otherwise, ODAV should strongly resist efforts by opponent municipalities like the city of Aurora to annex the airport.
- The airport should not be casually discarded to the bin of unachievable prerequisites.

Alternative that ODAV Should Consider

A wholly achievable alternative that is consistent with FAA and state law that ODAV should consider is:

a) a 500' runway extension to the north; better yet a 750' runway extension to the north. 750' is well-understood to be better and more appropriate for the long master planning horizon.
b) Reapproval for the necessary existing modification to standards for existing conditions.
c) Adjust the airport boundary to include the undeveloped through the fence areas on the current draft,
d) Show the Internal Circulation Road location that was shown on the 2012 ALP.

Conclusion

The direct airport stakeholders stand ready to work cooperatively with ODAV toward an appropriate 20-year master plan for the Aurora Airport along the lines of the alternative that we outline above. However, respectfully, we cannot abide any of the July 30, 2024 proposed alternatives and strongly oppose all of them. We hope that ODAV will agree that the assumptions and alternative proposed by the direct airport stakeholders are appropriate ones that ODAV should adopt in support of general aviation at the airport, regional disaster resilience and economic vitality for the decades to come. The future of aviation at the Aurora Airport depends upon it.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

[1] ODAV July 30, 2024 PPT Presentation to Planning Advisory Committee. This erroneous assumption carries forward to the August 1, 2024 "Refined Preliminary Alternatives Analysis" which similarly begins by asserting that ODAV has "recognized that maintaining current non-standard conditions is not acceptable to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA)." There is no such lawful FAA position that ODAV may "recognize." To the extent that ODAV has adopted such a "recognition" it is contrary to both federal and state law and may not serve as the foundation for the airport's 20-year future.

[2] ODAV's "alternatives" assume another "non-standard" condition regarding the location of the airport's septic drainfields in the north and south. The septic drainfield in the south was expressly approved by ODAV, FAA and Marion County in a land use process. It is not "non-standard" or if it is, it is already approved – by ODAV and FAA. Moreover, if necessary, those drainfields can be brought to whatever standard applies. But ODAV may not merely assume they are "non-standard", say they will be "removed" in all alternatives but have no other location for them and no analysis of whether it is feasible to establish any alternative location for them. If ODAV's unstated plan is just to annex the airport to the 900-population City of Auora that has done nothing but oppose the airport for the past decade, and that had a mayor who we understand to be on record saying the city wanted to annex the airport to shut it down, the private airport stakeholders strongly oppose any such -as yet – unarticulated plan.

DATE	NAME	QUESTION/COMMENT	RESPONSE
08/29/24	Ken Meuser, *Management West LLC*	This attached letter is to confirm my Opposition to the July 30, 2024, Aurora Master Plan Alternatives. None of the options presented are feasible or realistic. With at least one option that would destroy our operation/business here at the Airport. Runway extension at the Aurora State Airport is needed for increased safety but not at the unnecessary expense and destruction of the surrounding communities and businesses/operations at the Airport.	Thank you for your comments. Responses to the letter referenced are included as a separate document attached to this meeting summary.
08/29/24	Lukas Nickerson, *Pacific Skies Aviation LLC*	Anthony & Brandy - Good Afternoon, Please find Pacific Skies Aviation's feedback to the ODAV KUAO proposed alternatives attached to this email. Please ensure this letter is added to the testimony associated with the proposed alternatives.	Thank you for your comments. Responses to the letter referenced are included as a separate document attached to this meeting summary.
08/29/24	Jeff Schreiber *Pacific Aircraft Services*	Please see attached letter with response to ODAV Alternatives.	Thank you for your comments. Responses to the letter referenced are included as a separate document attached to this meeting summary.
08/30/24	John Dixon	Form Letter (see attachments)	Thank you for your comments. Responses to the letter referenced are included as a separate document attached to this meeting summary.
08/30/24	Paul Bazeley, *Aerometal International, Inc*	Please see attached a letter from Aerometal International Inc. providing our feedback to the ODAV's KUAO proposed alternatives. I would request that you include this letter with the Testimony associated with the proposed alternatives review. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions.	Thank you for your comments. Responses to the letter referenced are included as a separate document attached to this meeting summary.
08/30/24	John Timothy Warren, *AESOP LLC*	Please add my letter to the testimony associated with the proposed alternatives.	Thank you for your comments. Responses to the letter referenced are included as a separate document attached to this meeting summary.
08/30/24	Bruce Bergman, *Wylee Hangar Condominium Association*	Please find attached a response from Wylee Hangar Condominium Association. _____ Ladies and Gentlemen, This letter is written on behalf of the Wylee Hangar Condominium Association, a 29-unit association valued at over $16 million exclusive of the value of 45 aircraft and associated hangar interior buildouts	Thank you for your comments. Responses to the letter referenced are included as a separate document attached to this meeting summary.

DATE	NAME	QUESTION/COMMENT	RESPONSE
		and contents (including multiple working businesses) and is therefore one of the direct airport stakeholders whose aviation related interest and businesses are located at, and rely upon, the Aurora Airport. Please include this letter in the record of the 2023-2024 Aurora Airport Master Plan proceedings. The 27 units comprising the Wylee Hangar Condominium Association is situated on private property inside the perimeter fence and has accessed the runway via a through-the-fence agreement for over 30 years, taking great pains to ensure that our activity is aviation related and with our goal being to promote general aviation. Our 25 individual owners utilize their hangars for aircraft storage, business usage (aerial photography, aircraft maintenance, aircraft modifications), and as bases for charter operations. Our hangars are important investments and the possibility of losing them to a governmental agency is distasteful.	
09/09/24	William Granewich, *Aeros Jet Aviation*	Hi Tony... here's my letter!	Thank you for your comments. Responses to the letter referenced are included as a separate document attached to this meeting summary.
8/27/24	Jeff Lewis	Thanks, Tony. I appreciate the quick and detailed reply. What confuses is that the actual ALP includes a Table listing both 'existing' and 'future' C-II, right? So, it seems there is an error... either that 2012 signed ALP mis-stated 'existing' as C-II (should have shown B-II?), or there was in fact an upgrade to C-II preceding Suomi's signature. If such upgrade happened, when was it, and where is the FAA signature copy? The text you cited appears to come from pg.2 of chapter 4. Contextually, further down, does that page say the 2007 OAP encouraged an upgrade from B-II to C-II? And, if so, am I correct that the upgrade to C-II therefore happened after 2007? One more question... what do you have as the FAA approval date for the Master Plan preceding Suomi's 2012 signature, and is a PDF copy available online?	Hi Jeff, no problem, happy to help. Yes it does show existing and future conditions as C-II, but that is because the Critical Aircraft was determined to be C-II (existing) earlier in that 2012 master planning process (Chapter 3 – Forecasting). From the 2012 Chapter 3 – Forecasts: “According to the 2000 Airport Master Plan, the planned ARC was B-II, exemplified by the King Air turboprop and the Cessna Citation jet. At that time, ODA decided to constrain the forecast by keeping the airfield ARC at B-II. A runway designed for ARC B-II is adequate for about 45% of the business jets manufactured. The Airport has now passed the 500 operations threshold for Aircraft Approach Category C, so the current ARC should be C-II.

DATE	NAME	QUESTION/COMMENT	RESPONSE
			Aircraft Approach Category C accounts for 701 documented operations in FY 2007 and 390 in FY 2009, resulting in an average of 545 operations. The number of Aircraft Approach Category D airplane operations is negligible, as are operations in Airplane Design Group III. With more than 500 operations in Aircraft Approach Category C and more than 500 operations in Airplane Design Group II, the appropriate ARC for the Airport is C-II." It also gives a projected growth rate and that it does not expect the ARC to change in that 20-year planning period, so C-II is kept as the "future" condition on the 2012 ALP. This section of Chapter 3 above determines that C-II is the Critical Aircraft based on recent actual aircraft operations, and sets the existing condition/design standards for the rest of the plan, including the ALP. The change to C-II did not occur prior to the 2012 master plan. I hope this helps, Tony Beach
8/28/24	Joshua Williams, *Fire Chief, Aurora Fire District #63*	Good morning, I left you a voicemail this morning, but thought I would email you my question. I was reading the alternates for the UAO airport and could not help but to notice there was a lot of property acquisition. Specifically the property acquisition for aeronautic reserve, and the high priority acquisition. All of that property is currently privately owned, thus they pay property taxes. My question is who will be acquiring the proposed property for the reserve? Is it the State of Oregon, because if that is the case the state is exempt from paying property tax. As an example, I pulled up only 5 parcels contained in the area and those 5 parcels bring the Aurora Fire District over $100,000 in tax revenue. If this represents only 5 parcels, one could imagine the impact of all of them to be significant.	Good day Chief Williams, We appreciate you taking the time to review the draft refined preliminary alternatives for the Aurora State Airport Master Plan and providing valuable input. We understand your concern to maintain tax revenues that support the fire district. You are correct, the land the Oregon Department of Aviation (ODAV) owns is tax exempt; however, the private improvements on leased land (hangars, buildings, etc.) are taxed and invoiced by Marion County to ODAV, which are paid by the lessees. The refined preliminary alternatives illustrates "priority" parcels that would need to be acquired by ODAV to meet Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) design standards as well as to support the existing and future facility needs.

DATE	NAME	QUESTION/COMMENT	RESPONSE
		The loss of revenue from just those 5 parcels alone would cause a devastating cascade of events that may lead to the loss of career staffing and end 24 hour career coverage. I am looking forward to a response. Chief Williams	Property identified as reserve is shown in the event that the property becomes available for purchase, ODAV would be able to utilize federal funding to acquire the land. There is no timeline or requirement to acquire the reserve property. Thank you again for your review and comments. Thanks, Brandy Steffen (on behalf of the Oregon Department of Aviation)
9/3/24	Kirsten Newbury	1. Why is Lower Boones Ferry Road not included in alternatives? 2. I'm very concerned for small business owners like us. An extended unavailability of the airport will have dire consequences to our business. We can't all go to neighboring airports. 3. We're obviously pro airport. We'd like to see additional or expanded alternatives, more out-of-box brainstorming.	We believe that you are referring to rerouting Hubbard Highway (HWY 551) along the current Boones Ferry Road alignment. That concept was evaluated and discarded due to necessary ROW acquisition, costs to construct road and reconstruct existing road to meet capacity needs of Highway 551, and environmental concerns with relocating a major thoroughfare through an existing residential area (as opposed to the current alignment along one edge of the neighborhood).
9/3/24	Aron Faegre	Dear Alex, Tony, and Brandy: Attached is a document which can be used to formally gain a modification of standards for the ROFA on the west side of the airport, where Highway 551 and the Airport Perimeter Fence force a reduced separation from the runway centerline. I have taken the time to create this detailed risk analysis for ODAV, because under FAA's rules and standards this kind of modification of standards is allowed, and in this particular case the analysis fully demonstrates that the non-standard existing conditions result in an acceptable level of safety, as required by Order 5300.1G. Equally important, this eliminates the hundreds of millions of dollars of public funds needed to move Highway 551, or to move the runway, taxiway, and tower – funds which are sorely needed for other much needed airport improvements that can significantly improve safety – at Aurora and at other airports. Use of the modification of standards also saves	Thank you for participating in this important public process. The materials you provided have been added to the public record.

DATE	NAME	QUESTION/COMMENT	RESPONSE
		hundreds of jobs at the airport that under several of the preliminary schemes would be disrupted and likely terminated. This approach provides a win-win for all parties; I look forward to meeting with you and working cooperatively with ODAV to proceed in this direction.	
08/01/24	George Van Hoomissen, VH4 Aviation, LLC	Please see attached PDF containing a letter with public comments regarding the July 30th presentation to the Planning Advisory Committee for the Aurora State Airport Master Plan. I would appreciate it if you would reply to this email to confirm your receipt of the attached letter.	Thank you for your comments. Your comments have been added to the project record. The FAA Seattle ADO has clearly and repeatedly stated that the airport master plan must identify a "path to conformance" based on the C-II standards defined by the current and future critical aircraft represented in the FAA-approved master plan forecasts for the Airport. FAA has specifically identified the need for the ROFA to meet standards before runway improvements would be eligible for FAA support.
08/06/24	Pat Hickman	[submitted through the PAC feedback form] Currently use the airport; don't prefer any alternative due to: Amount of right-of-way (ROW) to be acquired (by acre) Impact to the Hubbard Highway Impact to local homes (by number of residential properties) Impact to local businesses west of the Hubbard Highway (by number of commercial properties) Impact to local farmland (EFU) Noise to local homes and businesses Farmland impacts (EFU) Amount of property acquisition needed Increase in traffic/operations at the airport Impacts to existing roads outside of the airport property Keep the airport the same expansion is not needed No expansion needed larger jet operators can use alternative airports already in place that have the facilities and are under utilized I do not support property acquisition to support additional hangars and parking. I prefer to not shift the runway, balancing impact to both aeronautical and non-aeronautical properties/development (as seen in Refined Alternative 1A)	Thank you for your comments. They have been added to the public record.

Attachments

Aron Faegre

Tony Helbling

George Van Hoomissen

Dave Mauk

Ted Millar c/o Wendie Kellington

Email 1 of 9	Email 2 of 9	Email 3 of 9
Email 4 of 9	Email 5 of 9	Email 6 of 9
Email 7 of 9	Email 8 of 9	Email 9 of 9
Exhibit A	Exhibit B	Exhibit C
Exhibit D	Exhibit E	Exhibit F
Exhibit G	Exhibit H	Exhibit I
Exhibit J	Exhibit K	Exhibit L
Exhibit M	Exhibit N	

Response to Comment

Jeff Lewis

U.S. Department
of Transportation
**Federal Aviation
Administration**

Northwest Mountain Region
Seattle Airports District Office
1601 Lind Avenue S.W., Suite 250
Renton, Washington 98057-3356

October 19, 2012

Mr. Mitch Swecker, Director
Oregon Dept. of Aviation
3040 25th Street, SE
Salem, OR 97302

Dear Mr. Swecker,

The Aurora State Airport Layout Plan (ALP) dated March, 2012 and submitted by WH Pacific, Inc., is hereby approved. A signed copy of the ALP is enclosed.

This approval considers only the safety, utility, and efficiency of the Aurora State Airport, and is conditioned on acknowledgment that any development on airport property requiring federal environmental approval must receive such written approval from the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) prior to commencement of the subject development. This ALP approval is also conditioned on acceptance of the plan under local land use laws. We encourage appropriate agencies to adopt land use and height restrictive zoning based on the plan since action toward this end is a prerequisite of the Airport Improvement Program (AIP). Grant Assurance 21, Compatible Land Use, requires airport sponsors to take appropriate action, including the adoption of zoning laws to restrict the use of land adjacent to, or in the immediate vicinity of the airport, to activities and purposes compatible with normal airport operations including the arrival and departure of aircraft. The FAA recognizes residential development adjacent to the airport property as an incompatible land use.

Approval of the plan does not indicate that the United States will participate in the cost of any development proposed. When airport construction, alteration, or deactivation is undertaken, such action requires notification and review in accordance with the provisions of Part 77 and Part 157 of the Federal Aviation Regulations.

Please attach this letter to the approved Airport Layout Plan and retain it in the airport files for future use under the Airport Improvement Program.

Sincerely,

Carol A. Suomi
Manager, Seattle Airports District Office

Encl: Aurora ALP dtd Mar 2012

cc:
Ms. Heather Peck, ODA
Mr. Rainse Anderson, WHP

Aurora State Airport
Master Plan Project



Planning Advisory Committee Meeting #7
October 15, 2024

Agenda

Time	Topic
5:00-5:10	Introductions
5:10-5:30	Alternatives Process & Review Refined Preliminary Alternatives
5:30-5:40	PAC Clarifying Questions
5:40-6:00	Review PAC Feedback & Comment Themes
6:00-6:15	PAC Clarifying Questions
6:15-6:30	Review Preferred Alternative
6:30-7:30	PAC Comments
7:30-7:55	Public Comments
7:55-8:00	Next Steps Public comments collected through the website **https://publicproject.net/AuroraAirport**

Introductions

Oregon Department of Aviation (ODAV)

Kenji Sugahara
Director

Alex Thomas
Policy, Planning & Program Manager

Tony Beach
State Airports Manager

Brandon Pike
Aviation Planner

Project Team

Agency Oversight & Funding

Airport Owner (Sponsor)

Planning & Engineering

Public Involvement

Cultural Resources


Archaeological Investigations Northwest, Inc.

Environmental Review

AGIS Survey

MAGYAR LAND SURVEYING LLC

Project Website Overview



https://publicproject.net/AuroraAirport

PAC Members & Alternates

- Airport Users/Businesses/Organizations
- Airport Neighbors
- Local Municipalities
- Tribal Organizations
- State Agencies
- Local and Regional Non-Profit Groups
- Environmental / Land Use Groups

PAC Meeting Guidelines

Meetings summaries will **include all comments along with responses/ follow up.**

- Meeting time **for all committee members to speak.** We have added more time for dialogue.

- Comments on **non-agenda items** should be provided in writing.

- Committee members are encouraged to **provide comments on draft work products presented within the allotted review period** provided by the Planning Team.

PAC Meeting Guidelines


As a committee, we agree to **approach this work with honesty, openness, and willingness to work together.**

- This includes building trust and **assuming good intentions in others** and ensuring that our behavior supports a successful process.
- We will work with each other and staff to **address issues as they arise, utilize tools to ensure clear communication and robust participation, and meet the communication needs of members.**
- PAC members represent their organization, please keep your constituents informed of public meetings and project information.
- **We need all PAC members to name/identify themselves.** Duplicates will be removed from the meeting.

Project Schedule – Where are we?

Updated September 2024

Aurora State Airport - Airport Master Plan Project Schedule (all future dates tentative)



The Alternatives Process

Preliminary Alternatives Process

- Concept Planning
  - At this phase, the Planning Team discussed a wide range of options to meet FAA standards, with potential impacts, and viability of the alternative to move forward. Many of these concepts were considered not viable early in the planning process, including a No Action Alternative.
- Prepared Preliminary Alternatives (7 Airside, 3 Landside)
  - Submitted to FAA for review and input
  - Presented at PAC Meeting 6 – 6/11/24
  - Presented at Public Open House – 6/13/24
  - Reviewed all feedback and comments received
- Refinements of Preliminary Alternatives (1A, 1B, 2)
  - The feedback informed the decisions on the refinements
  - Presented at PAC Working Session 3 – 7/30/24
  - Presented to the Oregon Aviation Board – 9/5/24

How the Preliminary Alternatives were Refined

- 7 Preliminary Airside Alternatives were created and presented to the FAA, PAC, and Public.
- 3 of the 7 Preliminary Airside Alternatives (*Airside Alt. 5, 6, & 7*) were discarded prior to PAC Meeting #6, based on FAA input that Airside Alternatives designed to B-II standards were not viable based on the existing C-II design aircraft and current air traffic.
- The No Action Alternative was discarded based on the impacts to future federal funding needed to support ongoing airfield facility improvements. The No Action also does not implement safety related improvements.
- 2 of the Preliminary Airside Alternatives (*Airside Alt. 2 & 4*) were discarded based on ODAV's ability to accommodate the future runway extension on-airport property. This was supported by PAC/public concerns for EFU lands and additional property acquisition.
- Preliminary Airside Alternatives 1 and 3 were carried forward into the Refined Preliminary Alternatives *(Now depicted as Refined Preliminary Alternatives 1A, 1B, & 2)*
- Preliminary Landside Alternatives 1 & 2 were presented at PAC Meeting #6. Preliminary Landside Alternatives were refined and merged into the Refined Preliminary Alternatives 1A, 1B, and 2.

Review:

Refined Preliminary Alternatives

Review:

Refined Alternative 1A – Shift Hubbard Highway West and Extend Runway North to 5,500 feet


SUMMARY

Refined Alternative 1A –Shift Hubbard Highway West and Extend Runway North to 5,500 feet

- **Refined Option for Preliminary Alternative 1** - Impacts to both aeronautical use facilities and non-aeronautical properties
  - Extends existing runway 497 feet north (5,500 feet)
  - Shifts Hubbard Highway and ODOT right-of way (ROW) approximately 80 feet west to clear ROFA; assumes new highway is centered in existing 200' ODOT ROW and with the same roadway configuration. The ultimate location of the highway and ROW width will be determined during a separate planning and design process with ODOT.
- **Land Requirements**
  - Approx. 43 acres of property acquisition to construct a parallel taxilane and vehicle service road east of Taxiway
  - Property acquisition reserve included for all properties currently in aeronautical use, so ODAV may acquire those properties with federal funds from willing sellers to keep them in aeronautical use.
- **Aeronautical Development/Redevelopment**
  - Includes a full-length parallel taxilane and vehicle service road (VSR) east of Taxiway A to address direct runway access and VPD issues
  - Requires removal of some existing hangars to accommodate landside improvements
  - ASOS, segmented circle/windsock in the ROFA, and drain fields in the RSA to be relocated
  - Reroutes Keil Road to clear ROFA and TOFA
  - Accommodates existing ATCT location and runway location

REFINED ALTERNATIVE 1A - Shift Hubbard Highway West and Extend Runway North to 5,500 feet

Overview



Review:

Refined Alternative 1B –Shift Runway and Hubbard Highway West and Extend Runway North to 5,500 feet


SUMMARY

Refined Alternative 1B – Shift Runway and Hubbard Highway West and Extend Runway North to 5,500 feet

- **Refined Option for Preliminary Alternative 1 -** Minimizes impacts to aeronautical facilities with greater impacts to non-aeronautical properties
  - Extends Runway 497 feet north (5,500 feet)
  - Shifts Runway approximately 80 feet west to accommodate parallel taxilane and vehicle service road on east side
  - Maintains existing 200' wide Hubbard Highway ROW and shifts ROW approximately 175 feet west to clear ROFA. The ultimate location of the highway and ROW width will be determined during a separate planning and design process with ODOT.
  - Includes a full length parallel taxilane and vehicle service road east of Taxiway A to address direct runway access and VPD issues
  - Reduced impacts to existing east hangars
- **Land Requirements**
  - Approx. 39 acres of property acquisition required to shift Hubbard Highway and ROW west and to construct a parallel taxilane and vehicle service road east of Taxiway A
- **Aeronautical Development/Redevelopment**
  - North landside area redesigned to accommodate parallel taxilane and vehicle service road
  - Reroutes Keil Road to clear ROFA and TOFA
  - ASOS, segmented circle/windsock in the ROFA, and drain fields in the RSA to be relocated

REFINED ALTERNATIVE 1B - Shift Runway and Hubbard Highway West and Extend Runway North to 5,500 feet

Overview



Review:

Refined Alternative 2 - Shift Runway East and Extend Runway North to 5,500 feet


SUMMARY

Refined Alternative 2 - Shift Runway East and Extend Runway North to 5,500 feet

- **Refined Option for Preliminary Alternative 2**
  - Extends Runway 497 feet north (5,500 feet)
  - Runway & parallel taxiway are shifted 85 feet east to clear Hubbard Highway
  - No change to Hubbard Highway required
  - Maintains existing ODOT ROW and west airport property boundary
  - Reroutes Keil Road to clear ROFA and TOFA
  - Requires removal of some existing hangars to accommodate landside improvements
  - Includes a full-length parallel taxilane and vehicle service road west of Taxiway A to address direct runway access and VPD issues
  - ASOS, segmented circle/windsock in the ROFA, and drain fields in the RSA to be relocated
  - ATCT to be relocated pending a future siting study
- **Land Requirements**
  - Approx. 37 acres of property acquisition required to shift the runway/parallel taxiway and to construct parallel taxilane and vehicle service road
  - Approx. 105 acres of property acquisition reserve included for all properties currently in aeronautical use, so ODAV may acquire those properties with federal funds from willing sellers to keep them in aeronautical use.


REFINED ALTERNATIVE 2 - Shift Runway East and Extend Runway North to 5,500 feet

Overview



Comparison of Cost Estimates

Refined Preliminary Alternatives



Note: Draft project cost estimates will be available for informational purposes and will be discussed further at the Dec 12th PAC meeting where we review the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP).


Clarifying Questions

PAC Feedback


Comment Themes

PAC Feedback Form Results


Do you currently use the airport?




Please rank the alternatives based on your preference for the Aurora Airport from most to least preferred. (Ranked-Weighted Score)



Airside: To meet C-II design standards which direction should ODAV shift the runway?




Landside: Should ODAV consider property acquisition, beyond what is required to meet runway safety standards to accommodate hangars or aircraft parking once existing airport property is at capacity?




Note: Alternative preferences were scored using the following ranked-weighted scoring: Most preferred – 3 points, Second preferred – 2 points, Least preferred – 1 point, No response – 0 points
The original PAC feedback forms will be available in the PAC meeting summary.

PAC Feedback Form Results

What influenced your choice for your highest ranked alternative?



What concerns would you like ODAV to consider as they make a recommendation on a preferred alternative?



Note: The original PAC feedback forms will be available in the PAC meeting summary.

PAC Feedback

Comment Themes - MOS

- Can we request a modification of standards (MOS)?
  - Under current FAA guidance, MOS are temporary and not a permanent solution for non-standard conditions. FAA has indicated they are not providing a MOS for this project.
- Does the 2012 ALP include an approved MOS?
  - No, the ALP noted that a MOS would be requested. Request for MOS is a specific process separate from the ALP approval process and does not guarantee an approval of a MOS.
- Can we move toward conformance by relocating the property fence closer to Hubbard Highway?
  - The fence and a portion of Highway 551 is within the ROFA. Both the highway and fence require relocation outside of the ROFA.

PAC Feedback

Comment Theme – Drain Fields

- Why are there no proposed locations for relocating the drain fields?
  - Privately-owned drain fields, located on leased ODAV property do not meet C-II runway safety area (RSA) standards and will be removed. Replacement of drain fields will be the responsibility of the owners.
- Were the drain fields approved by FAA in their current locations at the time of construction?
  - We have no record of the depth of FAA involvement in the permitting of these facilities when they were constructed. However, at the time the runway was classified as ARC B-II, which had a smaller RSA that did not conflict with the drain field placement.
- Is it possible to modify the drain fields in place to conform with RSA standards?
  - Structural enhancements have been evaluated by ODAV and FAA and have been found to not meet RSA grading standards and could impede the function of the drain field.

PAC Feedback

Comment Themes - Additional

- Why is the vehicle service road (VSR) parallel to the taxiway?
  - Many of the recent Vehicle or Pedestrian Deviations (VPD) reported by ATC involved vehicles entering movement areas as they go around parked aircraft on the apron. The VSR, as depicted, provides a safe and clear path free of parked aircraft for ground vehicles to operate while also providing a visual cue to drivers to remain in the non-movement area.

- We object to the depicted acquisition of privately-owned property for aeronautical reserve.
  - It is ODAV's intention to acquire the properties identified for aeronautical reserve from willing sellers if, and when they become available. By depicting the parcels on the ALP, it allows ODAV to pursue FAA funding for property acquisition.

- Can Hubbard Highway be rerouted along Boones Ferry Road?
  - That concept was evaluated and discarded due to necessary ROW acquisition, costs of construction, and greater impacts to residential.


Clarifying Questions

Preferred Alternative

Refined Alternative 1A – Shift Hubbard Highway West and Extend Runway North to 5,500 feet

PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE - OVERVIEW

Refined Preliminary Alternative 1A - Shift Hubbard Highway West and Extend Runway North to 5,500 feet




PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE – PROCESS FOR SELECTION

- ODAV considered feedback provided
  - ODAV has reviewed all PAC and public feedback submitted through the planning process and input provided during the preliminary and refined preliminary alternatives review.
- Does not require a runway shift
  - Based on PAC feedback, most responses do not support a runway shift
- Reduced impacts on west residential properties (compared to Alt 1B)
- Does not require relocation of the ATCT (compared to Alt 2)
- Phased opportunities to implement projects
  - Phase for projects needed to meet ROFA conformance standards
  - Phase for runway and parallel taxiway extension
  - Phase for addition of a vehicle service road (VSR)
  - Phase for the addition of a parallel taxilane
  - Runway reconstruction timing will be based on pavement condition and need

Preferred Alternative

Project Phasing


PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE – PHASE – MEETING ROFA/RSA STANDARDS



PROJECTS

- Remove Drain Field in South RSA
- Mitigate TWY A Drainage Ditch
- Hubbard Highway & ROW Shift (outside of ROFA)
- Fence Relocation (outside of ROFA)
- Keil Road Relocation (outside of ROFA)
- Add Islands (between TWY A and adjacent apron)


PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE – PHASE – CONSTRUCT VEHICLE SERVICE ROAD (VSR)



PROJECTS

- Property Acquisition (area needed for VSR)
- Construct VSR
- Remove Drain Field (between TWY A and North Hangar Area)
- Hangar Development (based on demand)

PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE – PHASE – NORTH RUNWAY EXTENSION




PROJECTS

- Extend the Runway by 497'
- Extend Parallel Taxiway & Construct new Holding Bay
- Remove North Drain Field (in extended RSA)
- Property Acquisition (extended ROFA)

Note: For project phasing, FAA has indicated that the ROFA/RSA standards would need to be met, prior to an extension of the runway. See FAA email received 3.26.24 in the public record.


PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE – PHASE - PARALLEL TAXILANE CONSTRUCTION



PROJECTS

- Property Acquisition (South Hangar Area)
- Construct Parallel Taxilane
- South Apron Reconfiguration
- VSR Relocation

PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE – PROPERTY ACQUISITION OVERVIEW



PAC Comments?

Public Comments?

Next Steps

Next Steps

- Prepare the:
  - Noise Analysis
  - Capital Improvement Plan (CIP)
  - Airport Layout Plan (ALP)
  - Draft Final Report
- Next PAC Meeting – Planned for December 10th (UPDATED DATE)
  - To discuss the Noise Analysis, CIP and ALP

Thank You

Alex Thomas – ODAV

Tony Beach – ODAV

Brandy Steffen – JLA Public Involvement

David Miller – Century West Engineering



Project Website: https://publicproject.net/AuroraAirport

PAC Meeting #8 – December 10, 2024

Aurora State Airport

AIRPORT MASTER PLAN PUBLIC MEETING



Planning Advisory Committee (PAC) Meeting #8

Tuesday, December 10, 2024
PAC Meeting #8 from 5:00pm – 8:00pm

This PAC Meeting will be held by phone or virtually (via Zoom).
Please join the virtual PAC meeting by visiting:
https://us02web.zoom.us/j/84488377615

This meeting will allow the PAC to further discuss the Aurora State Airport Master Plan. For copies of the airport planning work products, please visit the "meetings" page at: **https://publicproject.net/AuroraAirport**

For Additional Information Contact:
Alex Thomas, **Policy, Planning, & Program Manager**
Oregon Department of Aviation
Alex.R.Thomas@odav.oregon.gov

Special accommodations are available upon request (with 48 hours notice)

AURORA STATE AIRPORT

AIRPORT MASTER PLAN

PAC MEETING #8 AGENDA

Date/Time: December 10, 2024, from 5:00-8:00 pm

Location: Zoom Webinar: https://us02web.zoom.us/j/85045246628

Meeting Goals: Review noise analysis and roundtable discussion regarding comments received on the preferred alternative and additional PAC input.

Time	Topic	Person
5:00-5:10 pm	**Introductions**	Brandy Steffen
5:10-5:30 pm	**Review:** • Current alternative • Draft noise analysis	David Miller
5:30-7:30 pm	**PAC questions and comments** • Roundtable discussion regarding comments received on the preferred alternative and additional PAC input	Brandy Steffen
7:40-7:55 pm	**Public Comments** • Comments may be emailed before the meeting through the website: https://publicproject.net/AuroraAirport# • Commenters may have up to 2 minute to speak. We ask that only one representative from each organization speaks. We may not be able to hear from everyone. • *Reminder:* public comments typed into Zoom may not be answered during the meeting, but answers will be included in the written meeting summary.	Brandy Steffen
7:55-8:00 pm	**Next Steps**	Brandy Steffen

A meeting summary with all PAC and public comments will be posted to the project website.

We always will take comments via the website, which will be included in the meeting notes and shared with the PAC members: https://publicproject.net/AuroraAirport#

AURORA STATE AIRPORT

PLANNING ADVISORY COMMITTEE (PAC)
MEETING #8 SUMMARY

Date: Tuesday, December 10, 2024
Time: 5:00-8:00 pm
Location: Zoom Webinar

In Attendance

PAC Members Present

Alvin Klausen, *Marion County*
Aron Faegre, *alternate*, *Helicopter Transport Service; AABC/TLM Holdings*
Ben Williams, *Friends of French Prairie*
Beth Wytoski, *Regional Solutions*
Bill Graupp, *Aurora CTE, Inc*
Bruce Bennett, *Positive Aurora Airport Management*
Brian Asher, *City of Aurora*
Chris Neamtzu, *alternate, City of Wilsonville*
David Waggoner, *Willamette Aviation*
Dave Mauk, *Charbonneau Country Club*
Dave Tibbetts, *Columbia Helicopters*
Jamie Stickel, *City of Canby*
Jon Bickford, *Atlantic Aviation*
Ken Ivey, *Aurora Butteville Barlow Community*
Naomi Zwerdling, *Oregon Dept of Transportation*
Melissa Ahrens, *Oregon Dept of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD)*
Pam Barlow Lind, *Confederated Tribes of the Siletz Indians*
Patrick Donaldson, *Wilsonville Chamber of Commerce*
Ted Millar, *AABC/TLM Holdings*
Tony Helbling, *Aurora Airport Improvement Association*
Whitney Stewart, *Oregon Office of Emergency Management*

PAC Members Absent

Austin Barnes, *Marion County Planning Dept. Planning Organization*
Cathryn Stephens, *ODAV Board*
Cheryl Pouley, *Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde Community of Oregon*
Commissioner Tootie Smith, *Clackamas County*
Councilor Joann Linville, *City of Wilsonville*
Don Hardy, *alternate, City of Canby*
Greg Hughes, *alternate*, *Vans Aircraft*
Matt Crall, *alternate, Oregon Dept of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD)*
Matt Williams, *Deer Creek Estates HOA*
Matt Lawyer, *alternate, Marion County*
Micheal Weimer, *Life Flight Network*
Raul Suarez, *Aurora Air Traffic Control*
Rian Johnson, *Vans Aircraft*
Matt Nash, *alternate*, *Columbia Helicopters*
Robert Fournier, *Helicopter Transport Service*
Roger Kaye, *1000 Friends of Oregon*

Agency Representatives Present

Kenji Sugahara, *ODAV*
Alex Thomas, *ODAV*
Tony Beach, *ODAV*
Brandon Pike, *ODAV*
Tim House, *FAA*
Stacy Posegate, DOJ

Staff and Consultants

Matt Rogers, *Century West*
David Miller, *Century West*
Samantha Peterson, *Century West*
Mark Steele, *Century West*
James Kirby*, Century West*
Brandy Steffen*, JLA Public Involvement*
Jen Winslow*, JLA Public Involvement*
Ashley Balsom, JLA Public Involvement

Audience / Members of the Public

Betsy Johnson
Bill Poehler
Bruce Bergman
Doug Wilson
George Van Hoomissen
Jeff Lewis
Joe Mollahan
Joseph Schaefer
Julie Fitzgerald
Kevin O'Malley
Kirsten "Shurston"
Krista Kroiss
Lukas Nickerson
Mark Ottenad
Pete Nickerson
Rachel Leo
Shannon Colebank
Steve Bateman
Stopher Eldridge
George Buley
Commissioner Danielle Bethel

Overview

Planning Advisory Committee (PAC) members reviewed the noise analysis and had a roundtable discussion regarding comments received on the preferred alternative. *The presentation; meeting recording, chat, and transcript; and other materials are posted on the website (publicproject.net/AuroraAirport). Comments collected during the meeting have been added to this meeting summary.*

Welcome and Introductions

Brandy Steffen, JLA Public Involvement, welcomed everyone to the meeting and reviewed the PAC members. Brandy also mentioned that there was now a Public Records section on the website that will be updated. She reviewed the agenda and Zoom meeting tips and etiquette. The meeting was extended by an hour to ensure time to discuss and ask questions about the noise analysis and preferred alternative. **Tony Beach and Kenji Sugahara, ODAV**, reintroduced themselves and stated they were hoping for a great discussion.

Presentation

Noise Analysis

David Miller, Century West, reviewed the draft noise analysis. The analysis focuses on evaluating current and projected noise exposure levels through 2041, in compliance with FAA requirements under 14 CFR Part 150 – Airport Noise Compatibility Planning.

Current Alternative

David then shared the current preferred alternative and explained the process and how the decision was made. The plan prioritizes addressing non-standard conditions, such as the runway object-free area (ROFA) and runway safety area (RSA), which include incompatible features like highways, fencing, and drainage ditches. Overall, the plan balances compliance with FAA standards and PAC and public feedback while setting a path for phased, long-term improvements.

PAC Questions and Comments

Brandy began the roundtable PAC discussion. *Comments and responses are provided in the table below. Some PAC members didn't have questions or comments but were asked specifically if they wanted to add anything. Their names are listed in the table below.*

Public Comment

Brandy opened the public comment section of the meeting. There were three (3) public comments and each person was given three minutes to speak. After all spoke, there was time for additional public comments and Brandy asked if the commenters would like to speak again, which they did. Additionally, public in attendance were able to provide written comments throughout the meeting in the Q&A section. *Written and verbal comments, as well as responses, are provided in the table below.*

Next Steps

The next virtual PAC meeting #9 will be held in February 2025 to discuss the ALP, CIP, and the final plan. Brandy reminded the group that the meeting summary would address any unanswered questions and be posted on the website soon, along with a follow-up email regarding future meetings. Participants should submit any additional comments by December 23, 2024.

Brandy, Tony, and Kenji thanked the PAC and public attendees for their time and input, then ended the meeting.

PAC Member Questions/Comments and Responses[1]

ID	Name	Affiliation	Question/Comment	Response
8.1	**Ben Williams**	*Friends of French Prairie*	On the slide titled "Input Received on the Preferred Alternatives" you stated that no-build is a non-started relative to meeting future demand? My main concern is the future demand projections. I submitted additional comments last week, which I assume are on the record. The data Century West and ODAV are using to forecast operations comes from 2016-2021, with the 2021 data showing 72,549 operations. However, operations dropped to 64,651 in 2020 and further decreased to 63,015 in 2023. If we project the best case for 2023, we get around 68,045 operations. This shows a significant decline from 72,549, making that number seem like an anomaly. Yet, the future demand projections still seem to rely on it, and I don't understand why current data isn't being used. The numbers being used for future demand don't make sense when compared to the actual data from the FAA's ATAP. There were two prior maser plan efforts with robust forecasts that were never achieved. They always fell short. Thank you.	**David Miller, CWE:** The FAA has already indicated that any improvements to the runway would be limited to maintenance rather than expansions, such as runway extensions or strengthening, which would be necessary to meet future demand. The justification for the runway extension and other improvements isn't based on specific operations targets, but rather on meeting current standards like pavement strength and clearing protected surfaces. There are some issues with the data but the master plan forecasts are 20-year projections, where short-term fluctuations are normal. There have been recent declines in airport operations but some data, such as jet traffic, has rebounded. The FAA approved the forecasts, and although growth is expected, it's modest. Short-term trends, like recent fluctuations, don't warrant a revision of the forecasts. The airport still meets FAA requirements, and deviations in traffic are typical, with the need for updated forecasts arising only if significant, sustained declines occur.
8.2	**Bruce Bennett**	*Positive Aurora Airport Management*	I think it's important to clarify some points about airport property and access. While there's a distinction between "on-airport" and "off-airport" property, it's all technically airport property since it's zoned for aviation	**David Miller, CWE:** Thank you, Bruce. I think this is a great opportunity for us to discuss what you've described and explore ideas together. I know some work has already been done on proposed

[1] Live responses are included, along with additional information/clarification, as needed.

			use. Most of it is privately owned and taxed but remains integral to airport operations. For example, the main access road, Stenbach Way, is on private property with a state easement, built through a public-private partnership. I believe such partnerships should continue to ensure safe and efficient access for vehicles, bicycles, and pedestrians without relying on public roads like Airport Road Northeast. There's already an offer for a free easement, which is a significant contribution from airport landowners to support improvements. Overall, I think this master plan is one of the best I've seen since I started engaging with these processes in 1976, as it incorporates public input and follows regulations. However, I strongly suggest avoiding plans for hangar destruction, altering drain fields, or unnecessary expansions like adding another parallel taxiway, which we lack real estate for. Instead, the focus should remain on critical improvements, like a vehicle service road that's safely distanced from the runway. Thank you. The 2012 master plan included a vehicle service road, though I'm not sure if that's the exact term for it. While it could use some fine-tuning, it's significantly better than the one located right next to the taxiway. I also want to reiterate that the main airport access road, including how the control tower staff get to work, is on private property. I understand the need for complete control, but in this case, I believe an easement can provide the	roadway alignments on private land, and if that's the direction ultimately decided upon, that's fine. I'm curious about portions of the preferred alternative concept, especially the sections of the vehicle service road near the central terminal and around the tower. From an airport planner's perspective, I think about connectivity, especially north-to-south. A concept sketch or additional details could help inform our evaluation. I encourage everyone to kick these ideas around tonight as part of the conversation. I think it's our understanding that if we talk about the development of a vehicle service road, if it's on ODAV property, it would be eligible for FAA funding. If it's developed on private land, it's likely not to be eligible for FAA funding. That's the main distinction. **Tim House, FAA:** While using private land might save hundreds of thousands of dollars on the land itself, it wouldn't be eligible for FAA funding. This would mean the construction of the facility could end up costing millions of dollars instead. FAA only constructs on airport property and only funds construction on airport property to FAA standards.

			same benefits as ownership while saving the state hundreds of thousands of dollars. It's important to consider the value of using an easement, especially in cases like this, where it makes practical and financial sense. There are some on this call that will donate, so it would be a huge net savings after the construction costs.	**Kenji Sugahara, ODAV:** Hey Bruce, are you willing to donate? Good to know. **Tim House, FAA:** That's the way to solve it. Hundreds of thousands of dollars and you get a tax rebate or a deduction because you won't have to pay property taxes on it either. **David Miller, CWE:** Going back to my earlier comment, if landowners are open to considering selling their property, it would be helpful to include that input. This ties back to the broader discussion about property acquisition. I understand many are upset about the potential acquisition of privately owned lands on the airport's east side. The intention here is to create a pathway for willing sellers who may want to sell their parcels to ODAV. If the land isn't shown on the airport layout plan, it typically wouldn't qualify for FAA funding. The same applies to a proposed vehicle service road on private property. At this stage, providing as much detailed input as possible will help guide ODAV's considerations effectively.
8.3	**Aron Faegre**	*HTS*	I believe it's worth revisiting the 2012 plan. People have already donated land for the road shown in that plan, and it was even offered to ODAV in the past under the previous director. The aviation stakeholders' recent submission aligns with the 2012 plan, placing the road back where it was originally shown, which I think is the practical solution.	**Kenji Sugahara, ODAV:** If we included the 2012 internal circulation road as an acquisition in the master plan, would there be objections to that? It would move the road to an interior position. I'm curious about your thoughts on this. **David Miller, CWE:** I can clarify a bit. Going back to the facility requirements chapter, we looked at the current fleet mix and the forecast.

			This airport has always operated as a public-private partnership, even during its military days. The runway was public, while the parking areas were private. Senate Bill 680 further supports this concept of a public-private partnership. While the FAA has limitations on funding allocations, it doesn't exclude the possibility of partnering with the private sector or using ODAV's funds creatively, as Bruce mentioned. For example, the tower access today relies on an easement over private land through cooperation. The interior circulation road shown in 2012 could follow the same model, using easements and similar cooperative arrangements. This was previously discussed with the former director, so I encourage reconsidering this approach. I believe proposing the 2012 internal circulation road for the master plan is a legitimate idea. Historically, this airport has thrived as a public-private partnership, and that collaboration has always been key to its success. The 2012 plan supported interaction between businesses, which is vital for the airport as a hub of business activity. The location outlined in the 2012 plan enables that interaction and strengthens the airport's role as a cluster of interconnected businesses.	What's happening is that some of the larger business jets within the C-II range can't operate at full payload (either passengers or fuel) on hot days. So, the runway extension being analyzed would allow these larger C-II aircraft to operate without the same constraints, but it's not about moving up to the next aircraft category. Some C-II aircraft, and probably some B-II aircraft, can't operate on the current runway under high-temperature conditions with a full load. This is part of the evaluation.
8.4	**Aron Faegre**	*HTS*	On the issue of standards, the FAA's current ROFA requirements are excessive for an airport like Aurora. We're not accommodating 777s or 737s here, so holding us to the same criteria as Portland International or	**Tim House, FAA:** Modification of standards should not be considered during the master planning phase. They are meant to be part of a construction project. The master plan must adhere to current FAA

			SeaTac is unnecessary. I've worked on modifications of standards for other airports, including those with scheduled service, and Aurora should be no different. There's nothing in the FAA's guidance that outright prohibits submitting a proposal for these adjustments. Frankly, we've asked for clarity on these requirements and haven't been able to pinpoint who at the FAA is setting them. If we're being treated differently than other airports that have successfully gained approval for modifications, we need to address that. I'd encourage submitting a detailed proposal and pressing for equitable treatment. I mentioned the distinction between a 777 landing, which isn't going to happen at Aurora, and the purpose of modifications of standards. No standard is perfectly suited to every airport, and that's why flexibility exists. If we dismiss the possibility of modifications, we risk ending up with an unattainable $200 million project, something entirely outside the fiscal reality for this airport. Master planning should focus on feasible, achievable goals, not plans that are impossible to realize. I understand the point about modifications, but the rules for modifying standards do include a process, which is iterative. The master plan could acknowledge that applying for a modification of standards is part of the process once a project begins. There's no reason to delay the entire airport development over this. In my	standards, and while we're not planning for a 777 at this airport, we are focused on the C-II standard, which is the current FAA requirement. This isn't my stance; it's based on FAA guidelines. Our standards are safety as well. **David Miller, CWE:** As Tim mentioned, current FAA guidance on the use of modifications of standards (MOS) has shifted from being a planning tool to being a tool used to incrementally implement development projects. See **FAA Order 5300.1G** – Modification to Agency Airport Design, Construction, and Equipment Standards (9/29/17), Section 11. The MOS Process. See also **FAA AC 150/5300-13B**, change 1 – Airport Planning and Design (8/16/24), Sections 2.8 - 2.8.3, Modification of Standards.

			submission, I showed that we can make significant progress now, like moving the fence, to achieve 95% of the desired outcome. Regarding the request for more space, it's not about increasing the size of aircraft but about ensuring safety. I'm surprised you'd say that (regarding safety), but to my knowledge, it's not about introducing larger aircraft. The goal is simply to allow existing aircraft to take off with full fuel and load, particularly on hot days. We should clarify this, as I've interpreted the runway length to be for the design aircraft. There was a reduction from a 1,000-foot extension to 500 feet, and this discrepancy arose from two different consultants working with the same airport design guide. But I don't want to dwell on that; let's keep focusing on the main issue. There's no intention to bring in larger aircraft.	
8.5	**Aron Faegre**	*HTS*	I just want to briefly touch on the modification of standards. I know there was discussion about a B-II airport, and while I understand the FAA's stance on not pursuing that, I want to point out how Renton has allowed 737s to operate with a B-II designation. It shows that there's some flexibility here, and I hope we can apply the same flexibility to Aurora. I also want to clarify that the drain field issue is not a request for modification; we've submitted compliance documentation showing that adding geofabric can support C-II aircraft and fire trucks. This isn't a modification request, just a clarification. Regarding the potential	**Kenji Sugahara, ODAV:** So is the objection that the property is shown as potentially eligible for acquisition if, for example, HTS decides they've outgrown the site and become a willing seller? Is the concern that it's being depicted in a way that allows federal funds to be used for purchase if it becomes available? The only intent here is to ensure that if the property is ever up for sale, it's eligible for federal funding as part of a state acquisition. I just want clarification on whether that's the issue or if there's something else at play.

			acquisition of HTS property, I want to stress how strongly they oppose this idea. They are a large international company with a strong connection to Oregon, and they rely on the airport for firefighting operations. They're supportive of the airport, and I believe they would be open to partnering with us in the future, but we need to respect their position and not show their property as being subject to acquisition. I think it muddies their title and creates uncertainty about their operations. I'd recommend simply asking if anyone at the airport is considering selling, and if so, then showing their property as available for acquisition. That approach feels more like a friendly offer to the private companies involved. However, when the government signals interest in purchasing property, it tends to devalue the property. People perceive that dealing with the government is challenging, with its resources and legal capabilities, so it creates a negative impression and can discourage other buyers. It's not a positive look. You know, and I guess what I don't really understand is that you can update an ALP and let's say there's suddenly a seller who comes up who is very willing to sell to the state. Can't you do an update to the ALP to show that? I want to give my personal statement that I'm happy to help on anything, you know, any of these issues that could help the airport.	It's a worry that the ODAV would go through condemnation process. Is that the biggest concern? **James Kirby, CWE:** Yeah, the drain field issue came up, and there are several reasons why it's not currently in compliance. It can't support aircraft loads due to existing structures, doesn't meet grading requirements, and overall, there are multiple issues with the current setup. We reviewed the NV5 proposal Aron mentioned and had a technical evaluation, but as it stands, that proposal wouldn't meet the requirements. There were requests for additional technical details and an expanded design, but we didn't receive anything further. The proposal mainly focused on adding a cap to the drain field, which would actually worsen the grading noncompliance. To address the issue, it would essentially require a complete reconstruction of the drain field. The FAA has also weighed in, noting that a drain field in the RSA isn't compliant at C-II standards, even if it worked under B-II. Fixing the existing drain field at its current location would be problematic, and it's not compatible with the standards we need to meet at this point. But it (the drain fields) would have to be somewhere else, right? It still can't be inside the RSA given the structures you're proposing and we can actually evaluate it to know whether it's not actually going to

			I just want to follow up that we had those conversations, but they didn't go anywhere. We wanted our geotech to talk to your Geotech and that was denied. We never received whatever you're talking about. You wanted additional information, and we're prepared to have the grading corrected. And yes, and it would be a rebuilding of it. I would like for this to be opened again for discussion. I'll submit comments by the 23rd if you can provide something that explicitly states you can't have a drain field in the runway safety area. I haven't seen it in any of the advisory circulars. We've proposed a method that would make it work. I'm not looking for just someone's word on a piece of paper. I want to see it in the standards, not just an opinion. We showed how with geofabric it does (work). Maybe you've never used the geofabric.	carry aircraft objectively. AS far as discussion, there was an email chain that just kind of dead ended without any additional information from NV5. There are emails from the FAA that state you can't have one anymore. Well, you can't have a structure that won't bear the load of aircraft in an area that has to be designed to bear the loads from aircraft. If you bury a drain field, it's non-functional. It has to be towards the surface. It must breathe. It's a living thing. You can't bury it under a foot of rock.
8.6	**Tony Helbling**	*Aurora Airport Improvement Association*	Okay, four points. First, on the drain field: As chair of HDSC, I was involved in the email exchanges with James Kirby and Betty Stansbury. ODAV hired Century West to study the drain field, but there was no airport participation in gathering data until HDSC stepped in. There was even a potential solution to port the sewage to Columbia Helicopters, but that idea just disappeared without explanation. Second, we're asking for a collaborative discussion. These Zoom meetings don't work. They allow for dismissing comments and muting participants, like Aron right now, who	**Kenji Sugahara, ODAV:** We have kept the meetings virtual for accessibility. We are also open to refining the alternative, so please make sure to give us suggestions. People will have full access to speak during the public comment portion of the meeting. After the initial three minutes, there will be additional time to speak. The PAC process is certain and there can't be last-minute changes. To your first point, I want to mention, would you be open to the idea if we talked about it, sort of what I mentioned to Aron about the

			can't even provide input. This isn't productive. Third, referring to ORS 36.642, Aurora State Airport is a public-private partnership and a through-the-fence airport. The stovepipe approach to this master plan has led to unnecessary roadblocks, ignoring collaborative solutions like past agreements that facilitated access. Finally, we should work together to establish solutions, such as internal circulation roads on private property. Ted has even volunteered a portion of his property, which could cover 75-80% of the road. But to move forward, we need everyone; Ben Williams, Jon Bickford, and others; at the table for real collaboration.	circulation road, the internal circulation road, but actually putting that on our match plan with the idea that we could put it there for acquisition so we can actually use FAA funds for it. Because remember, it must be pretty much built, right? And then we're going to need to maintain it as well. Regarding your comments on ORS 36.642, the agency has reviewed and considered these comments and agrees that some of the impetus behind ORS 836.642 was to assist TTF businesses with their capital investments by creating more opportunity for TTF agreements at rural airports. But, ORS 836.642, does not create a unilateral bar to the state's future acquisition of property. Rather, ORS 836.642 creates a partnership between ODA and a TTF business, placing shared responsibility on both to establish and meet the fiscal needs of the pilot site, maintain safety of operations and maintain positive community relations and compatibility with existing uses. There is not a singular, exclusive, goal or requirement of protecting a TTF businesses' private property assets. If acquisition of property is necessary to, for example, "ensure that pilot sites continue to operate in a safe manner (ORS 836.642(3)(d)," "facilitate orderly management of pilot sites(ORS 836.642(3)(f)," or "enable conformity with approved airport master plans (ORS 836.642(3)(k)," then it is part of ODA's shared responsibility to

				include the potential acquisition of that property into its master planning. And, it is the TTF business's shared responsibility to support that plan, which it does by following the standards and guidelines established by ODA in rule to ensure these goals are met.
8.7	**Tony Helbling**	*Aurora Airport Improvement Association*	Century West, ODAV - everyone goes home with a paycheck, yet you're proposing actions like condemning property. That's a taking that could ruin people's lives. It's not too late to change course; this plan hasn't been finalized. If you're open to refining the plan, as you said earlier, then my suggestions are: keep the drain field in place, stop condemning private property, and don't push private property near Airport Road for state purchase. There's no need to tear down hangars. The vehicle service road (VSR) is unnecessary - it's not conducive to economic growth. I spoke with Biz Oregon about this; we invested in this airport to foster business and bring jobs, not jeopardize them. Remove the VSR, which fits somewhere like PDX, not here. And about the parallel taxi lane—not the taxiway—we explored cost-effective, private enterprise solutions three years ago, like marking easements for CCAP owners to taxi aircraft. That wouldn't cost the state anything and could reduce project costs. These are the kinds of collaborative solutions we should've discussed long ago—before	**Tony Beach, ODAV:** We've had input throughout the process about including a vehicle service road in the master plan, but then there's been pushback when it's shown on state-owned property. When Kenji asked about acquiring property further back, you mentioned that private property owners have already volunteered and agreed to do that. What do you need from ODAV right now? Why this is so important to the master plan right now, especially given these existing agreements.

			we started threatening to condemn hangars. The ATCT Manager has told us that if someone taxis into the green area, he's required to report it to the state, and it gets investigated under some FAR rule. Apparently, you can't taxi across those green "putting greens." Fine, let's not paint it green. Let's paint it as some other conditional area to prevent direct access from the ramp to the runway. We're willing to do that. This eliminates the need for a parallel taxi lane and the vehicle service road. If we could just get into a collaborative mode and brainstorm, we could come up with innovative ideas. For instance, take the drain field; people say it has to support an aircraft, but look at Tehachapi. They pump raw sewage into a field within their RSA. How does that support aircraft? Yet they manage it. We can show that our drain field can support aircraft and emergency vehicles, but we're not even allowed to discuss it. It's frustrating, especially when we try to bring knowledgeable people to the table and are told they can't join. That's just the wrong approach. We need to figure out a way to move this forward together. Taking people's property and threatening them, even without the funds to do it, creates pre-condemnation blight. That's damaging, and it's a horrible thing to do to people. Two points. First, people have already volunteered their private property for	

			aviation use through existing agreements. Second, if we'd had collaborative discussions earlier, we could have addressed the need for an internal circulation road, not a vehicle service road. An internal circulation road supports economic success at a GA airport like ours, while a vehicle service road is more suited to a commercial airport like PDX. Let's focus on making this a successful GA airport by maintaining private properties for aviation use and implementing infrastructure that promotes economic development and jobs. The parallel taxi lane and the VSR in the preferred alternative are the main reasons for the potential need to take the front row hangers, but we don't need either of those things. If we focus on the internal circulation road, we don't have to take those hangers. Most of the road is already paved, and the property owner is willing to make the missing section available. This road would allow tugs, fuel trucks, and even personal vehicles for things like aircraft repairs, unlike the VSR, which would restrict access to only qualified vehicles. An ICR would be open for everyone—bicycles, walkers, and general use—unlike a VSR, which would be restrictive. Regarding easements, it's simple; the state operates on Stenbach through an easement, and that's all we're talking about here.	
8.8	**David Waggoner**	*Willamette Aviation*	Tony Beach, maybe I can clarify your question about how the internal circulation road ties into the master	**Tony Beach, ODAV:** When we're getting feedback about including a vehicle service road in the master

			plan. It's simple; if we get the internal circulation road approved, which is nearly complete but not yet implemented, it changes the plan significantly. With the ICR in place, there's no need for the vehicle service road or the taxi lane, which opens up more possibilities and flexibility in the master plan.	plan, we need clarity. Are we talking about state property acquisition? Or are we relying on private property owners who are unwilling to sell but open to other arrangements? That distinction changes how it fits or doesn't fit into the master plan. If it's the latter, that's a separate discussion altogether.
8.9	**Ted Millar**	*AABC/TLM Holdings*	The internal circulation road discussion highlights a lack of transparency and collaboration. This is the first time I've heard that state funds can't be spent on an easement, and this hasn't been communicated to property owners before. Setbacks and agreements with Marion County might need adjustment for hangars along the road. Instead of working with us, it feels like the state is imposing airline-centric rules on a general aviation airport, which operates differently. Aurora's business cluster model, designed by state leaders and senators, depends on seamless collaboration between private entities that own 56% of the airport footprint but have little to no input. We've repeatedly requested meaningful discussions, but decisions feel predetermined. This isn't a true public-private partnership. It's one-sided, with the state dictating and dismissing our input.	**Tony Beach, ODAV:** I just want to make sure it's clear where the vehicle service road and the internal circulation road fit within the scope of the master plan. If there's more to add or anyone wants to expand on what Ted was discussing, now's the time.
8.10	**Ted Millar**	*AABC/TLM Holdings*	Is Tony Beach or Tim House saying the state could purchase the internal circulation road we've outlined? If so, could we also work with Marion County to adjust the planning and setback requirements? It doesn't really matter who owns the road since	**David Miller, CWE:** The option of ODAV acquiring the internal circulation road right of way may exist. The ability to use FAA funds would depend on FAA-approval of

			everyone will use it for the benefit of the airport. Property owners might consider this if we can resolve issues like setbacks and create reverse easements to ensure private owners can access the state-owned road. There are a lot of moving parts, but if we approach it collaboratively, as Tony Helbling suggested, we're open to making it work.	the concept and its perceived added benefit to the overall Airport.
8.11	**Tony Helbling**	*Aurora Airport Improvement Association*	The idea is that if we work collaboratively, including Marion County, we could explore options like establishing the internal circulation road as a county road on private property or something similar. Sometimes, what initially seems like a crazy idea starts to make sense when people come together and hash it out, moving things forward as a true public-private partnership. I understand Tim and Tony have rules and regulations they need to follow, and I respect that. But if we can set out and figure out a cooperative path, we could boom the airport even larger than it is. Most of the undeveloped areas of the airport belong to the state and everything else has already exploded, and this approach could amplify that momentum. I'll speak for South End Air Park, and I'll tell you right now, nobody down in that area wants the state to ever acquire that property. I just wanted to add to what Ted mentioned about the reverse proposal, where the state acquires the property and enters an agreement for its use. If that happens, it would need	**Tim House, FAA:** I wanted to address a point from the previous session, which Tony also touched on, about altering the ALP when a property owner decides to sell. The master plan's purpose is to engage public interest and gather input. Adding a property to the ALP without any public engagement or input creates significant challenges for us, especially when it comes to determining eligibility for FAA funding. A property is either marked as "to be acquired" and then there is a discussion and it gets acquired, or it requires a formal public process to add it to Exhibit A to become a grant-funded acquisition.

			to be reflected as a property acquisition in the master plan.	
8.12	**Ted Millar**	*AABC/TLM Holdings*	Most of my points have already been discussed but need to work collaboratively on a public-private partnership to address issues like the sewer and septic systems. I encourage setting up a meeting with our consultants and Century West to prove that our proposals meet requirements. Second, TLM Holdings, my company, previously submitted a 97-page document with recommendations, but it was never acknowledged in earlier PAC meetings. I'd like those submissions, along with contributions from others like Aaron Faegre and Tony Helbling, to be revisited and incorporated into this process. There's a lot of commonality among the submissions, but the main opposition remains against the parallel taxiway and the state's proposed internal circulation road along the runway. We want the state to utilize our internal circulation road instead. And that eliminates 90% of the objections to the preferred master plan.	The 97-page document submitted on your behalf by Wendie Kellington, as well as materials and correspondence submitted by others throughout this project are included in "Public Records" section of the project website.
8.13	**Jamie Stickel**	*City of Canby*	Good evening, everyone. I'm Jamie Stickel, the Director of Economic Development for the City of Canby. Ahead of tonight's meeting, I met with our city administrator and Canby's mayor. The mayor also sent a letter, which we emailed to Brandy, Tony Beach, and Alex Thomas earlier this evening. I'm happy to share it with anyone in the group.	Thank you for your comment.

			I'll read the letter as part of our public comment because I believe it supports much of what has been discussed tonight: My name is Brian Hodson, and I serve as mayor for the City of Canby, a position I have held for the last 12 years. During my tenure, the Aurora Airport has been the subject of many decisions, deliberations, planning, and processes. The City of Canby views the Aurora Airport as an economic driver for the region. It serves as a vital facility for businesses in Canby and neighboring cities. The Aurora Airport and its growth are crucial to the industry now and as we look to the future. The City of Canby's position remains unchanged: we support the airport as an economic driver, the businesses that rely on it, and the ongoing efforts to update the Aurora Airport Master Plan. However, as the master planning efforts have progressed, we have learned of concerns raised through the Aurora Master Plan PAC. These differences seem to risk harming the businesses that rely on the airport for their operations, which, in turn, impacts Canby's economic development opportunities. We have heard requests from at least one business seeking a more collaborative process. The City of Canby echoes this request and calls for a process that is collaborative and transparent. Members of the Aurora Airport PAC have asked for an	

			opportunity for stakeholders to meet in person and develop a plan that benefits all. The City of Canby is willing to host such a meeting to support the overarching goal of ensuring this project serves many, not just a few driving it. Thank you for your time and consideration. Additionally, I want to emphasize the importance of accessibility in this process, as Kenji mentioned. The City of Canby offers ADA-accessible buildings, Zoom capabilities, and, importantly, excellent snacks. When people are asking for in-person meetings and collaboration, it may be time to pause the current process, bring stakeholders together, and work centrally to find solutions that move us forward. As Kenji and Mr. Helbling have highlighted, this is an opportunity for all of us to engage and refine the preferred alternative. I'd love to see your faces in person. Thank you very much.	
8.14	**Jon Bickford**	*Atlantic Aviation*	Kudos to the young lady from Canby! Getting together in Canby sounds great, and snacks are always a plus! Regarding the preferred alternative, I'm not impressed with how it's laid out. The back vehicle road could be a good idea if it works, but from my perspective, the collaborative approach isn't going well. For example, we closed for a week, and when I came back, a green space had been painted across the front of my ramp with no explanation or discussion. It effectively shut down my	Thank you for your comment.

			main way for airplanes to access the ramp, and my pilots started getting written up automatically. Now, the new preferred alternative extends that green space across the front of my ramp, blocking my other entrance. This leaves only one way to get airplanes in and out, and hangars behind my ramp would have to cross through it. This setup is not pro-business. I appreciate Tony's idea about possibly marking it in a way that still allows us to use it without pilots getting written up, but the current plan is not ideal. Additionally, the painted green space at South End Airport isn't conducive to the hangar tenants there—they're unhappy about what's coming. Once this preferred alternative is included in the master plan, property values are likely to drop, and other problems could arise, as others have mentioned. I believe it's essential that we sit down face-to-face and thoroughly review the details. I'm hopeful we can have that conversation soon.	
8.15	**Patrick Donaldson**	*Wilsonville Chamber of Commerce*	The Chamber of Commerce has appreciated being part of this process from the beginning. When I joined in November 2019, I received a lot of briefings and information from various stakeholders, including the Chamber, the City of Wilsonville, and others. Back then, the previous master plan was characterized as ending poorly, with people losing faith in the process.	Thank you for your comment.

			When this new process started, we were optimistic about a positive outcome, expecting something fair and transparent that could lead to consensus—even if not everyone was happy. However, in the last few meetings, it feels like the process has veered off course, resembling a state fair ride. It no longer seems fair or transparent, and people feel disengaged and unheard. At the start, there was a covenant between the process and the PAC members—a commitment to dialogue and fairness. It feels like we've strayed from that. There's now an opportunity to revisit those original commitments, reorient, and recommit to them. I hope we can move forward in a way that restores integrity and transparency, avoiding the negative perceptions that surrounded the previous master plan. Let's get back on track. Thank you.	
8.16	**David Waggoner**	*Willamette Aviation*	Thank you for letting me speak. Kenji, I'm truly delighted to hear you're open to rethinking the preferred alternative because I am completely opposed to it as it stands. My first concern is the impact on our neighbors outside the airport, especially along Highway 551. Moving the highway will displace homes, including those of retirees and people on fixed incomes. Displacing these residents, especially during a housing shortage, contradicts Oregon's efforts to address affordable housing issues.	**Kenji Sugahara**: Sure thing. We're definitely open to exploring refinements, as I mentioned. That said, there are FAA requirements, like the ROFA, which are non-negotiable. We've been looking at various options—moving the runway east, which would disrupt a lot, keeping it in place with some balancing, or shifting it completely west, which would displace even more homes. It's a tough situation. However, based on the feedback we've received today, there's room to

			It's unacceptable to force these people out of their homes. On our property, we house organizations vital to Oregon's disaster and emergency response, like the Civil Air Patrol. We've provided a building they've turned into a permanent emergency operations center for search and rescue, homeland security missions, and cadet training. If the current plan proceeds, that building will be lost, and there's no alternative location to move these critical services. Additionally, we support the Disaster Airlift Response Team (DART), which provides emergency supplies to isolated communities during crises. Our Aurora facility serves as the North Oregon hub, currently storing emergency food and surgical supplies. The current plan jeopardizes this essential service by eliminating our ability to support the hub. While I support extending the runway within the fence to enhance the airport's transportation role, this must be done without harming neighbors or undermining emergency services. I'm thrilled to hear you're willing to reconsider, and I hope we can find a solution that keeps the airport effective without these significant drawbacks. Thank you.	explore and analyze potential refinements. So, we're listening and will continue to evaluate options. Thanks.
8.17	**Ted Millar**	*AABC/TLM Holdings*	I have an aerial photo of the entire airport, including everything west of Highway 551 within the roadway boundary. I'd be happy to provide a copy of it by email. It's already included in some of our submitted	The current preferred alternative graphic depicts the existing airport boundary around ODAV-owned property. The church property that you've referenced is identified as potential future 'Aviation Reserve"

			documents, and it clearly shows the internal circulation road proposed back in the 2012 master plan. In the current preferred alternative, the airport use boundary includes everything within the roadway boundary. I own the old church property in that area, and I'd like to ensure that it remains within the airport use boundary for future development and added into the airport. I've already submitted supporting documents regarding this.	acquisition and therefore falls within the future airport boundary. Properties identified as Aviation Reserve would be purchased from willing sellers. A property identified for potential future acquisition does not guarantee acquisition.
8.18	**Alvin Klausen**	*Marion County*	No comment	Thank you for participating in the PAC.
8.19	**Bill Graup**	*Aurora CTE, Inc*	No comment	Thank you for participating in the PAC.
8.20	**Chris Neamztu**	*City of Wilsonville*	No comment	Thank you for participating in the PAC.
8.21	**Dave Mauk**	*Charbonneau Country Club*	No comment	Thank you for participating in the PAC.
8.22	**Dave Tibbetts**	*Columbia Helicopters*	No comment	Thank you for participating in the PAC.
8.23	**Melissa Ahrens**	*Oregon Dept of Land Conservation and Development*	No comment	Thank you for participating in the PAC.
8.24	**Naomi Zwerdling**	*ODOT*	As stated earlier in the meeting, ODOT did provide comments on the preferred alternative in regard to the highway shift. And that was put into the record. So, I don't have any more comments than that.	Thank you for participating in the PAC.
8.25	**Pam Barlow Lind**	*Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians*	No comment	Thank you for participating in the PAC.
8.26	**Whitney Stewart**	*Oregon Department of Emergency Management*	No comment	Thank you for participating in the PAC.

8.27	**Tony Helbling**	*Aurora Airport Improvement Association*	A couple of points: First, regarding the internal circulation road—why can't it be included on the ALP? It seems inconsistent to include Highway 551, which is outside the state's property, but not the internal road. That feels like a double standard. Second, going back to the goals slide from earlier, I noticed that item 3E of the ORS statute, which emphasizes protecting investment, is missing. I had a conversation today with someone who asked a great question: If ODAV is charged with protecting investments at Aurora State Airport, does that mean the state's investment only, or also private enterprise investments? I'd ask Kenji, the ODAV board, and others, why not both? Protecting both public and private investments, like businesses building hangars and contributing to the local economy in Wilsonville, Canby, Aurora, and Woodburn. They's why we build businesses near the airport. We should prioritize this as a goal of the master plan should be a priority. That's my two cents.	**David Miller, CWE:** The option of ODAV acquiring the internal circulation road right of way may exist. The ability to use FAA funds would depend on FAA-approval of the concept and its perceived added benefit to the overall Airport. The agency has reviewed and considered these comments and agrees that some of the impetus behind ORS 836.642 was to assist TTF businesses with their capital investments by creating more opportunity for TTF agreements at rural airports. But ORS 836.642, does not create a unilateral bar to the state's future acquisition of property. Rather, ORS 836.642 creates a partnership between ODA and a TTF business, placing shared responsibility on both to establish and meet the fiscal needs of the pilot site, maintain safety of operations and maintain positive community relations and compatibility with existing uses. There is not a singular, exclusive, goal or requirement of protecting a TTF businesses' private property assets. If acquisition of property is necessary to, for example, "ensure that pilot sites continue to operate in a safe manner (ORS 836.642(3)(d)," "facilitate orderly management of pilot sites(ORS 836.642(3)(f)," or "enable conformity with approved airport master plans (ORS 836.642(3)(k)," then it is part of ODA's shared responsibility to include the potential acquisition of that property into its master planning. And, it is the TTF business's shared

				responsibility to support that plan, which it does by following the standards and guidelines established by ODA in rule to ensure these goals are met.
8.28	**Aron Faegre**	*HTS*	Highway 551 is so important to resolving the FAA's ROFA concerns, and moving it by about 24 feet, including one lane plus some gravel, seems reasonable. It sounds like ODOT has given a formal letter stating that any changes would require giving them 100 feet elsewhere, but that land isn't currently being used. Since this involves two state agencies, and given that the Governor oversees both, why not address this at a higher level? A long-term plan could focus on moving the road within the existing easement, which would simplify the project significantly. A proper discussion weighing the pros and cons seems like the obvious solution. I also hope there's time to address and answer some of the other important questions raised today.	**Tony Beach, ODAV:** We've communicated throughout this process that addressing the airport's non-standard items presents some very difficult decisions. I want to emphasize that we hear your concerns and appreciate your commitment to protecting both the airport and the private investments tied to it. This process is about ensuring the long-term future of the airport so it can continue to serve all users and the development it supports. Our primary goal is maintaining safe and effective operations for everyone based at the airport, as well as aviators across Oregon and nationwide. Thank you all for your comments and thoughtful discussion on the preferred alternatives.
8.29	**Ted Millar**	*AABC/TLM Holdings*	Could I formally request another open PAC meeting before the ODAV makes its decision? Ideally, this would be in person or a hybrid format. There are many innovative ideas and comments that have been raised, and it would be valuable to review and discuss them further. This could give us an opportunity to develop better hybrid solutions before the board reaches its final decision.	Thank you for your comment. There are no plans to add additional PAC meeting to the schedule at this time.
8.30	**Bruce Bennett**		I'll keep it brief. I just want to clarify that the internal circulation road, as	Thank you for your comment.

			planned in 2012, is mostly on ODAV property. It runs from near the rotating beacon to just past 10 Block Way. I think that's an important detail to note.	
8.31	**Tony Helbling (chat)**		It has been started that "The FAA is requiring that non-standard conditions be brought into compliance." Several airports in the same ADO region have non-standard conditions and will NEVER be brought into compliance as a result of a number of factors. Boeing Field, which is a far higher profile airport than Aurora, will NEVER be in compliance as a result of federally-protected historic buildings, etc. It *sounds* to me that what isn't being said, is that AIP-funding will be withheld from Aurora until it is brought into standard; however, airports all over the country continue to receive AIP funding with non-standard conditions. There has always been a path for deviations within the ADO, why is that not-being explored by ODAV? Outside of the Airport Compliance Manual FAA 5190.6B, please point to the "recent" FAA dogma that states that deviations would not be honored/considered? Has a law been passed within Congress of FAA funding that changes past practice? Or is this an ADO leader's personal position?	**David Miller, CWE:** The guidance provided to our planning team and ODAV has been coordinated through the Seattle Airports District Office (Seattle ADO) in the FAA Northwest-Mountain Region. FAA staff direction for standards refers to current FAA policy as stated by Seattle ADO staff, in particular with regard to requirements for airport sponsors to meet various design standards. As noted earlier, FAA guidance on modification of standards (MOS) at airports has been updated since the last Aurora Airport Master Plan was completed in 2012. The input provided by FAA staff on this subject during our PAC meetings is consistent with current FAA guidance, where a path to conformance must be defined during master planning. A future MOS may be considered for a specific project element if the long term path remains viable. See **FAA Order 5300.1G** – Modification to Agency Airport Design, Construction, and Equipment Standards (9/29/17), Section 11. The MOS Process. See also **FAA AC 150/5300-13B**, change 1 – Airport Planning and Design (8/16/24), Sections 2.8 - 2.8.3, Modification of Standards.

8.32	**Tony Helbling (chat)**		The record needs to show - short 2.5 hour PAC meetings controlled electronically - when we're talking about the destruction of hundreds of millions of dollars is not the way to do business. Doug Wilson's idea is exactly the outside the box we're talking about - if we could work collaboratively rather than under threat and control... we could move this thing forward!	Thank you for your comment.

Attendee Questions/Comments and Responses[2]

ID	Name	Question/Comment	Response
8.33	**Jeff Lewis**	Miller mentioned TFMSC as a data source for the noise modeling. Can the full TFMSC data file be made available for public review, and in a common format, so citizens can confirm the aircraft types, quantities, etc.? And, can we confirm the data parameters of the dataset... does it include post-pandemic recovery timeframes?	TFMSC Data are publicly available at https://aspm.faa.gov/tfms/sys/main.asp.
8.34	**Jeff Lewis**	At 557pm, Miller says they are looking at numbers showing recent increases in IFR jets, etc. The people need to see the data he claims being looked at post-pandemic. What will be done to maximize transparency of data through at least September 2024? When will we see it?	TFMSC Data are publicly available at https://aspm.faa.gov/tfms/sys/main.asp.
8.35	**Jeff Lewis**	Bruce also noted a long history of master plans, going back to CH2M Hill in 1976. Some of us have seen them all. Can we confirm the fact that ALL master plan forecasts have failed... that there has never been a forecast of operations met going forward? And how does this resonate with Ben's excellent question, about the true liability of a no-build alternative?	Forecasts are intended to provide a best guess of how operational metrics will evolve over time, based on the best information available at that time. The no-build alternative has been considered and eliminated as it does not address the operational and safety needs of the airport.
8.36	**Jeff Lewis**	Is Faegre eligible to attend as an alternate to HTS, as the posted member list does not	PAC members and their alternates may be coordinated with ODAV and JLA.

[2] Live responses are included, along with additional information/clarification, as needed.

		show him as that role (he is alternate to Ted Millar)?	
8.37	**Jeff Lewis**	At 601pm, Bruce B is disinforming by declaring the private airport-related lands are part of the airport... and miller is nodding his head. Is that appropriate? This is NOT airport land, especially as regards application of hundreds of millions of FAA grant monies (not even one dollar goes off airport). Would miller please explain why he was nodding at this false statement by Bruce?	**Bruce Bennett:** All the aircraft businesses and hangars are not airport land? I cannot agree. The are properties zoned, developed, and used strictly for aviation. **CWE:** Mr. Miller was simply nodding his head to indicate that he understood the question.
8.38	**Jeff Lewis**	at ~610, Faegre repeatedly cites SB680 and claims it is about public private partnership... but those words do not occur in the text of SB680. It is about TTF, and it was created by Betsy Johnson, all in service of the Aurora pilot community. Can someone please clarify the context of SB680 as a TTF legislative act that is NOT about PPPs?	Please refer to SB680.
8.39	**Doug Wilson**	It has been started that "The FAA is requiring that non-standard conditions be brought into compliance." Several airports in the same ADO region have non-standard conditions and will NEVER be brought into compliance as a result of a number of factors. Boeing Field, which is a far higher profile airport than Aurora, will NEVER be in compliance as a result of federally-protected historic buildings, etc. It *sounds* to me that what isn't being said, is that AIP-funding will be withheld from Aurora until it is brought into standard; however, airports all over the country continue to receive AIP funding with non-standard conditions. There has always been a path for deviations within the ADO, why is that not-being explored by ODAV? Outside of the Airport Compliance Manual FAA 5190.6B, please point to the "recent" FAA dogma that states that deviations would not be honored/considered? Has a law been passed within Congress of FAA funding that changes past practice? Or is this an ADO leader's personal position?	**David Miller, CWE:** The guidance provided to our planning team and ODAV has been coordinated through the Seattle Airports District Office (Seattle ADO) in the FAA Northwest-Mountain Region. FAA staff direction for standards refers to current FAA policy as stated by Seattle ADO staff, in particular with regard to requirements for airport sponsors to meet various design standards. As noted earlier, FAA guidance on modification of standards (MOS) at airports has been updated since the last Aurora Airport Master Plan was completed in 2012. The input provided by FAA staff on this subject during our PAC meetings is consistent with current FAA guidance, where a path to conformance must be defined during master planning. A future MOS may be considered for a specific project element if the long term path remains viable.

			See **FAA Order 5300.1G** – Modification to Agency Airport Design, Construction, and Equipment Standards (9/29/17), Section 11. The MOS Process. See also **FAA AC 150/5300-13B**, change 1 – Airport Planning and Design (8/16/24), Sections 2.8 - 2.8.3, Modification of Standards.
8.40	**Jeff Lewis**	At 625, Faegre notes KRNT has a recent APMP showing a B-II airport despite all the B737s that takeoff their after manufacture. How many of these larger-than-B-II ops happen at KRNT each year? Is Faegre correct that the KRNT example means KUAO can select a B-II designation in this current master plan?	This is an Airport Master Plan for Aurora State Airport. For information regarding Renton Airport, please see the Renton Airport Master Plan Report. The AAC/ADG for Aurora State Airport is C-II based on current and projected future activity.
8.41	**Jeff Lewis**	If we are going to entertain including HTS as a possible airport acquisition, and if Faegre is suggesting they may be interested in leaving, is it not appropriate that the APMP document more thoroughly the role of HTS at KUAO? And should this documentation note their history: leaving the Corvallis airport, building anew near KUAO but with no airport access, running an outfit that is completely independent of ODAV's land holding?	A detailed evaluation of off-airport properties that may or may not be acquired is outside the scope of this project. The purpose of depicting potential acquisition (with willing sellers) of adjacent aviation use parcels is to protect their long term aviation land use and to keep the option of using FAA funds open.
8.42	**Jeff Lewis**	Kirby discussed the drainfields at 631. How did it come to be that the drainfields existed prior to the 2012 Master Plan yet were completely missing from that APMP. and APMP process? Also, if FAA had known about the septic drainfields when they signed the plan in 2012, would they have annotated a modification of standards?	For details about the 2012 Airport Master Plan please reference that report.
8.43	**Jeff Lewis**	Is it possible that Tony and Aron are too obsessed with the idea that 'partnership' means no longer having to conform with higher regulations, safety standards, etc? Is it also possible that Tony's repeated expression of condemnation fears fails to see that a B-II airport with no runway extension does in fact ensure no condemnation threat? Why not face the facts: this airport is a mess BECAUSE of this BS 'partnership TTF' concept, and FAA is FINALLY doing the right	Aurora State Airport is classified as an AAC/ADG C-II airport based on current and projected activity.

		thing, saying 'enough is enough' on the MOS's?	
8.44	**Jeff Lewis**	At 651, Helbling states a belief that an easement is sufficient to create the vehicle service road. But, is he failing to recognize FAA's significant security concerns, which are the core reason for a VSR being very restrictive (not for him to just zip up to Willamette to chat w Waggoner)? What precisely are FAA's SECURITY concerns? And what precisely are the concerns by ATC, to manage moving aircraft safely and efficiently without surprise pickups, etc.?	Thank you for your comment.
8.45	**Jeff Lewis**	Is it reasonable for the public to expect a full disclosure from key PAC members, as to what financial history and gains some of these members are accruing from the current messy TTF situation at KUAO? This especially about the fiscal interests of Millar, Bennett, and Faegre, and to a lesser extent Helbling?	All PAC members serve in an advisory role. Financial disclosures by PAC members are not expected or requested.
8.46	**Jeff Lewis**	At 700, Tim House noted the need for meaningful public engagement, as a primary goal of the APMP process. Can I say, THANK YOU, TIm!?	Thank you for your comment.
8.47	**Jeff Lewis**	Does the data confirm that, on a daily average, for 2024, we are seeing on average 5.5 'air taxi' classified operations per day, but close to 100 small planes in the closed pattern? Given that air taxi is a close proxy metric for larger jets, doesn't it make sense that KUAO remains strongly a B-II airport, serving almost exclusively small planes?	Aurora State Airport is classified as an AAC/ADG C-II airport based on current and projected activity.
8.48	**Julie Fitzgerald**	From Julie Fitzgerald, Mayor of Wilsonville. Thank you for the opportunity to comment. I hear many valid concerns and ideas with merit, worth considering. Another point: the Boone Bridge is, as we know. out of date, undersized and not capable of withstanding a major seismic event. To keep or freight moving, a major point of Oregon’s economy, it must be replaced, and rebuilt with a much needed S bound auxiliary lane. The current estimated price tag, to the best of my knowledge, $900,000,000. It is not certain that there is funding to replace it in the next 10 or 20 years, unless we can get the state to	This is an Airport Master Plan for Aurora State Airport which is managed by Oregon Department of Aviation (ODAV). Boone Bridge is managed by Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT). Planning related to Boone Bridge is the responsibility of ODOT, and outside the scope of this project.

		re-prioritize it. It would be a real shame to see the state move Highway 51 before identifying how and when to replace the Boone Bridge. I hope the preferred alternative recognizes the need to prioritize the Boone Bridge, before moving Highway 51, eliminating housing, essential facilities, and before funding the vitally needed Boone Bridge which carries 126,000 vehicles daily.	
8.49	**Julie Fitzgerald**	Clarification: My question above was meant to refer to Highway 551. Thank you.	Thank you for the clarification.
8.50	**Jeff Lewis**	I am finding no means to comment except via Q&A. SO I will state this: thank you all for participating. I believe the only appropriate decision is to stay with B-II, NOT extend the runway, and have ODAV stop allowing excessive overweight use of the current runway. Rely on FAA for maintenance costs. Restore the REAL partnership, not just within, but throughout the larger and more important public. Aurora Airport has a lot of cleanup to do, with the general public. TTF has created a huge mess.	Aurora State Airport is classified as an AAC/ADG C-II airport based on current and projected activity. As discussed in Chapter 4, a 497' runway extension is justified.

Public Comment

ID	Name	Question/Comment	Response
8.51	**Doug Wilson**	Hi, I'm Doug Wilson, owner of FBO Partners, with over 32 years of experience in the general aviation industry, spanning from the East Coast to the West Coast. I've worked with Century West on AWOS programs and am familiar with AIP funding and grant assurance matters. My office is based at Boeing Field, and my Cessna 182 is currently at Aurora Airport for an avionics upgrade. During the presentation, it was noted that the FAA is requiring non-standard conditions at Aurora to be brought into compliance. However, other airports in the Seattle ADO region, like Boeing Field, have non-compliant features—such as its utility runway and the Georgetown Steam Plant—that will never	**David Miller, CWE:** The guidance provided to our planning team and ODAV has been coordinated through the Seattle Airports District Office (Seattle ADO) in the FAA Northwest-Mountain Region. FAA staff direction for standards refers to current FAA policy as stated by Seattle ADO staff, in particular with regard to requirements for airport sponsors to meet various design standards. As noted earlier, FAA guidance on modification of standards (MOS) at airports has been updated since the last Aurora Airport Master Plan was completed in 2012. The input provided by FAA staff on this subject during our

		meet compliance standards but have been managed through deviations. It seems AIP funding for Aurora is being withheld until full compliance is achieved, which limits new development. My question is: Why hasn't ODAV explored deviations with the Seattle ADO, as other airports with similar conditions have done? If deviations are not an option, can you point to specific FAA regulations or recent Congressional laws that explicitly prohibit this? Or is this a policy decision unique to the ADO? Thank you.	PAC meetings is consistent with current FAA guidance, where a path to conformance must be defined during master planning. A future MOS may be considered for a specific project element if the long term path remains viable. See **FAA Order 5300.1G** – Modification to Agency Airport Design, Construction, and Equipment Standards (9/29/17), Section 11. The MOS Process. See also **FAA AC 150/5300-13B**, change 1 – Airport Planning and Design (8/16/24), Sections 2.8 - 2.8.3, Modification of Standards.
8.52	**Lukas Nickerson**	Hi, I'm Lukas Nickerson from Aerometal International and Pacific Skies Aviation, based here at Aurora since 2005. I'd like to formally state for the record that I oppose the state's proposed master plan. Other stakeholders have already covered my primary concerns, but I have one additional question directed at Mr. Miller and the Oregon Department of Aviation. What percentage of the approximate $200 million master plan budget is allocated to correcting non-standard conditions versus other development projects the ODAV wants to pursue? It seems a significant portion of the costs—such as for the vehicle service road and the parallel taxiway—aren't directly tied to bringing the airport to standard. If you could provide those figures in writing, that would be helpful. That concludes my comments—thank you.	**David Miller, CWE:** To clarify, in the last meeting in October, we broke down the costs associated with the preliminary alternatives. A portion of the costs were related to the runway extension, highway realignment, and property acquisition for the highway and hangars. You're correct that the costs for the east side, particularly for the vehicle service road and parallel taxiway, are driven by development needs, not compliance with standards. These items were introduced through the master planning process, as mentioned by Tony and Kenji, but they aren't directly related to meeting the standards, like the runway object-free area or runway safety area. Thanks for pointing that out.
8.53	**Wendie Kellington**	As a lawyer with long experience in this process, I have three key points. First, a master plan must include all aviation-related uses for the airport, both public and private. Aurora has always shown areas for private,	Thank you for your comment.

		aeronautics-related use in its plans, and state law mandates that these through-the-fence operations be coordinated with the airport's master plan. There is no legal basis for limiting the plan to only the areas ODAV owns. Second, the idea that the feds won't fund anything ODAV doesn't own is incorrect. Even if that were true, ODAV should not trade $150 million for a misguided service road project that destroys private business, jobs, and infrastructure. That's neither efficient nor in the best interest of aviation. The third point I want to make is that the runway extension is the only safety issue we're talking about right now. The runway has needed to be lengthened for the aircraft currently using the airport since 2012. This isn't about making room for bigger or newer aircraft; it's about meeting the needs of the planes that are already here. We have a serious safety concern with the current runway length, and we need to address it immediately. And the fact that we have a one in a thousand-year chance of having a problem because 551 is located where it is, we got a problem right now with the runway not being long enough. We need to take care of that right now. If we care about safety, extending the runway should be our priority, and we can consider moving 551 later, when funding allows. But for now, we must extend that runway to prevent any potential accidents and protect pilots.	
8.54	**Doug Wilson**	I apologize for taking a bit more than my three minutes. I just wanted to point out that David was kind enough to answer the question from the speaker after me, but I haven't received a response to my own question. Specifically, I asked what has changed in FAA regulations regarding compliance with non-standard	**Tim House, FAA:** Yeah, modifications are modification of standards which are available. They are not considered as part of the master plan. We need to present a plan that meets standards.

		conditions at airports and AIP funding. I still haven't received an answer, and I'd really appreciate it if that could be addressed. Also, I'd like to hear from the gentlemen from the FAA and Kenji regarding this matter. I'll turn my time back over to them. Thank you.	**Kenji Sugahara, ODAV:** So, Tim, question for you. Is there a difference between a modification to standard and a deviation? Or is a mod to standard? Because that was the question. **Tim House, FAA:** It sounds like what he (Doug) is saying is to give us a modification of standards while we're planning it.
8.55	**Doug Wilson**	Alright, I speak your language, gentlemen, grant assurance and AIP funding. Let's get down to brass tacks. A 7460 is the most basic concept of a modification for the transitional surfaces under FAR 77. For those on the call, transitional surfaces are the 701 slope from the centerline of the runway, as well as areas like RSA and RFA. If a hangar needs to penetrate FAR 77, a 7460 is filed, and the FAA reviews it for hazards to navigation. That's a deviation. A modification, on the other hand, would change the actual FAA regulations around how AIP funds are allocated, which I'm asking about here—specifically about a deviation, not a modification. Using my example of Boeing Field, which has the Georgetown steam plant; a federally protected building that penetrates FAR 77—along with the utility runway too close to the main runway, they still receive AIP funding. My earlier point was that it seems the ODAV may be unwilling to submit a master plan to the FAA that's not fully in compliance because they believe AIP funding isn't available for anything less. Is that true or false? Has FAA policy changed in the last few years such that deviations are no longer possible? I'm talking about existing airports with non-conformities, not new greenfield airports.	**Tim House, FAA:** Have you been a part of the master planning process? **Doug Wilson:** Tim, great question, but I believe it's irrelevant. Yes, I'm part of the airport planning committee at Boeing Field, and I also helped hire the current director. As for the relocation of Taxiway Bravo, it's on the far side of the utility runway and doesn't address the separation between the two runways. And yes, they do have simultaneous operations today. I fly it every day—are you asking if a Boeing 777 is next to me on final? The answer is yes. If you're unsure, feel free to contact the tower. The FAA is misinformed here. I understand you're referring to the small runway, but this is more about maintenance versus an extension, correct? And are we talking about AIP funding for a master plan that includes upgrades like pavement strengthening or runway lengthening? **David Miller, CWE:** FAA has indicated there's a distinction between rehabilitating existing runways and upgrading them to meet standards like pavement weight capacity or runway length. That's what I meant earlier. **Doug Wilson:** Got it. And I want to clarify about FAA's process for filing

			deviations. In the case of non-standard issues like a 7460 for penetrating a surface, there's a process for this, right? I can show you a hangar at Boeing Field that penetrates that surface. **Tim House, FAA:** Part 77 is an imaginary surface, and we're making incremental improvements toward meeting standards. As long as airports are progressing, we continue to fund them, but we wouldn't fund an extension or reconstruction if they aren't working towards compliance. We only fund maintenance if they're in non-compliance.
8.56	**Doug Wilson**	So FAA is withholding AIP funding for airports not in compliance, except for maintenance?	**Tim House, FAA:** Exactly. If an airport isn't progressing toward meeting standards, we'd only provide maintenance funding, not upgrades or extensions. **Doug Wilson:** Understood. But for full compliance, should we be thinking of moving directly to compliance, rather than incremental progress? **Tim House, FAA:** Yes, the preferred alternatives show the airport in compliance once completed. But "progress" means making steps toward meeting the standards. **Doug Wilson:** I just encourage thinking about this in terms of moving directly to compliance rather than incremental steps. And Tim, thank you for being here after hours—much appreciated.
8.57	**Wendie Kellington**	I really want to echo what Dave and Tim mentioned. There is a clear path forward that doesn't involve placing this internal service road in the middle of business jet hangars and potentially destroying the airport. It's possible to extend the runway and include a	**Kenji Sugahara (ODAV):** Wendy, remember what I said at the beginning? **Wendie Kellington:** I heard it, and I believe it's probably true. I've never heard such a positive olive branch at

		plan in the master plan to move Highway 551, which would require Odav to work hard to make that happen. These options are available. We don't have to make this a binary choice where we either destroy the business jet hangars and the golden goose that brought us Aurora, or continue to have an unsafe runway. We can work incrementally, as Tim mentioned—maybe move the fence, make small adjustments, and even strengthen the drain field if we collaborate. Kenji, we've learned that there's likely a way to get the drain fields to comply with standards. It would be reckless to ignore these opportunities and not pursue a solution that works for all the stakeholders, including the aeronautics community, ODE, and the FAA. If we let this chance slip away and end up with the preferred alternative as it is, then shame on us.	the end of a public meeting as I've heard today.
8.58	**Aron Faegre, *HTS***	I was going to mention something similar to what Wendy said. Tim, it makes complete sense that we should pursue an incremental path to compliance. With the ROFA, there seems to be a straightforward approach. The first step would be to negotiate with ODOT through the governor's office to move the fence closer to the road, which shouldn't be too difficult. Then, negotiate with ODOT to keep the road within the 100-foot easement and add a lane and a half to the west. This sequence makes a lot of sense and is achievable. I'd encourage ODAV and the FAA to consider this as a positive, doable solution without the massive costs of $100 or $200 million. Just a suggestion.	**Kenji Sugahara, ODAV:** We've been discussing phasing for a while.

Additional Emailed Comments

ID	Name	Question/Comment	Response
8.59	**Eric Winston** 11/24/2024	There is already a huge shortage of hangars at Aurora. The proposed destruction of hangars makes no sense with the economic damage it will cause by evicting multiple businesses with no options of relocating at the airfield. A vehicle lane could be built away from the taxiway and would be much safer and not require hangar removal. I'm for all of the improvements at the airfield but only with no destruction of hangars. I also propose the ODAV approve the development and airfield access to more hangars on the north end of the airport to satisfy hangar demand without an undue red-tape filled approval process.	Thank you for your comment.
8.60	**Peter Kincart ATP, CFII** 11/25/2024	Alex Thomas and Anthony Beach, Please register and make part of the master plan record my very strong objection to the "taking" of any privately owned hangars on the Aurora Airport. There is a significant shortage of hangars. Destroying hangars with no replacement does not support aviation in Oregon in a positive way. The hangars sited for destruction are all currently providing significant employment. The two motivations for the proposed destruction can be solved in a better way: either 1) a vehicle perimeter road would work much better and separate vehicle and aircraft traffic, or 2) ODAV purchasing only 1 acre from a willing seller to build my necessary vehicle lane(s). I recommend airport safety improvements but only with no destruction of any hangars.	Thank you for your comment.
8.61	**Jeff Oerding, Columbia Aviation Association Historian**	I am writing to express my strong objection to the provisions of the East Side Property Acquisition outlined in the new Aurora Airport Master Plan.	Thank you for your comment.

	11/24/2024	This “strategy” is ill-advised, burdensome, over-reaching and totally unnecessary, not to mention a HUGE waste of taxpayers’ money. The condemnation of private property in this plan is unconscionable. Aviation safety is paramount, but this plan goes WAY TOO FAR. ODA continually states it has a low budget, and now it wants to “dig deep” into taxpayers’ pockets to fund a project for which there is no present need. I ask you to reconsider ODA’s position on this financially debilitating project.	
8.62	**James W. North** **Cindy Iseli** 11/29/2024	There is already a severe shortage of hangars at Aurora State airport. With the currently proposed Master Plan many additional hangars will be destroyed. This will devastate the owners as well as the people that are employed at these facilities. This will decimate the current thriving economy of the airport. Instead of the current plan we urge you to: 1. Move the vehicle lane farther east from the runway or use the current Airport Road NE 2. The parallel taxi lane on the west side of the runway is not needed As a pilot and hangar owner at Aurora I recommend airport safety improvements but only with no destruction of any hangars. Thank you for your consideration.	Thank you for your comment.
8.63	**Gary J. Turel** 12/02/2024	Please register and make part of the master plan record my very strong objection to the “taking” of any privately owned hangers on the Aurora airport. The hangers possibly slated for destruction are imperative for the safe storage of aircraft. These hangers are very valuable to the	Thank you for your comment.

		Oregon flying community. Alternatives to the hangers destruction: 1. Create a vehicle lane as far away from the taxiway as possible. 2. The parallel taxi-lane is unnecessary. Very similar results could be achieved by ODAV purchasing one acre from a willing seller. I recommend the airport safety improvements; but only without the destruction of any hangers. Thank you.	
8.64	**Mark Ottenad** 12/04/2024	Hello Alex and Brandy, Can you please explain why the following direction is given to members of the public to attend the Dec 10 PAC meeting? "Others can join using the link on the website: https://publicproject.net/AuroraAirport (on the "meetings" page)" What is the purpose of sending the public to a website, and then having to find a link called Meetings, and then have to scroll down the page to find the correct meeting link, and then click on that? Why not just say here's the meeting link: https://us02web.zoom.us/j/85045246628?? The meeting announcement says: "**Materials:** The agenda is posted to the website." Why not just provide a link to the meeting agenda, which also has the Zoom link: https://publicproject.net/files/UAOAMP/uao-amp-pac8agenda-111924.pdf?e0208a471d? Thank you. - Mark	**Brandy Steffen:** Hi Mark, Thanks for your comments and questions. I hope the following answers your questions, but please let us know if you need anything else. The meeting flyer (public invitation), agenda, and ODAV's email to the general public interested in the project included the direct "public" Zoom link to make it easy for the public to participate. Regarding the PAC member email that included a link to the website, not the direct "public" link: 1. We want PAC members to be able to direct others to the right page on the website, regardless of the meeting. The most current information and meeting link are always at the top of the page, along with any other meeting materials (if applicable); this has been consistent throughout the life of the project. 2. We previously had some confusion by PAC members about which Zoom link to use. Each PAC member receives a

			unique link directly from Zoom that is associated with their name and affiliation; that is what we want them to use so that all PAC members are appropriately identified for our meeting notes. In the first email to the PAC, I attached the agenda and reminded them that it was posted on the website. I didn't attach the agenda in the follow up emails, since it had already been delivered.
8.65	**Philip L. Miller** 12/03/2024	Sirs, I am submit to you my personal comments opposing that portion of State of Oregon's, Oregon Department of Aviation's (ODAV) Aurora Airport Masters Plan under current review giving serious consideration to the taking of privately owned hangars. This idea seems extremely counterproductive to the overall needs of general aviation. Specifically the needs of both business and private aircraft owners. A shortage of hangars exists now. Owners of privately owned aircraft provide significant employment and revenue to the County and State. This taking/destruction of hangars reportedly is a land use/taxiway/road issue. ODAV is supposed to be an advocate for the users of airports under their purview. Would not these users be better served by purchasing 1 acre from a willing seller to resolve your issues. Does ODAV really want to, or be known as, the cause of undue hardship on businesses and individual hangar owners which it is tasked to serve, by increasing the unavailability of hangar space. Airport safety can be improved without destruction of any hangars.	Thank you for your comment.

8.66	**Ben Williams** 12/06/2024	Brandy, et al; Your last email re: PAC meeting 8 scheduled for next Tuesday states: We are looking forward to seeing you at the **next meeting (VIRTUAL) on Tuesday, December 10, 2024 from 5:00-8:00 p.m.** The Planning Team and ODAV appreciates your feedback on the preferred alternative that was presented at PAC Meeting 7. Based on the feedback and requests to discuss the Preferred Alternative further, ODAV would like to use PAC Meeting 8 to review the noise analysis and have a roundtable discussion with you all regarding comments on the preferred alternative and any additional input or recommendations that you would like to bring to the meeting. Please see attached comments from Friends of French Prairie. The reality that is clearly now being avoided is that the almost two year delay in the master planning process has put us into the forecast period, and the present has caught up with the future. The forecasted operations are already falling short of the real operation numbers, and those real operations numbers for 2022, 2023 and YTD 2024 are being ignored. It is our hope that this reality will be discussed at next week's PAC meeting. **Attachment comment from Friends of French Prairie**	**Brandy Steffen:** Thanks for your comments, Ben. I'll make sure to pass them along to any team members who weren't on your original email. I look forward to our meeting next week.
8.67	**Tony Helbling** 12/10/2024	Tony and Brandy, Please enter attached packet delivered to the OAB 12/5/24 into tonight's record. We will be referencing it during the round table discussion. Please acknowledge receipt.	Thank you for your comment. The referenced documents are included.

		Attachment 1 Attachment 2 Attachment 3 Attachment 4 Attachment 5	
8.68	**George Van Hoomissen** 12/10/2024	Your Project Update dated 10/15/2024 regarding the Preferred Alternative said: "The phases of these projects are in no specific order of implementation; however, based on FAA input, the phase to extend the runway would not occur until the phase to meet ROFA and RSA standards are completed." I am interested in knowing more about the "FAA input" on this topic. Has ODAV or ODAV's consultants received anything from the FAA in writing which states that the proposed runway extension may not be completed until after all ROFA and RSA standards have been met? If so, please provide copies of any such documents from the FAA.	**David Miller, CWE:** The precise sequencing of some proposed improvements, particularly the parallel taxilane and vehicle service road are not driven by design standards, but overall safety. However, it is correct to conclude that based on FAA input provided throughout the master planning process, that major runway improvements, such as a runway extension or reconstruction to increase pavement strength cannot be completed while the runway does not meet standards. However, once the ALP drawing is approved by ODAV and FAA, project-specific MOSs may be considered by FAA if the Airport is making satisfactory progress toward meeting standards. Defining a path toward compliance is a critical element in what may be an incremental process extending over many years.
8.69	**George Van Hoomissen** 12/10/2024	Your Project Update dated 10/15/2024 shows the Preferred Alternative having four separate phases, noting: It provides phased opportunities for the flexible implementation of projects to conform to standards, improve efficiency, and improves safety. The phases of these projects are in no specific order of implementation; however, based on FAA input, the phase to extend the runway would not occur until the phase to meet ROFA and RSA standards are completed. It seems obvious that, out of all the work	See previous response.

		envisioned in the four separate phases, the work that would most significantly enhance the safety of operations at the airport is the proposed runway extension. Why would the ODAV not want prioritize that phase, making the runway extension the first phase for implementation?	
8.70	**Tony Helbling** 12/10/2024	Would you allow Betsy Johnson to participate during the PAC portion of tonight's meeting or will you require her to only speak during the public testimony portion? Please let me know ASAP.	**Kenji Sugahara:** Sorry man, it has to be during public comment. That would open the door to litigation.
8.71	**Tony Helbling (to David Waggoner)** 12/10/2024	Dave, Please see thread below. We're going to need you to set up Betsy Johnson as your alternate for tonight's PAC meeting. Otherwise, she can only speak for 2 min during public testimony. Durning the public input segment, you will still be able to share your direct concern about your property being taken and it's effect on emergency aero services associated with Willamette Aviation's property – detrimental effect on disaster response – but may be limited to two minutes. Thanks for doing this…	No response necessary.
8.72	**David Waggoner** 12/12/2024	Master Planning Committee, I would like to appoint Betsy Johnson as my alternate for the PAC meeting this evening. Please confirm receipt of this email and the appointment has been made. I also want to register my concern on how the current Preferred Alternate would effect the emergency services provided from our property on the Airport and the devastating impact on our airport neighbors.	**Tony Beach:** Hi all, I am sorry but we can't make last-minute changes to the PAC. As you know, there is a lot of interest from airport users and local communities in representing a wide range of organizations for the UAO master plan. Our PAC is already significantly larger than used for most master plans, and our goal is to be as fair and transparent as possible. Most importantly, we value the feedback from the members of the

		The Preferred Alternate would displace many of the airport neighbors living to the west of the Hubbard Hwy. Many of the residents are retired and living on a fixed income. In a time where there is a housing shortage, forcing the residents out of their homes would be a horrendous burden. The Civil Air Patrol (CAP) and the Disaster Airlift Response Team (DART) both have facilities on our property to support of Oregonians during and after an emergency. We provide, at no cost, a facility where the CAP has established a permanent Emergency Operations Center (EOC). The CAP has installed communications equipment to coordinate their efforts with State and Federal agencies in responding to disasters. It is a communications hub for Oregon and Southwest Washington. The EOC also is the home for a CAP Cadet program. CAP's cadet program is designed to inspire the country's youth to become leaders and good American citizens through their interest in aerospace and service to the country. Cadets work their way through a series of achievements by completing studies and other activities. Some of the achievements include aerospace education, moral leadership, physical fitness, drill and ceremonies, leadership, and other special activities. The EOC is also used as a staging area for Oregon DART. This distribution hub is used to store and transport emergency supplies, medical equipment and responders from Aurora to outlying communities impacted by fire, floods and other natural disasters. If the current Preferred Alternate is adopted, the EOC building would be demolished, forcing the EOC to be closed. This would	organizations that we have requested representation on the PAC for this master plan. The process in which we conduct the master plan for UAO is very important. For 3 years since this process started we have made sure that all PAC members had equal opportunities for engagement. This includes, for public benefit, transparency in who represents organizations and communities throughout this process. The PAC list is published on the project website. The public will have ample opportunities to provide comments in the meeting as long as time allows. If there is not enough time, the public can submit written comments that will be considered by the planning team and included in the public record for this master plan. Thank you for your understanding

		significantly Oregon's emergency preparedness response. Thank you for your consideration.	
8.73	**Trent Brownlee** 12/10/2024	Hi Brandy, I won't be able to join the PAC meeting and request that Betsy Johnson be my alternate for the PAC meeting tonight, is that something you can accommodate? I appreciate your help with this.	**Brandy Steffen:** Hi Trent, I apologize for not responding yesterday, I was preparing for the meeting. Currently Jon Bickford is the Atlantic Aviation representative on the PAC and no alternate is listed. If Atlantic Aviation would like to make a change to your representation on the PAC, please let me know ASAP so I can get the right people on our email list and update our membership list on the website.
8.74	**Wendie Kellington** 12/10/2024	Brandy, For tonight's proceeding on the KUAO Master Plan, PAC member TLM Holdings LLC has several exhibits it would like to have made a part of the record. They are large. Can I send you a link to a dropbox containing those items or do you want them in several (and if this is the preferred methodology then it will be **a lot)** of smaller batches? Please advise. Thank you. Best, Wendie	Please send any exhibits or comments to ODAV to be included in the record.
8.75	**Wendie Kellington** 12/10/2024	Brandy, Please see the attached submitted on behalf of TLM Holdings LLC for tonight's proceeding. Please confirm receipt. Regards, Wendie Kellington Brandy, I have confirmation that you have received 23 emails from me composed of TLM's letter and its exhibits. Are you saying you received only	**Brandy Steffen:** Thank you Wendie. I have received two emails from you with attachments today. **Brandy Steffen:** Hi Wendie, Thank you for clarifying! Yes, I see that you sent 23 emails with attachments yesterday, all nested under the same

		one exhibit? If so which one? Please advise. Thank you. Best, Wendie Brandy, will you please respond when you get a chance today? Thank you. Best, Wendie *Please see website Public Records for all attachments*	email subject line. These have been received.
8.76	**Tony Helbling** 12/11/2024	Please enter into the record that I logged into the PAC meeting approximately 7 minutes before it started where I heard you, Tony Beach and Kenji Sugahara laughing about about not letting Senator Betsy Johnson be allowed to represent Atlantic Aviation. It is clear to me the request was received before the start of the meeting and was clearly known to you.	**Tony Beach:** Hi Tony, I don't remember laughing about that specifically, but we'll include your comments in the record. Yes we did receive a few last second and conflicting requests to change PAC representation or add alternates within an 80 minutes of the meeting starting. I explained why we would not make these changes so close to the meeting, and that the public would have ample opportunity to comment in the meeting and provide all of their comments in full in writing. That opportunity was provided in the meeting, and we went overtime to allow the public to provide additional comment. Regarding Mr. Brownlee's request, he was replaced on the PAC by Jon Bickford when he took over for Trent as GM for Atlantic Aviation at UAO back in September. As a reminder, the latest PAC list is on the website here: https://publicproject.net/auroraairport# Thanks for your comments and input in the PAC meeting, **Kenji Sugahara:** Tony H. - your recollection is incorrect. If anything, any discussion about a last minute alternate substitution was about how inappropriate it was and how we would be providing additional time for

			public comment to accommodate former Sen. Johnson if she so wished. We are looking to prevent process issues that would likely result in litigation from those opposing the master plan.
8.77	**Kristen Newbury** 12/13/2024	I logged into the Master Plan presentation last Tuesday evening. I was dismayed by the obvious lack of collaboration between the Planners and the airport tenants. The meeting grew somewhat contentious, primarily due to airport tenants not believing their objections or ideas were listened to. And, it seemed to me the tenants didn't believe ODAV had served as an advocate for them. Several airport advocates provided examples of airports in the PNW that do not conform to FAA requirements but do have authorized variances. Several tenants cited areas where they disagree with the preferred plan but offered alternative ideas instead. Tenants again cited the historical public-private cooperative partnership enjoyed by the airport that sadly does not appear to be recognized in the Plan. And what happened to apparently reasonable ideas like moving the airport fencing west rather than the much more expensive option of building more road surface, much less invoking eminent domain and actually moving the road west. On a good note, I see this as a leadership opportunity for Kenji Sugahara to step in and bring the two sides together with a goal of tweaking the current plan through in-person discussion, brain storming, and consensus building to achieve a workable Master Plan.	Thank you for your comment.

		Hurray for the Mayor of Canby who submitted a statement attesting to the economic value of the airport to his community. Hurray for the on airport business owners willing to partner with ODAV for workable solutions. Hurray for the government-business partnerships that already exist, like with providing the Civil Air Patrol with permanent headquarters. Or for providing hangar and hub operations for ODART. Please, I urge ODAV not to turn away from the voiced dissatisfaction we heard Tuesday night but to embrace it as an impetus to move forward, together. The Aurora Airport is too important a resource to allow these dissents to fester.	
8.78	**Bruce Bennett** 12/16/2024	Dear Kenji, Tony, and Alex, Thank you three for all the time spent on the FAA-required master plan for the KUAO airport. As the Manager and owner of Blue Sky Aurora, LLC I now offer ODAV the purchase of the Aurora Airport ramp/taxi lane property parcel # 510198 (Please see property research report dated 12/12/24 attached). This 1.07-acre parcel would connect the main ODAV ramp property to the southern portion of taxiway A by extending ODAV's parcel to the taxiway A access south of the control tower. As well as significantly increasing ODAV's ramp size. I request that this potential addition to ODAVs ramp and taxi lane be added to the master plan that is underway. I believe that this addition will accomplish much of the benefits of the currently planed parallel taxiway and roadway without the	**Tony Beach:** Hi Bruce, we have received this email, and the follow up email with the attachment. I've forwarded them to the master plan team.

		huge costs and legal challenges of that very unpopular plan. This parcel was created in 1996 specifically for ODAV's future use to go along with the plan at that time of ODAV purchasing all UAO property West of the "building restriction line" that existed in 1996 and for many years leading up then. In the spirit of cooperation and collaboration I offer this parcel to ODAV at a discount of 20% off the tax value if we can conclude a transaction by the end of 2025. Again, thank you and please contact me with any questions. Attachment	
8.79	**Dave Mauk** 12/16/2024	There are many ways to assess the proposed Aurora State Airport master plan. Before that, I'd like to put this in context from the participants' points-of-view. Flight operators see safety, services and ease of operations as priorities. Property owners want utilization and positive return on their assets. Nearby communities view it through the lens of noise disturbance, potential accidents in their neighborhoods, negative impacts on property values, and preservation of farmland. FAA's view is through the microscope of compliance to its standards. And ODAV's point of-view has an eagle eye focused on promoting airport growth, above its safety and efficiency goals, good neighbor policies, and benefits to a greater number of Oregonians. What has been witnessed during the decade-plus struggle of devising a master plan for Aurora State Airport demonstrates that ODAV has diverted from its 'mission to provide infrastructure, financial resources, and	Thank you for your comments.

		expertise to ensure a safe and efficient air transportation system.' The agency presses forward as an advocate for Aurora Airport's growth, bypassing infrastructure, financial stability and safety aspects. Somewhere along the way, ODAV's mission morphed into being a 'chamber of commerce' -like agency for the aviation industry. Its dual mandates - aviation safety and aviation growth – are proving to be incompatible with each other. As a public agency, it has a core duty of providing safety for that industry and the public who use and are impacted by it. ODAV is failing in this primary duty at Aurora Airport. Before final consideration, it seems useful to untangle the web of why the plan for this airport is now in its second decade, all the while universally unpopular with community stakeholders, and now it seems, operators and property owners, too. Twenty-eight general aviation airports are owned by ODAV, who is responsible for providing infrastructure and safe usage for those airports. Some of these airports are more important lifelines to their communities than others, connecting recreation, commerce, healthcare, and disaster assistance. Many of those airports have needs that exceed allocated funds. In total, this state agency has a role in nearly 100 public use airports in Oregon. One airport emerged to receive extra attention, funds and a push to grow it beyond the limits of its constrained site. A tower was built at that one airport. Users of this airport began flying larger aircraft under compliance waivers. To meet standards for these non-	

		compliant larger aircraft, this airport would need to expand its runway and make other costly improvements. This airport would need a master plan enabling it to meet the demands of few, large, mainly transient, non-compliant aircraft, despite its constrained site, over 90% usage by light aircraft, and objections of community stakeholders. This is where Aurora State Airport is now and has been for years. ODAV is flying outside the boundaries of its mission. Excuse the use of mixed metaphors, but the master plan for Aurora Airport has been a runaway train. And there is no light at the end of its tunnel. ODAV's ambition as an advocate and property developer, is misguided and not compatible with its core duty of aviation safety. ODAV is not held accountable to the citizens of Oregon in its current structure. ODAV's lack of budgetary restraint and financial accountability is reckless when other state agencies are counting pennies and reevaluating spending priorities. ODAV does not provide adequate benefits for the funds it receives and the communities it serves. And it's safe to say that a development strategy to use this airport for unmanned air commerce will also crash-land. Without substantial FAA financial backing it would not be feasible for ODAV to fly beyond its core mission. ODAV's empire-building at a general aviation airport in the north edge of Marion County is irresponsible when a 750 acre, full service, modern, underutilized airport sits dead center in this same county. Salem-Willamette Valley Airport, as well as McMinnville Municipal Airport, are well-positioned, and more than capable and ready to accept large aircraft, and subsequent revenue growth that may come from it. This	

		alternative deserves serious due diligence and consideration. ODAV's preferred alternative is a solution looking for a problem, not a solution that fits Aurora Airport's constrained site, nor the region's aviation budget. Stuffing ten pounds into a five-pound sack doesn't make sense. Finding ways to make the sack fit more makes it undependable. Putting ten pounds into a twenty-pound sack, or better yet, having two twenty-pound sacks, is preferable, with plenty of extra room for safety. Aurora Airport is a flawed location for expansion. Salem and McMinnville are ideal solutions for larger aircraft and space without breaking the bank. In conclusion, ODAV is misguided, underperforming and wasting resources in it's aviation promotion activities. This jeopardizes its core mandate of 'providing infrastructure, financial resources and expertise to ensure a safe and efficient air transportation system.' Its preferred plan for Aurora State Airport is no plan at all. Not when it's irresponsibly expensive, opposed by every neighboring community, will invariably lead to costly lawsuits that further delays compliance with FAA standards, and when regional, underutilized airports are readily available at low cost to ODAV. As history has shown over the past decade, opponents of expanding Aurora State Airport to accommodate larger, mainly transient jet aircraft, while ignoring environmental, noise, safety, and land use directives, as well as community objections, are not going away. ODAV directors, board members and staff have come and gone, but we are, and will still	

		be here, to protect our community from the ambitions of an unaccountable agency, out-of-state parties, and the greedy few who insist their self-interest is more important than thousands of local stakeholder citizens of Oregon. The Charbonneau District of Wilsonville, my constituency of several thousand citizens, is year-in and year-out, the highest voter turnout in Oregon. We care about what happens in Oregon, and make sure our voices are heard. This letter gives voice to what we're saying, as adamantly as ever. We don't want to lose value in the thousands of properties we call home. We don't want to see the quality of our air, water and soil suffer more environmental degradation. We don't want to lose valuable farmland. We don't want our municipal governments and state regulations to be run over by big moneyed interests. We don't want the peace and quiet of country living to be ruined. We don't want another pretext to expand the airport and do this all over again. It's the duty of the ODAV board of directors and governor to consider airport options in the region as preferred alternatives to this colossally fanciful plan, to clip ODAV's wings in its non-essential activities, and return it to a safety mandate that can benefit all Oregonians, instead of in this case, only a few operators who have reasonable alternatives, and affluent, transient out-of-state users.	
8.80	**Ted Davis** 12/18/2024	Dear ODAV c/o Alex Thomas, As a pilot that flies off KUAO, please register and record my urgent input for the Aurora Airport Master Plan that is underway not to	Thank you for your comments.

		consider the condemnation and destruction of any aircraft hangars. Hangars are in very short supply which has driven the prices up dramatically. In addition the owners of the hangars that are proposed to be destroyed have no viable option to relocate on the airport. There is more than ample access to KUAO via Airport Rd NE for vehicles. There is no need to add an internal roadway.	
8.81	**Itamer Reuven** 12/17/2024	Dear ODAV c/o Alex Thomas, As a pilot that flies off KUAO, please register and record my urgent input for the Aurora Airport master plan that is underway to NOT consider the condemnation and destruction of any aircraft hangars. There is already a shortage of reasonably priced hangers and this will make things worse.	Thank you for your comments.
8.82	**Steve Brenneke** 12/18/2024	Mr. Alex R Thomas: Please avoid any loss of existing hangers at KUAO. These losses would devastate the owners and the airport community. I understand you need to make changes but you have alternatives such as moving the highway and the runway to the west in plan Refined Alternative 1B.	Thank you for your comments.
8.83	**Aric Krause** 12/18/2024	Dear ODAV/ Alex Thomas, I am writing to express my strong concerns regarding the refined preliminary alternatives outlined in the Aurora State Airport Master Plan update. After reviewing the details, I believe several aspects of the plan should be reconsidered due to their potential negative impacts on the surrounding community and existing infrastructure. 1. **Displacement of Residents and Businesses:** Both Alternative 1A and 1B involve significant property acquisitions that	Thank you for your comments.

		would displace numerous residential and commercial properties. Specifically, Alternative 1A impacts 13 residential and 4 commercial properties, while 1B impacts 20 residential and 4 commercial properties. This level of displacement creates unnecessary hardship for community members and disrupts the stability of the area. 2. **Traffic and Infrastructure Strain:** Shifting Hubbard Highway, along with realigning roads such as Keil Road, poses risks of increasing traffic congestion and disrupting existing transportation networks. These changes could have long-term repercussions for commuters and freight traffic. 3. **Issues with Alternative 2:** While Alternative 2 avoids shifting Hubbard Highway, it requires relocating key airport infrastructure, including air traffic control towers and segmented circles. Additionally, this alternative necessitates the acquisition of 37 acres for runway alignment, with a total of 105 acres being earmarked for future aeronautical use. The removal and replacement of hangars in this plan would also lead to short-term disruptions for airport operations and long-term inefficiencies for existing tenants. The lack of helicopter parking and limited large aircraft accommodations further suggests this alternative does not fully meet the operational needs of the airport. 4. **Community Engagement and Feedback:**	

		While the document mentions public review and feedback, the proposed alternatives suggest that many community concerns remain unaddressed. A more robust and inclusive engagement process is essential to ensure all voices are heard and considered. 5. **FAA Compliance vs. Community Needs:** While I understand the FAA's requirement for compliance with design standards, this must be balanced with the needs and well-being of the surrounding community. Placing undue emphasis on expansion at the cost of local harmony is counterproductive and risks eroding public trust. I strongly urge you to reconsider these alternatives and explore options that align more closely with the values and priorities of the community. Sustainable growth and thoughtful planning can coexist, but only if the concerns of all stakeholders are taken seriously. Thank you for your attention to this matter. I would be happy to discuss these concerns further or participate in a forum to work towards more balanced solutions. As a Commercial Pilot, tenant, CAA Club member, and Van's Aircraft employee my life is very much impacted by this proposal and I am not in support of the options on the table today.	

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 16:53:32
Okay, let's start.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 16:54:07
Hi, everyone. We're just getting started. We're about six minutes out from the start of the meeting.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 16:54:13
So as you join, please make sure that you

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 16:54:18
update your affiliation just by clicking on your name and the three little dots that are next to that.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 16:54:24
And we will get started here shortly.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 16:57:05
Hi, everyone again. Just to make sure you all know to

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 16:57:10
hover over your name under either

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 16:57:14
where the pictures are and just right click on the little three dots. Or if you're looking at the participant list.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 16:57:22
You can hover over your name. And again, the three little dots and that will allow you to rename yourself to show your affiliation. So PAC members, if you can do that, that's great.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 16:57:37
And we'll get started here in just a minute.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 16:59:37
All right, everyone, we'll get started here in just a minute.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 16:59:41
But we have just one more minute before we

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 16:59:46
eight official planning advisory committee meetings started.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 17:00:13
All right. It looks like a lot of our members are joining. So welcome, everyone.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 17:00:18
We'll get started here in just a minute.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 17:00:23
And as we're getting started, feel free to update your affiliation if you would like.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 17:00:30
You can hover over your picture or if you look at the participant list, you can hover over your name.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 17:00:37
And on those, there's three little dots that will pop up

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 17:00:40
And you can add the organization or business that you are representing

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 17:00:46
here tonight as PAC members.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 17:00:53
Okay, I'm hearing lots of

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 17:00:57
door chimes, which means people are joining us.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 17:01:34
Okay.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 17:01:35
I think we have most of our representatives here.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 17:01:40
And I know we have full three hours if we need it.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 17:01:46
But I want to make sure that we have plenty of time for our discussions here tonight.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 17:01:52
So I think we will get started.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 17:01:56
If for some reason you are a PAC member.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 17:02:00
My colleagues Jen and Ashley will help get you into the right location.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 17:02:06
Again, we are just having our main PAC representatives

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 17:02:10
as participants. We will, of course, have a public comment period like we do every

meeting.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 17:02:16
at the end of the meeting.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 17:02:21
We also have the chat feature for panelists.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 17:02:25
If you have questions that come up during the presentation, feel free to include a chat question there.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 17:02:33
For those of you attendees from the public or maybe who are

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 17:02:39
alternates, you can use the Q&A feature. We won't be responding to those questions necessarily in the meeting unless you're having a technical issue.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 17:02:48
But all of the questions, the chat.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 17:02:51
All of this information will be provided in the meeting summary where we will have responses to any questions that come up tonight.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 17:03:00
And all of that information along with the video recording from this meeting are posted to our website

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 17:03:07
Which we will make sure we include here in the chat so you all have that.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 17:03:12
So I think we're ready to get started. My name is Brandy. I'm going to be helping facilitate the conversation today.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 17:03:19
Just a reminder that we are recording this meeting and it will be posted to the project website.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 17:03:24
Again, if you haven't already.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 17:03:27
adjusted your name, you can do that by hovering over the three on your photo and those three little dots will allow you to rename yourself as PAC members.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 17:03:36
When we do have the roundtable conversation, we'd love for you to be on camera so

that we can all see each other as we

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 17:03:44
talk.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 17:03:45
Just logistically, we'll keep everyone muted until there are points for opportunities for comments and conversation.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 17:03:53
Again, we'll have public comment periods at the end of the meeting. And we know there may be a lot of interest here tonight.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 17:04:01
So while we normally do a three minute timeframe, if there's more conversation

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 17:04:07
We'll make sure to do a second pass as time allows.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 17:04:13
And then I just wanted to say we haven't had a problem with this recently, but if there are duplicate names, we'll just

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 17:04:20
try to connect with you and make sure that we get the right name. We would like to have that as part of our record and just make sure that everyone is identified appropriately.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 17:04:31
Okay, so this is our agenda for tonight. Oh, sorry, can you go back, David? No, that's fine. So we are going to just review the draft airport noise analysis.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:04:34
Sorry, sorry, sorry, sorry.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 17:04:41
We'll have some time for clarifying questions about what's presented and then we'll review the non-standard conditions and preferred alternative. And then we'll open it up for a bigger conversation. And so this is our opportunity to have PAC

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 17:04:56
continue the conversation from our last meeting, review any comments that have come up from that.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 17:05:03
And then again, we will have plenty of time for public comments.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 17:05:07
Before we talk about next steps.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 17:05:10
and um just

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 17:05:12
any further conversation.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 17:05:14
So I will now hand it to Tony.

[Tony Beach - ODAV] 17:05:19
Good afternoon, everyone. I'm Tony Beach. I'm the state reports manager with the Oregon Department of Aviation. And I just want to thank you all for joining us.

[Tony Beach - ODAV] 17:05:27
to have this discussion. Looking forward to going over the

[Tony Beach - ODAV] 17:05:30
the noise information that we've put into this process, as well as getting additional input from

[Tony Beach - ODAV] 17:05:36
the pack in from the public on our preferred alternative.

[Tony Beach - ODAV] 17:05:40
So I'm on the call today as is our director, Kenji Sugara

[Tony Beach - ODAV] 17:05:45
And Alex, our policy planning and program manager, and our aviation planner

[Tony Beach - ODAV] 17:05:50
Brandon Pike. Kenji, I'll shoot it over to you if you want to add any comments.

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 17:05:55
Sure. First off, welcome. I'm really excited to have everybody here.

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 17:05:59
There's been a lot of passion behind this

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 17:06:03
pack and i appreciate that

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 17:06:06
And value everybody's opinion and the information and opinions that you've given us.

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 17:06:13
I want to reiterate something that was said by Brandy.

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 17:06:18
The way we're going to do public comment is three minutes at a time until we get

through everybody, okay?

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 17:06:23
And then once that time's over, if you want to speak longer, let us know. We're happy to let you talk, okay?

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 17:06:30
We are making sure that we hear all of you. It doesn't mean that just because you're not a PAC member that you won't be able to say what you want to do. So as long as you stay on topic and it's

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 17:06:41
And it's helpful, please.

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 17:06:44
give your comment. The other thing I want to emphasize is that as an agency, we are open to refining the preferred alternative.

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 17:06:53
And I'll repeat that again so you hear it.

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 17:06:57
We're open to refining the preferred alternative. As long as it complies with standard, right? So make suggestions.

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 17:07:05
We want a robust discussion when it happens.

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 17:07:08
And the reason we got here, I'm about full transparency in everything. So I got a call from the Department of Administrative Services. Some folks came in and said.

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 17:07:19
Hey, you didn't give us an opportunity to speak. The agency didn't. And I was like, okay. So I had this conversation

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 17:07:26
And we're like, we said, we gave opportunities

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 17:07:31
We didn't do one-on-ones for the reason that that was brought up

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 17:07:35
As a rationale for litigation in the past. And what we want to do is make sure is that the process is 100%. That's important.

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 17:07:43
Because we all want to avoid litigation.

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 17:07:45

So that's why. But I understood the concerns and I'm like, wait a second.

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 17:07:51
I'll do one better. Let's figure out a way where we can have that discussion. Everybody can talk about

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 17:07:57
All their concerns and bring it up, bring up ideas and do that in a way that involves everybody so we can't be accused of having conversation behind closed doors.

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 17:08:06
Because we can't have that. As an agency, we're dedicated to transparency and making sure everything happens

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 17:08:12
in the public's eye, so we remain accountable to the public.

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 17:08:15
So that's why we're here today.

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 17:08:18
And I'm hoping that we have some great discussion

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 17:08:22
And we end up with a great product in the end because I know there's a lot of passion. Like I said before, I'm being passionate right now.

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 17:08:29
But, you know, I appreciate each and every one of your opinions, thoughts.

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 17:08:34
And I'm hoping that we can have a good discussion. So thank you for taking the time to actually come.

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 17:08:40
And make your comments known.

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 17:08:44
Look forward to talking some more. Thank you.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 17:08:48
Great. Thank you, Kenji and Tony.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 17:08:53
This is the

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 17:08:54
the project team. It's the same as it has been for the last several years.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 17:08:59
And then, David, can you go to the next slide?

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 17:09:02
I wanted to let you all know we've all

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 17:09:04
We continue to update the website. You can see the link there. And then we also posted it in the chat.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 17:09:14
So on the website, we've also been including the public records. So any emails that we received, including comments.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 17:09:21
We have received a lot

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 17:09:23
This year, especially in the last several months. So we are trying to add those as quickly as possible. So if you don't see your name there or your comments for some reason, please know that we are working on it and we will get those all up.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 17:09:38
as soon as possible. And then we're trying to keep it updated with the most current information.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 17:09:45
All right, the next slide.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 17:09:49
is our PAC members. So thank you all for being here again. As Kenji mentioned.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 17:09:56
We've tried to have, this is quite a large group and it's so great because we hear so many different viewpoints from you all. And so you can see that we have a lot of different representation. And so you can see here our main representatives as well as our alternates.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 17:10:17
And this has been updated as of as of

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 17:10:21
the fourth, so just a few days ago so um

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 17:10:25
Thank you all for being here. I know it's a big group.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 17:10:29
So just some quick guidelines just and

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 17:10:34
These are the same that we've had for a while. So for you all, this might not be a surprise.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 17:10:40
But our meeting summaries will include all of the comments we hear today, both verbally as well as written down. We also include public comments or emails that come through within about the week.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 17:10:54
We'll talk about that a little bit more, but we try to include all of that along with a response or follow up.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 17:11:02
The meeting time is for all committee members to speak.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 17:11:05
So we have a lot of time set aside today for a roundtable. So I'll be checking in with you all. No pressure. You can always pass.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 17:11:12
But I want to make sure that we hear from all of you today and have some conversation.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 17:11:19
Please provide non-agenda items in writing because we want to leave time for conversation around the items of which we are here tonight to speak about.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 17:11:29
Also, committee members are encouraged to provide comments and we will give you plenty of time. So we'll talk about this later, but we'll have until December 23rd to get all comments back from you all.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 17:11:44
About this. So next slide.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 17:11:49
Again, these are guidelines that you all agree to in the chartering way back at the beginning of the project. But as a committee, we agreed to approach this work with honesty, openness, and willingness to work together.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 17:12:02
That means assuming good intentions in others and making sure that our behavior supports a successful project. As issues arise, please bring those forward.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 17:12:13
And as PAC members, we appreciate you keeping your constituents informed of the project and information.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 17:12:21

Again, we do need all PAC members to name and identify themselves and duplicates will be removed from the meeting. We'll of course try to talk

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 17:12:30
And get everything resolved before doing that. But we just want to know who's here and who's representing their groups.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 17:12:38
All right, next slide.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 17:12:40
And I think one thing we didn't talk about just really quickly is

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 17:12:45
as we have this conversation, let's focus on issues and not specific people, right? And because we know we represent a lot of variety of viewpoints.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 17:12:54
And so I think let's just bring those issues to the forefront

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 17:12:59
And that will just help our meeting go smoothly.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 17:13:04
So here is our schedule.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 17:13:07
David, I think, are you taking this one?

[David Miller - Century West] 17:13:11
I can, excuse me. I can, sure.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 17:13:12
Oh, I can take it. Well, I think

[David Miller - Century West] 17:13:16
Yeah.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 17:13:17
The big change here is that we have scheduled and we'll of course send out more information a final meeting in February on February 4th.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 17:13:27
And so as Kenji mentioned, we wanted to provide additional time for you all to have conversations and dialogue. So while this was originally planned for our last meeting.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 17:13:38
We are pushing our last meeting to February 4th.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 17:13:42
So that's the big reveal on this new graph.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:13:47
Okay.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 17:13:50
Okay, now I think it's you.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:13:52
Okay, are we ready?

[David Miller - Century West] 17:13:55
Okay, well, thank you, Brandi. Thanks, everyone, for being with us tonight.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:14:00
For those of you who haven't heard me before, I'm David Miller. I'm the lead aviation planner with Century West Engineering.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:14:06
And we're going to go through some information, as Brandi outlined in the agenda earlier.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:14:11
I've got a whole team of people from Century West available to answer more technical questions if they come up.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:14:19
Mark Steele, who is our lead noise analyst. And we've got James Kirby as our lead airport engineer for the Aurora Airport.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:14:27
If questions come up that need a little bit more detailed responses, I'll be calling on them.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:14:33
This analysis is really intended to provide an overview of noise exposure at the Aurora State Airport, both current and the exposure levels that are

[David Miller - Century West] 17:14:44
projected based on the 2041 forecast.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:14:48
So I'll walk through it. It'll be a bit of a high-level presentation.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:14:52
I also want to mention that the technical memo for the noise analysis is being

[David Miller - Century West] 17:14:59
finalized and will be released after the meeting.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:15:02
And as with a lot of the other information that we've presented when you have

[David Miller - Century West] 17:15:06
that written narrative and the graphics that you can look at more closely.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:15:10
It's a great opportunity to provide your comments in writing.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:15:16
So on the overview side, first thing I would say is that the noise analysis as part of an airport, an FAA-funded airport master plan

[David Miller - Century West] 17:15:25
is done to meet the FAA requirements for noise, and those are defined under federal law, 14 CFR Part 150.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:15:33
And so the analysis is consistent with what the FAA sees at airports all over the country.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:15:42
The software that's used to create noise exposure

[David Miller - Century West] 17:15:45
mapping or contours is called the Airport Environmental Design Tool, AEDT.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:15:51
I mentioned this because it's not new software today, but it's different software than that was used in the prior master plan.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:15:59
The integrated noise model, if you're familiar with that, or INM, was replaced by the FAA, I think about 10 years ago, eight or 10 years ago.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:16:09
And that is no longer considered a usable program by the FAA. So the AEDT is what we're

[David Miller - Century West] 17:16:16
doing. Also, if you're interested in comparing contours later, I would just point out that that

[David Miller - Century West] 17:16:22
contours that are generated by the two software programs aren't necessarily identical.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:16:27
I think that the FAAs, the reason they created the AEDP model was to create a more

refined noise

[David Miller - Century West] 17:16:34
analytical tool so

[David Miller - Century West] 17:16:37
There's often a temptation to go back and compare to earlier contours. I would just offer a caution on that because

[David Miller - Century West] 17:16:44
in our experience over the years, we've found that the two software programs produce somewhat different model.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:16:50
results. But at this point, that's not relevant because AEDT is the only noise analysis tool the FAA recognizes.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:16:59
So what AEDT does, the model is it's the same basic approach that the old model used, and that is that it's creating a

[David Miller - Century West] 17:17:09
a representation of cumulative noise impacts, noise exposure, if you will.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:17:14
in an annual day-night average level, or what we call DNL.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:17:18
So this is essentially

[David Miller - Century West] 17:17:21
the aggregation of all noise exposure generated at the airport through the air traffic.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:17:27
spread out over the entire year.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:17:29
So we often do noise work for quite a long time and

[David Miller - Century West] 17:17:34
generally people will say, well, when the plane flies over my house, it's a lot louder.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:17:39
Well, that's true. But because it's an average, it captures times where the aircraft are directly overhead and times where they're not.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:17:47
So it is not a measure of individual events. It is that cumulative effect

[David Miller - Century West] 17:17:52
The day-night part simply is an FAA, an EPA,

[David Miller - Century West] 17:17:58
HUD metric where there's a nighttime penalty assessed for operations that occur

[David Miller - Century West] 17:18:04
in the evening or nighttime periods, there's a

[David Miller - Century West] 17:18:07
After 10 p.m, there's a 10 decibel penalty applied, etc.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:18:11
I see it down here.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:18:14
And then the FAA threshold for significance is 65 DNL, and that is the

[David Miller - Century West] 17:18:22
the metric that the FAA considers when they're evaluating noise impacts and the noise

[David Miller - Century West] 17:18:28
as the noise levels are increased, the numbers go from 65 on up. I think in our modeling, we are modeling

[David Miller - Century West] 17:18:37
If I remember correctly, 65 to 80 DNL. So we'll see that in just a minute.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:18:45
And I will…

[David Miller - Century West] 17:18:47
I'd be happy to answer any questions you can when we get down there.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:18:52
So the software modeling is essentially a practice of entering activity data

[David Miller - Century West] 17:19:00
to my fleet mix. So that goes back to our FAA approved forecast of activity

[David Miller - Century West] 17:19:06
And then in the modeling exercise, we get down to the specific aircraft types.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:19:11
So there are distinctions made between single engine piston

[David Miller - Century West] 17:19:15
multi-engine piston jets, both large and small, and helicopters as examples.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:19:22
And then each in the computer model, each one of those aircraft, and there are

[David Miller - Century West] 17:19:27
hundreds and hundreds of aircraft selections available in the model.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:19:31
It's intended to be a representative capture of the noise exposure.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:19:37
through the entire fleet.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:19:41
the activity numbers, the traffic levels that come out of the forecast are attributed to these types of aircraft.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:19:49
And then the noise signatures for each of these aircraft are assigned within the computer model.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:19:55
The data in terms of operations, as I said, our noise analysis is consistent with our forecast, which were approved by the FAA.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:20:04
Both current and 20 years.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:20:06
And then when we were looking at refining the fleet mix.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:20:10
in greater detail, we relied on the FAA's instrument flight plan

[David Miller - Century West] 17:20:15
or TFMSC data.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:20:17
And then the ADS-B data the FAA generates to help with

[David Miller - Century West] 17:20:23
More specific aircraft tracking.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:20:26
And on that, the flight track

[David Miller - Century West] 17:20:28
component or the part of it is really where the aircraft fly

[David Miller - Century West] 17:20:31

And in doing building aircraft

[David Miller - Century West] 17:20:34
noise models and flight tracks.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:20:36
We recognize that aircraft fly everywhere. Any lines that are represented on a map are just approximate representations.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:20:44
There are some common routes in this graphic on the right highlights sort of an intensity.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:20:49
kind of the equivalent of a heat map you can see where

[David Miller - Century West] 17:20:52
the majority of the traffic in the vicinity, the traffic patterns is captured this is a

[David Miller - Century West] 17:20:57
representation from ADS-B data.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:21:01
The airport traffic patterns and so on are depicted. So we consider that although the

[David Miller - Century West] 17:21:07
The fact that we use ADS-B data is

[David Miller - Century West] 17:21:12
Also, we have to remember that ADS-B data is not complete.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:21:17
Not all aircraft are actively using the system, and so there are some limitations with that.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:21:24
But it is helpful to sort of geo-reference aircraft locations in terms of getting common

[David Miller - Century West] 17:21:30
locations. We also look at the, as I mentioned, the airport traffic patterns. We look at the instrument flight

[David Miller - Century West] 17:21:37
our instrument flight, we should say instrument approach procedures, the instrument departure procedures.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:21:42

for each runway and we look at runway splits through consultation with the control tower.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:21:50
et cetera. We

[David Miller - Century West] 17:21:54
look at helicopter tracks based on input from the operators.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:21:59
And again, the majority of the helicopter traffic in the vicinity of the airport

[David Miller - Century West] 17:22:04
does not originate or terminate at Aurora State Airport.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:22:11
The only helicopter traffic that is associated with the adjacent operations of Columbia and HTS

[David Miller - Century West] 17:22:17
are related to the runway itself, not the aircraft that are bypassing the airport en route to their facilities.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:22:23
And we did find in the instrument flight data there was considerable amount, not a large volume, but there was notable

[David Miller - Century West] 17:22:30
instrument flight data for some of those helicopters.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:22:35
So that's kind of…

[David Miller - Century West] 17:22:37
Those are kind of the basic data inputs.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:22:41
So when we were building our flight tracks.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:22:44
for 2021, we were also

[David Miller - Century West] 17:22:47
comparing the information with the airports

[David Miller - Century West] 17:22:52
published noise abatement procedures, which includes a preferred traffic pattern.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:22:57
And then we acknowledge that we acknowledge that

[David Miller - Century West] 17:23:00
up in the sky, there are no lines on the ground for pilots to follow.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:23:05
and noise abatement procedures are voluntary and ultimately the pilots are responsible for operating the aircraft

[David Miller - Century West] 17:23:11
in a safe manner at all times, and that can be affected by weather and other conditions.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:23:16
And then, of course, when the air traffic control is in operation, the controllers are able to direct aircraft

[David Miller - Century West] 17:23:23
to certain locations, clearances and routing within the traffic area.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:23:29
It's a good generalization or representation, but that was one of

[David Miller - Century West] 17:23:34
that we consulted when we were building the tracks.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:23:38
So these are the 2021 flight tracks and it looks a little bit like a spaghetti map.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:23:44
But essentially what we're seeing is traffic patterns on both sides of the runway.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:23:49
left traffic uh

[David Miller - Century West] 17:23:52
And then we've got some helicopter traffic patterns inside.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:23:56
And again, what we're hearing from the

[David Miller - Century West] 17:24:01
control tower and the helicopter some of the helicopter flight training helicopter operations is that

[David Miller - Century West] 17:24:08
There is a considerable amount of helicopter traffic on the west side of

[David Miller - Century West] 17:24:12
of runway 1735.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:24:14
So we've identified both areas there.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:24:18
And then the different routes, the sort of the angled lines that connect with the adjacent traffic patterns are

[David Miller - Century West] 17:24:27
common arrival and departure routings aircraft pilots are taught to enter traffic patterns

[David Miller - Century West] 17:24:33
And at 45 degree angles when they can. And so we've identified those as common routes.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:24:40
And then some of the longer running legs are really departure or arrival routes that are more

[David Miller - Century West] 17:24:46
specific to the instrument procedures.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:24:48
It's important to point out, and this will become obvious a little bit later when we see the contours.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:24:54
Once the aircraft leaves the vicinity of the airport, particularly when they're more than a mile from the runway.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:25:01
The noise levels that are generated are low enough that they don't

[David Miller - Century West] 17:25:07
They're not ultimately captured in the 65 DNL contour.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:25:11
meaning the levels of exposure

[David Miller - Century West] 17:25:13
for the model are lower than that.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:25:15
There can be a lot of deviations, a lot of movement around

[David Miller - Century West] 17:25:19
two, three, four miles from the airport, but it

[David Miller - Century West] 17:25:21
Based on the FAA model doesn't impact the shape of the contours right around the

runway in every case.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:25:31
So this is a review of the 2021 noise contour. So this represents the existing air traffic at the airport based on the 2021

[David Miller - Century West] 17:25:42
forecast that was approved.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:25:45
And as I said earlier, the band, the outer noise contour is a 65 dnl

[David Miller - Century West] 17:25:51
And that extends off the airport laterally

[David Miller - Century West] 17:25:55
Yeast is largely over adjacent private aeronautical use land, including some of the through the fence development.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:26:04
And then some exclusive farm use areas down to the southeast. On the west side, it runs opposite the

[David Miller - Century West] 17:26:11
Hubbard Highway and across some various land uses

[David Miller - Century West] 17:26:15
predominantly ag uses efu and a little bit of residential throughout there.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:26:21
And then the other contours are incrementally higher. These are increments of five.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:26:26
DNL, so we go from 65 to 70.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:26:29
which is the light green color and then we go 75

[David Miller - Century West] 17:26:34
And then finally, 80. So the highest concentration of noise

[David Miller - Century West] 17:26:39
captured in the model is in and around the runway

[David Miller - Century West] 17:26:43
The contours.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:26:46
are shaped in part by some of the features on the airport.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:26:49
You might notice the little bump out at the south end down up the runway 3-5 end.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:26:56
And that is largely attributed to the fact that there's an aircraft hold area there

[David Miller - Century West] 17:27:00
And that extra noise burst, if you will, is generated in large part by engine run-ups.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:27:06
There is no aircraft holder at the north end of the runway, so those run-ups are distributed throughout the airport so we don't see

[David Miller - Century West] 17:27:13
exactly the same kind of…

[David Miller - Century West] 17:27:16
activity there.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:27:18
So this is…

[David Miller - Century West] 17:27:21
This is representative of the existing noise exposure.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:27:26
And it is actually, despite the fact that the ADDT model and the INM models are different.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:27:32
The noise exposure levels are actually pretty similar to what we saw from the old master plans.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:27:39
noise analysis.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:27:42
So let me jump ahead over to 2020.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:27:45
Sorry, 2020.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:27:48
Sorry, we dropped out.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:27:50
Okay, so 2041 contours of the tracks are similar. One thing I would say about this is that we

[David Miller - Century West] 17:28:00
When we did the 2021 tracks

[David Miller - Century West] 17:28:03
We attempted to replicate where aircraft were flying to the best we could, and that is.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:28:10
ADS-B data, as I mentioned earlier, show that and then some other

[David Miller - Century West] 17:28:14
some other factors, including the helicopter traffic pattern on the right side, or I mean the west side of runway

[David Miller - Century West] 17:28:21
1735.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:28:23
When we did the 2041 contours, we wanted to

[David Miller - Century West] 17:28:28
Our assumption is that the assumption that

[David Miller - Century West] 17:28:32
the ability there would be an opportunity

[David Miller - Century West] 17:28:36
to improve

[David Miller - Century West] 17:28:37
the use of the airport's noise abatement procedures.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:28:41
So in short, what we're seeing with the current traffic is the compliance with the pattern and the

[David Miller - Century West] 17:28:47
abatement procedures is fairly good, but there's always room for improvement.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:28:53
So when we're looking at the 2041 contour, in particular, we're assuming that the helicopter traffic will be contained on the east side

[David Miller - Century West] 17:29:02
traffic pattern, it would be right traffic

[David Miller - Century West] 17:29:05
In some cases, and it would be on the east side of the runway

[David Miller - Century West] 17:29:08

There's also some changes and we're

[David Miller - Century West] 17:29:12
We noted that some of the

[David Miller - Century West] 17:29:16
traffic departing out to the

[David Miller - Century West] 17:29:20
to the south as it's heading over Aurora is is capturing some of the um

[David Miller - Century West] 17:29:26
the areas that are identified as potentially noise sensitive and there's kind of an opportunity maybe to tighten that up a little bit.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:29:33
But this is something that I think as the airport goes through its ongoing work in the future of noise

[David Miller - Century West] 17:29:39
noise mitigation and noise abatement planning.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:29:42
There's always room for improvement.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:29:45
So when we jump up to 2041, we're looking at

[David Miller - Century West] 17:29:50
tightening up the pattern a little bit, including the

[David Miller - Century West] 17:29:56
the area over Aurora so when

[David Miller - Century West] 17:29:59
the aircraft are departing south on the traffic pattern on runway 17.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:30:04
they would begin their turn

[David Miller - Century West] 17:30:06
in line with the noise abatement procedure, which is what we had here.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:30:11
So we've approximated that and tried to run the line, the traffic pattern line through those two

[David Miller - Century West] 17:30:17
areas of noise sensitive land use, or I should say more noise sensitive land use.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:30:25
And that is why the tracks are a little different here.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:30:29
And I mentioned the helicopter pattern here.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:30:31
Everything else is largely the same. The other couple of other considerations, the one main difference in the 2041

[David Miller - Century West] 17:30:39
contours is that we are also

[David Miller - Century West] 17:30:41
Assuming the 497-foot runway extension to be in place. So there's a

[David Miller - Century West] 17:30:47
shift of noise a little bit north because of that. You can see that as we go into the contour.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:30:54
So these are the 2041 contours and again the 65 dnl

[David Miller - Century West] 17:31:00
In this case, I would point out the main distinction is that the 65 DNL contour

[David Miller - Century West] 17:31:05
On the 2040 one, remember, this is based on the 21 forecast so more traffic

[David Miller - Century West] 17:31:11
than 2021.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:31:15
somewhat smaller percentage, if you will, of flight training single engine pistons.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:31:20
more jet operations. So we see some changes with that.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:31:24
So the 65 contour extends beyond airport property here and it does to the south as well.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:31:31
And in this case, we've also assumed that an aircraft hold area would be added to the north end

[David Miller - Century West] 17:31:37
of the runway taxiway system. So that little bit of a bow that we see at the south end would be

[David Miller - Century West] 17:31:43
repeated at the north end a little bit.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:31:45
Again, just for a quick reference, I know it's tough to go back and forth, but if you pay attention to where I go.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:31:51
65 goes beyond the end of the property line.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:31:54
here you can see that it

[David Miller - Century West] 17:31:56
This is in part due to the noise.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:31:59
Excuse me, the runway extension

[David Miller - Century West] 17:32:02
which is about 500 feet and then also partly due to the increase in traffic.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:32:08
So when you get to the point where you're comparing these, that's something to look at.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:32:13
we see the lateral changes this way consistent with the increase in traffic.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:32:21
It's forecast.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:32:24
So one thing about that. So the way the model works is we are able to overlay the contours

[David Miller - Century West] 17:32:31
over the existing zoning.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:32:33
in the existing airport property line.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:32:35
what this table shows, and this will be detailed in the memo, but this identifies the

[David Miller - Century West] 17:32:41
area of acreage within the different zones, including the airport, which is partly within the public.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:32:47
That would also include some of the adjacent private through defense or other aeronautical

[David Miller - Century West] 17:32:54
activities, land uses.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:32:57
Again, 65, these are acres, so you can kind of see the

[David Miller - Century West] 17:33:02
the changes in acreage

[David Miller - Century West] 17:33:05
over time, both 2021 and 2041, so we see it.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:33:11
a net increase of

[David Miller - Century West] 17:33:12
of acreage from approximately 267 acres to about 319 acres.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:33:19
of 65 and above. Now, it's important to remember that a good portion of this is all over airport land.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:33:25
or over adjacent privately owned aeronautical land uses.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:33:30
So…

[David Miller - Century West] 17:33:32
that's just a good frame of reference.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:33:36
Okay, so that was pretty quick, but that might be a good place to stop.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:33:41
See if there are any questions I can answer for Tim.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 17:33:43
Yeah, thanks, David. So that was a lot of technical information. And if you're like me, you're not an engineer. So you may have clarifying questions.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 17:33:54
If you do, please just raise your hand and I can call on you.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 17:33:59
We'll of course have plenty of time for roundtable discussion, but if you have

clarifying questions around

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 17:34:05
what David just presented

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 17:34:08
either use the raise your hand feature or for those of you who are on camera, I can see you.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 17:34:15
So just give me a wave.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 17:34:27
Okay. Well, it looks like you all are experts and which is great. So we will keep it moving. And then again, of course, if you have clarifying questions, we can we can

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 17:34:41
touch back on that.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:34:44
Okay, yes. Thanks, Brandi.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:34:49
So we're going to move on now over to the development side and provide just a quick summary

[David Miller - Century West] 17:34:57
of the kind of the

[David Miller - Century West] 17:34:58
the key issues that we're dealing with here

[David Miller - Century West] 17:35:02
And as Kenji mentioned, I think…

[David Miller - Century West] 17:35:05
Earlier, we're not

[David Miller - Century West] 17:35:07
This presentation, we're not going back and presenting

[David Miller - Century West] 17:35:11
all of the same information we presented earlier because I think

[David Miller - Century West] 17:35:14
You've all heard that and had a chance to review and comment on that.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:35:19
So what we're going to try to do

[David Miller - Century West] 17:35:21
focus on some of the

[David Miller - Century West] 17:35:25
specific issues that we're trying to address.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:35:28
And then what led to the preferred alternative, preliminary preferred alternative.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:35:35
And then just kind of highlight the priorities of the FAA that have been identified, which we've been trying to

[David Miller - Century West] 17:35:41
address throughout the plan.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:35:44
So just as a refresher, the master plan is focused on the ODAV owned property, not the adjacent property in terms of planning facilities.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:35:55
So what we're looking at in terms of airfield improvements, whether it's a runway taxiway.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:36:02
other improvements related would be focused on property owned biodav

[David Miller - Century West] 17:36:08
And in some cases, in some examples, there may be property that needs to be acquired in order to accommodate that facility.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:36:17
which you all know, and we can talk about that a little bit.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:36:21
Again, our focus is on this area.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:36:24
And again, we've got, as we've presented through several meetings over the last year or year and a half.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:36:32
There are a large number of non-standard conditions at the Aurora State Airport that the master plan is attempting to address.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:36:40
And really, within that group of items, the FAA,

[David Miller - Century West] 17:36:47

has several

[David Miller - Century West] 17:36:49
standards design standards, if you will, that really are high priorities and not just at Aurora but

[David Miller - Century West] 17:36:55
the country. The runway object free area is one of them. That is that flat plane of airspace, if you will. It's not airspace, but that

[David Miller - Century West] 17:37:04
the flat plane that extends

[David Miller - Century West] 17:37:08
from the center line of the runway laterally, 400 feet in both directions, so it's 800 feet wide

[David Miller - Century West] 17:37:14
and extends about 300 feet beyond each end of the runway.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:37:19
If I remember my dimensions.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:37:21
That is where the Hubbard Highway comes into play, but not just the Hubbard Highway we've got

[David Miller - Century West] 17:37:26
portions of Kyle Road. We've got facilities on the field and some of the other items. We've got fencing

[David Miller - Century West] 17:37:34
in the roadways and the fencing and the other items are not

[David Miller - Century West] 17:37:37
considered compatible with the object-free area.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:37:40
runway object-free area by the FAA.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:37:42
So the general guidance from FAA

[David Miller - Century West] 17:37:47
for OFAs or ROFAs as we call them

[David Miller - Century West] 17:37:50
is that the ROFA must be controlled by the airport

[David Miller - Century West] 17:37:54

And I must be free of obstructions.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:37:56
So that's kind of their general operating

[David Miller - Century West] 17:38:00
guidance for that.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:38:01
The runway safety area is another surface depiction for the runway.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:38:06
It's a little bit different than the OFA in that in addition to the obstacle clearing component, anything that's vertical.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:38:14
It also has a surface standard, a compaction standard.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:38:19
And it needs to be able to support the weight of an aircraft or an emergency vehicle.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:38:25
In dry conditions.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:38:28
We have, as we've discussed through a couple of meetings, we know we have

[David Miller - Century West] 17:38:32
the existing drain field at the south end of the runway that's in the current runway safety area.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:38:38
And we know that the drain fields at the north end of the runway are currently outside the RSA but would be inside the future RSA.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:38:46
with the runway extension.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:38:48
But in terms of the current conformance.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:38:51
Because we're dealing with the existing conditions, not the future in terms of strict conformance.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:38:58
We're really focused on the south end of the runway today.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:39:00

There's also an open drainage ditch running along the parallel taxiway that

[David Miller - Century West] 17:39:06
is also not compatible with FAA design standards.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:39:10
for RSA. So that would need to be mitigated.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:39:14
We've talked about before along the southern apron section adjacent taxiway alpha there are

[David Miller - Century West] 17:39:21
a number of taxiways or taxi lanes that align with taxiways

[David Miller - Century West] 17:39:26
that effectively provide direct access from the apron to the runway and that

[David Miller - Century West] 17:39:29
That's something that the FAA also likes to see.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:39:35
eliminated.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:39:37
So then, you know, just as a note, there are a lot of other non-standard conditions that aren't listed that will be coordinated.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:39:44
with FAA. And this is a 20-year master plan. The projects are numerous and they won't all be completed in one

[David Miller - Century West] 17:39:54
one single project. So the way most airports approach non-standard conditions

[David Miller - Century West] 17:40:00
is to work with the FAA on addressing the highest priority needs and then work down the list.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:40:07
Also, because we've talked a lot about this in the past several meetings.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:40:11
modification of standards, the FAA process for modifying standards.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:40:15
Based on current FAA guidance is not available as a planning solution, a planning level solution.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:40:22

The FAA has changed its approach on this in the last number of years. So mods now are considered during design.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:40:29
Long story short for the airport master plan and the approval of the airport layout plan, the FAA is requiring

[David Miller - Century West] 17:40:37
that the airport layout plans show a path to compliance or conformance.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:40:43
We have design standards that are currently in effect for aircraft approach category c

[David Miller - Century West] 17:40:50
And Design Group 2, or C2,

[David Miller - Century West] 17:40:53
That is not affected by the forecast because we've got the traffic currently and we need to meet the standards currently.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:41:00
And those standards are also in place in the future based on the forecast activity.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:41:06
This is not a case of trying to expand the airport.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:41:12
to meet standards, we've got the need to meet standards based on current traffic.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:41:18
So I will continue down here.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:41:23
So just to quickly summarize the preferred alternative again, this is mostly to facilitate the roundtable. We're going to just refresh everyone a little bit on some of the goals.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:41:33
preferred alternative and some of the key features but then

[David Miller - Century West] 17:41:36
We've talked about this with you in the last couple of meetings at length, and I think it's a great opportunity for you all

[David Miller - Century West] 17:41:44
to kind of…

[David Miller - Century West] 17:41:45
begin the conversation.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:41:48
In the roundtable form.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:41:50
So again, the goals for the preferred alternative were

[David Miller - Century West] 17:41:56
you know shaped in part by the feedback reviewed through the process.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:42:00
And I touched on the FAA design standards and conformance with the standards is a given.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:42:07
And that's where particularly the concentration on

[David Miller - Century West] 17:42:11
the object free area and the highway safety area came in. And I think what we learned through the process, and we've experienced this

[David Miller - Century West] 17:42:18
Also, in the development sense, because right now

[David Miller - Century West] 17:42:24
because runway 1735 is out of

[David Miller - Century West] 17:42:28
informants, if you will, with the applicable design standards

[David Miller - Century West] 17:42:31
The FAA funding for the runway is limited to effectively maintenance.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:42:38
Until the progress is sufficient to satisfy the FAA that

[David Miller - Century West] 17:42:43
compliance or conformance is established and is actually becoming

[David Miller - Century West] 17:42:49
a reality. The airport is really in a state aviation division department is inactive.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:42:56
in a situation where they will not be able to make significant improvements to the runway.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:43:01
without addressing the non-standard items.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:43:03
And that's strictly, that's straight from the FAA and that's just their policy directive.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:43:09
And it isn't limited to the Ohio State Airport we see around the country and different parts of the country in different airports.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:43:17
The other goal and beyond just meeting standards is to improve the efficiency of airport operations.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:43:23
And also to improve safety. So those are kind of the overarching goals that we were trying to

[David Miller - Century West] 17:43:30
to focus on and putting together the preliminary alternatives and as we've gone through the refinement.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:43:36
So based on that, we heard a lot of feedback and I don't need to go through all this, but I think that

[David Miller - Century West] 17:43:45
A lot of the suggestions were

[David Miller - Century West] 17:43:48
things like, you know, consider a no-build alternative

[David Miller - Century West] 17:43:53
That could be done.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:43:57
that would be limiting the airport to effectively maintaining what is already in place, not improving, not extending the runway.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:44:05
and other things related to upgrades. So I think that

[David Miller - Century West] 17:44:09
It's kind of a non-starter in the ability to meet future demand.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:44:14
As it's noted there, it was presented in the preliminary, but it wasn't carried forward.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:44:21
And then…

[David Miller - Century West] 17:44:23
general input was to reduce or eliminate impacts to existing hangars.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:44:27
That's understandable. Parallel taxiway. These are, again, feedback. These are comments that you all provided. So we're just restating them.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:44:35
Parallel taxi lane is not needed.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:44:38
Then the comments about the vehicle service road relocated.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:44:43
off airport property

[David Miller - Century West] 17:44:45
Or elsewhere.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:44:47
So that, again, is that again

[David Miller - Century West] 17:44:51
Thank you. That's…

[David Miller - Century West] 17:44:53
Good comment. Important to point out, I think it's been said, and I'll just say again, is that if any proposed

[David Miller - Century West] 17:45:00
improvement say the vehicle service road that would be located off airport property

[David Miller - Century West] 17:45:05
would not be funded by ODAB. So if there's anything that ODAV would fund would require property acquisition. So if the concept

[David Miller - Century West] 17:45:15
that, you know, is being considered

[David Miller - Century West] 17:45:19
is to…

[David Miller - Century West] 17:45:20
relocate the vehicle service road off airport property that

[David Miller - Century West] 17:45:24
is something, of course, that could be considered

[David Miller - Century West] 17:45:27
it would not be funded by the FAA or ODAV.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:45:31
And then there was a comment about shifting the highway within the existing right-of-way

[David Miller - Century West] 17:45:36
And again, this is our basic approach to this based on some feedback we received from ODOT highway

[David Miller - Century West] 17:45:43
people early in the process was that

[David Miller - Century West] 17:45:47
their preference would be to maintain their current right-of-way width

[David Miller - Century West] 17:45:51
And to keep the highway centered in the right of way.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:45:53
So in our planning assumptions, again, as a conceptual planning document

[David Miller - Century West] 17:45:58
We did that. We maintained the right-of-way width and we shifted the road and the right of way

[David Miller - Century West] 17:46:04
to the west in order to clear the options that had the highway shift.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:46:08
In order to clear the object-free area.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:46:10
And again, this is something that

[David Miller - Century West] 17:46:13
Well, two things. One is that the final decision on highway design

[David Miller - Century West] 17:46:18
Including whether the current configuration would be maintained or upgraded to a multi-lane

[David Miller - Century West] 17:46:24
divided configuration or something along those lines driven by traffic, not by the airport

[David Miller - Century West] 17:46:29
That's a decision ODOT will make.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:46:31
So I think that there are approaches, it's an ODOT decision, not a ODAP decision.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:46:37
So we are uh

[David Miller - Century West] 17:46:38
From a conceptual planning standpoint, keeping the highway

[David Miller - Century West] 17:46:42
and the right of way in line with what they have indicated.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:46:47
they needed to see. So we went through all these back in our October 15th meeting and

[David Miller - Century West] 17:46:51
And this was kind of the feedback we had.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:46:56
And then let's see.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:46:59
I would add, I think…

[David Miller - Century West] 17:47:01
It didn't end up on this bullet point, but there were also suggestions that the grain field could be

[David Miller - Century West] 17:47:08
kept in the runway safety area and there were some discussions about uh

[David Miller - Century West] 17:47:13
design challenges with that and we'll just kind of leave that for

[David Miller - Century West] 17:47:17
for the roundtable discussion that comes up again.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:47:23
So, let's see, shifting over, this is again the overview of the preferred alternative. This has not changed since the last meeting, so you're familiar with all the components.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:47:33
If you remember, we had distinct breakouts of phases.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:47:38
So individual components, there were basically four

[David Miller - Century West] 17:47:42
They do not all have the same impacts. So for example, the ability to clear the runway object free area

[David Miller - Century West] 17:47:50
on the highway, this option does not impact the hangars.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:47:55
So it's important as you're kind of going through the roundtable discussion to sort of

[David Miller - Century West] 17:47:59
see the different pieces. Remember that there are parts of the alternative that likely would be implemented individually.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:48:07
As opposed to all at once. So if there are things that you like or don't like or would do differently, that's kind of the

[David Miller - Century West] 17:48:14
the area that would be most helpful to focus on.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:48:20
So, again, I'll just reiterate, happy to weigh in. So we are here to help. We're here to listen. As Kenji said, this is your opportunity to

[David Miller - Century West] 17:48:29
to have a discussion amongst yourselves as a planning advisory committee

[David Miller - Century West] 17:48:35
to just sort of discuss

[David Miller - Century West] 17:48:37
what's in front of you.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:48:39
come up with some ideas and discuss those and we've gotten a lot of um

[David Miller - Century West] 17:48:45
We've gotten a lot of comments from PAC members on an individual basis, but what we haven't had a lot of

[David Miller - Century West] 17:48:51
Based on the way we've presented this information or the ability to consolidate information.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:48:57
We haven't had a lot of engagement sort of laterally within the PAC.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:49:01
Everyone represents a particular group or interest, but it would be helpful, I think, to see the PAC sort of

[David Miller - Century West] 17:49:09
sort of…

[David Miller - Century West] 17:49:10
discuss things you know sort of in the context of the group.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:49:14
But it is, again, this is the opportunity for the PAC members to provide additional input

[David Miller - Century West] 17:49:19
Or expand on your earlier input, just a little bit more detail would be good.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:49:25
And again, ODA will consider this input along with any written comments that are generated by the

[David Miller - Century West] 17:49:34
December date, 20th, I believe it was uh to

[David Miller - Century West] 17:49:38
23rd, I think. Yeah.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:49:42
to…

[David Miller - Century West] 17:49:43
consider when it's making its final decision.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:49:48
So I think, Randy.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:49:51
in the time we can just open it up to the time

[David Miller - Century West] 17:49:54
to the power.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 17:49:55
Yeah. Yep.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 17:49:56
And I'm wondering if, David, if you could put down the screen and then we can just see people's faces. I know it doesn't

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 17:50:07
It doesn't mimic our reality quite as well, but it's as close as we can get with virtual meetings. So I saw

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 17:50:16

Van Williams.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:50:16
So I'm going to unshare my screen for a moment if I understand correctly.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 17:50:20
Correct. Yeah.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 17:50:22
And I saw Ben Williams and then I think Bruce Bennett, you had your hand raised. Okay, great.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 17:50:28
And then…

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 17:50:32
Great. And I see some of you have

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 17:50:35
come off camera. So, oh, we see your dog

[David Miller - Century West] 17:50:38
Oh, I'm sorry. Sorry about that.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 17:50:39
It's okay.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:50:41
Come on, bye. I'm trying to figure out how to blink this here.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:50:59
Yeah, I'm looking for an…

[David Miller - Century West] 17:51:02
I'm not sure how to

[David Miller - Century West] 17:51:03
It's giving me screen choices, but I don't see an option for shutting this off.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:51:09
So…

[David Miller - Century West] 17:51:13
And see what I can do with that. What do you suggest?

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 17:51:17
That's a great question.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 17:51:20
Let's see if I can hear from that.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:51:27
I'm getting some direction here. Stand by. Hold on.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:51:33
Share screen. I want to share screen.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:51:38
You tell me if it goes blank.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:51:44
Yeah, I'm sorry about that.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 17:51:44
Sorry, everybody. Just some technical difficulties.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 17:51:48
Okay, so Ben Williams, I think you should be able to unmute and we'll go from here and we'll

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 17:51:54
get david some help.

[Ben Williams - FOFP] 17:51:56
Can you hear me, Brandy?

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 17:51:58
Yes, thank you.

[Ben Williams - FOFP] 17:51:59
Great, thanks. That was a cute dog, by the way.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:52:02
Thank you. Thank you.

[Ben Williams - FOFP] 17:52:04
whoever that belonged to.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:52:05
That's mine.

[Ben Williams - FOFP] 17:52:06
Good man. So, Dave, you said a few minutes ago on the slide

[Ben Williams - FOFP] 17:52:12
titled Input Received on the Preferred Alternatives.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:52:16
Mm-hmm.

[Ben Williams - FOFP] 17:52:16
you said you said

[Ben Williams - FOFP] 17:52:17
No build is a non-starter.

[Ben Williams - FOFP] 17:52:21
relative to meeting future demand.

[Ben Williams - FOFP] 17:52:25
Right?

[David Miller - Century West] 17:52:26
What I meant by that, thank you for the question. I think just to clarify.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:52:31
In that context, what I mean to say is that

[David Miller - Century West] 17:52:34
The FAA is already

[David Miller - Century West] 17:52:39
indicated that, for example, the runway

[David Miller - Century West] 17:52:41
improvements to the runway would be limited to maintenance only improvements.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:52:46
So that's…

[Ben Williams - FOFP] 17:52:46
I understand that. You said that last time.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:52:48
So the improvements on the runway would be

[David Miller - Century West] 17:52:51
for example runway extension and or strengthening

[David Miller - Century West] 17:52:55
to meet future demand.

[Ben Williams - FOFP] 17:52:57
Right.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:52:57
or current.

[Ben Williams - FOFP] 17:52:59
So my attention or focus in your statement is

[Ben Williams - FOFP] 17:53:03
on the future demand part. And I submitted additional comments last week about this

[Ben Williams - FOFP] 17:53:09
Which presumably are on the record.

[Ben Williams - FOFP] 17:53:12
The data set that Century West and ODAV have used

[Ben Williams - FOFP] 17:53:18
as the basis for

[Ben Williams - FOFP] 17:53:21
forecasting total operations

[Ben Williams - FOFP] 17:53:24
was 2016 through 2021.

[Ben Williams - FOFP] 17:53:28
The ATADS data for 2021 had total operations at 72,549.

[Ben Williams - FOFP] 17:53:37
Up from 65,949 in 2020.

[Ben Williams - FOFP] 17:53:44
My appeal, my question at the last PAC meeting was why are we not using current data?

[Ben Williams - FOFP] 17:53:49
The reality is that we're now in your forecast period and the present has caught up with the future.

[Ben Williams - FOFP] 17:53:56
Because in 2020,

[Ben Williams - FOFP] 17:53:59
to the operations dropped from 72,549

[Ben Williams - FOFP] 17:54:04
to 64,651.

[Ben Williams - FOFP] 17:54:07
And in 2023, they further dropped to 63,015

[Ben Williams - FOFP] 17:54:14
and then rebounded a little bit year to date if we use the same overall

[Ben Williams - FOFP] 17:54:20
number for 2023. Best case, you can forecast 68,045 operations for this year.

[Ben Williams - FOFP] 17:54:30
So we got three years of data dramatically below 72549

[Ben Williams - FOFP] 17:54:36
which now looks like a one-year blip

[Ben Williams - FOFP] 17:54:40
And the forecasts are based off of that.

[Ben Williams - FOFP] 17:54:43
or some ramp up to that.

[Ben Williams - FOFP] 17:54:45
And yet you're saying that either a no-build alternative or a revision to B2, which we also talked about at the last meeting.

[Ben Williams - FOFP] 17:54:55
It is not possible based on future demand. But the numbers that you're using for future demand make no sense.

[Ben Williams - FOFP] 17:55:02
to me sitting here looking at the FAA's ATAP data.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:55:05
Okay, let me try to unpack that. Thanks for the comment, Ben.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:55:08
First of all, let me back up and I should choose my words carefully. In terms of future development, that's not

[David Miller - Century West] 17:55:14
the best way to describe it because the best way to describe it

[David Miller - Century West] 17:55:17
I would point out that the justification for a runway extension can be met today.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:55:23
Not based on hitting some particular operations target.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:55:27
And the same could be said for pavement strength. So when I said future improvement, future development.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:55:33
That's really what I was referring to, not because traffic will hit a certain metric.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:55:38
Now, with regard to the numbers and the forecast, I appreciate your input. There

are some issues with your data set and the data sets that we're using, but I'll set that aside for the moment.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:55:49
The main point I want to make is that master plan forecasts are 20 year forecasts.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:55:54
And activity within that 20-year planning period, that planning horizon

[David Miller - Century West] 17:56:00
Activity is expected to be above and below the projection line throughout the planning period. It is not unusual.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:56:05
Deviations are expected. These are best projections and numbers will be up and down.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:56:12
And along those lines, if there's an upward or a downward deviation in the first five years of a forecast.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:56:18
That isn't enough justification for the FAA to throw the forecast out and do them again.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:56:24
And more importantly, a short-term trend, as you described, is not a

[David Miller - Century West] 17:56:29
sufficient to determine a long-term trend.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:56:32
There can be numbers, and I've looked at the OPSNET data just the other day, and you're right, there was a decline after 21 in some areas, but

[David Miller - Century West] 17:56:41
Some of those numbers are coming back up again as well.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:56:44
We also looked at the instrument flight plan data just to gauge that, and we're seeing actually the jet traffic has increased despite the airport operations decrease.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:56:52
It's a lot to pack in there, but it's a long way of saying that

[David Miller - Century West] 17:56:58
The forecasts are a guide and the FAA's approved them.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:57:02

It's the way master plans are done, the forecasts are done earlier in the process and it

[David Miller - Century West] 17:57:08
those numbers are in place and the FDA has determined that they are reasonable for planning purposes.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:57:14
Again, important, I think, to reiterate that the forecast growth is nominal. It's not large. I mean, in terms of growth rates, it's a fairly modest growth rate.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:57:25
And the overall volume of air traffic at the airport isn't

[David Miller - Century West] 17:57:30
driving the improvements that we're talking about tonight, the conformance with the design standards.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:57:38
Or even something like the runway extension.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:57:40
So short-term fluctuations, they are what they are, but they're not significant in that evaluation, I'd say.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:57:48
Again, important to remember the current and future design or critical aircraft is established by the air traffic and again

[David Miller - Century West] 17:57:56
Looking at the more recent flight data through 2020 into year-to-date 24,

[David Miller - Century West] 17:58:03
The airport is still well above the threshold that the FAA requires for the C2 designation.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:58:10
And growing, frankly.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:58:12
So again.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:58:14
It's not uncommon for a port traffic to deviate like this, but what typically happens

[David Miller - Century West] 17:58:19
is that when airport master plan forecasts are easily or quickly exceeded.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:58:26

or not realized in a significant way.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:58:29
Meaning sharp declines in both operations and aircraft type usage

[David Miller - Century West] 17:58:34
then that's typically when the FAA says it's time to update the master plan and do a new set of forecasts. But there's nothing in what you're describing that would push

[David Miller - Century West] 17:58:42
Oh, they have in that direction.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:58:45
So that's, I guess, I can say about that.

[Ben Williams - FOFP] 17:58:47
I'm not going to turn this whole evening into a debate about that, but I would just add that

[Ben Williams - FOFP] 17:58:52
you know you're coming in here following two prior master plans that were replete with

[Ben Williams - FOFP] 17:59:00
very robust forecasts.

[Ben Williams - FOFP] 17:59:02
for increases in operations and none of them were ever met.

[Ben Williams - FOFP] 17:59:06
in the 2000 or the 2012 master plan. They were never achieved. They always fell far short.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:59:12
Understood. Understood.

[Ben Williams - FOFP] 17:59:13
But thank you for the time.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:59:14
Well, I appreciate that. Thank you.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:59:18
Okay.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 17:59:18
Okay, great. I think I saw Bruce next. And so Bruce, I'll ask you to unmute. And then I saw Aaron and then Tony.

[Bruce Bennett - Airport user, property & business owner] 17:59:28
Good afternoon. Thank you.

[Bruce Bennett - Airport user, property & business owner] 17:59:32
I think it's important to clarify

[Bruce Bennett - Airport user, property & business owner] 17:59:35
It's semantics, but it's also an understanding.

[Bruce Bennett - Airport user, property & business owner] 17:59:39
David, you were talking about on airport and off airport

[Bruce Bennett - Airport user, property & business owner] 17:59:43
And all of that property is on airport. I mean, it's zoned airport, it's aviation use i understand

[Bruce Bennett - Airport user, property & business owner] 17:59:50
there's a piece of it that's owned by the state and then the majority is owned by private individuals.

[Bruce Bennett - Airport user, property & business owner] 17:59:56
But it's all the airport.

[Bruce Bennett - Airport user, property & business owner] 17:59:59
And…

[Bruce Bennett - Airport user, property & business owner] 18:00:02
when it's when

[Bruce Bennett - Airport user, property & business owner] 18:00:03
you talk about off airport people

[Bruce Bennett - Airport user, property & business owner] 18:00:06
It might sound like across the street or non-aviation use. So I just think that's important for everyone to understand.

[Bruce Bennett - Airport user, property & business owner] 18:00:12
through the fence of the tff

[Bruce Bennett - Airport user, property & business owner] 18:00:15
TTF.

[Bruce Bennett - Airport user, property & business owner] 18:00:16
abbreviation is airport property.

[Bruce Bennett - Airport user, property & business owner] 18:00:20
very, very

[Bruce Bennett - Airport user, property & business owner] 18:00:22
almost all the jobs, all the development is on that

[Bruce Bennett - Airport user, property & business owner] 18:00:26
through the fence, which is airport property. It's just privately owned.

[Bruce Bennett - Airport user, property & business owner] 18:00:30
and heavily taxed.

[Bruce Bennett - Airport user, property & business owner] 18:00:32
That's airport property.

[Bruce Bennett - Airport user, property & business owner] 18:00:35
The reason that's important, I think, is the main airport

[Bruce Bennett - Airport user, property & business owner] 18:00:40
access road stenbach way

[Bruce Bennett - Airport user, property & business owner] 18:00:42
is on private property. The state has a permanent easement on that property

[Bruce Bennett - Airport user, property & business owner] 18:00:48
The state built that road with the state road

[Bruce Bennett - Airport user, property & business owner] 18:00:51
with the private

[Bruce Bennett - Airport user, property & business owner] 18:00:52
with the owner's assistance

[Bruce Bennett - Airport user, property & business owner] 18:00:55
But they did build that road.

[Bruce Bennett - Airport user, property & business owner] 18:00:57
And so that's the kind of the

[Bruce Bennett - Airport user, property & business owner] 18:01:00
public-private partnership that i'd like to see

[Bruce Bennett - Airport user, property & business owner] 18:01:05
plan and continue.

[Bruce Bennett - Airport user, property & business owner] 18:01:08
the uh

[Bruce Bennett - Airport user, property & business owner] 18:01:10
I think that's critical. Everyone agrees we need a way for vehicles to get

[Bruce Bennett - Airport user, property & business owner] 18:01:15
safely back and forth on the airport, not pulling out on airport road northeast

[Bruce Bennett - Airport user, property & business owner] 18:01:21

with a trailer full of airplane parts or a fuel truck or something they're

[Bruce Bennett - Airport user, property & business owner] 18:01:26
there needs to be ways for vehicles to get bound for coffee and fuel and parts and

[Bruce Bennett - Airport user, property & business owner] 18:01:32
There's just dozens.

[Bruce Bennett - Airport user, property & business owner] 18:01:34
thousands yearly of trips back and forth

[Bruce Bennett - Airport user, property & business owner] 18:01:37
passengers and parts and maintenance

[Bruce Bennett - Airport user, property & business owner] 18:01:39
airport to airport and it's back in the day, it might have been on the

[Bruce Bennett - Airport user, property & business owner] 18:01:45
on the taxiway before the tower

[Bruce Bennett - Airport user, property & business owner] 18:01:48
But that's not the right way.

[Bruce Bennett - Airport user, property & business owner] 18:01:50
And we've had problems.

[Bruce Bennett - Airport user, property & business owner] 18:01:53
with this transition.

[Bruce Bennett - Airport user, property & business owner] 18:01:56
So I strongly support a strong support

[Bruce Bennett - Airport user, property & business owner] 18:01:59
Thank you.

[Bruce Bennett - Airport user, property & business owner] 18:02:01
an access road for other than aircraft

[Bruce Bennett - Airport user, property & business owner] 18:02:04
including bicycles and pedestrians traveling on the airport and

[Bruce Bennett - Airport user, property & business owner] 18:02:09
since all the property is not owned by the state, it would make the most sense. And there's been an offer of a free

[Bruce Bennett - Airport user, property & business owner] 18:02:18
free easement and

[Bruce Bennett - Airport user, property & business owner] 18:02:19
I mean, that's significant. It's hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of value

being donated by

[Bruce Bennett - Airport user, property & business owner] 18:02:25
by an airport.

[Bruce Bennett - Airport user, property & business owner] 18:02:27
landowners to help make the system go.

[Bruce Bennett - Airport user, property & business owner] 18:02:32
And also.

[Bruce Bennett - Airport user, property & business owner] 18:02:34
I think it's important to focus on positive improvements

[Bruce Bennett - Airport user, property & business owner] 18:02:39
I think this master plan in general

[Bruce Bennett - Airport user, property & business owner] 18:02:42
I've been involved with everyone since 1976 chu m hill

[Bruce Bennett - Airport user, property & business owner] 18:02:48
a lot of master plans, a lot of updates, a lot of studies

[Bruce Bennett - Airport user, property & business owner] 18:02:51
In some ways, this is one of the best.

[Bruce Bennett - Airport user, property & business owner] 18:02:53
following the rules and getting neighbors and public input

[Bruce Bennett - Airport user, property & business owner] 18:03:00
ideas like moving a control tower and tearing down hangars probably put it in the other category

[Bruce Bennett - Airport user, property & business owner] 18:03:07
one of the worst. But I know we're not at the final yet.

[Bruce Bennett - Airport user, property & business owner] 18:03:12
And so that's my strong suggestion is to

[Bruce Bennett - Airport user, property & business owner] 18:03:16
except this

[Bruce Bennett - Airport user, property & business owner] 18:03:18
this latest version with the exception of any hangar destruction

[Bruce Bennett - Airport user, property & business owner] 18:03:26
or taking up drain fields.

[Bruce Bennett - Airport user, property & business owner] 18:03:29
going backwards and backwards

[Bruce Bennett - Airport user, property & business owner] 18:03:32
Of course.

[Bruce Bennett - Airport user, property & business owner] 18:03:35
the taxiway

[Bruce Bennett - Airport user, property & business owner] 18:03:37
the parallel tax way is more than adequate for an airport of this size.

[Bruce Bennett - Airport user, property & business owner] 18:03:42
We just don't have the real estate.

[Bruce Bennett - Airport user, property & business owner] 18:03:44
For a second one and the vehicle service road is

[Bruce Bennett - Airport user, property & business owner] 18:03:49
critical as it is has to be as far from the runway as possible.

[Bruce Bennett - Airport user, property & business owner] 18:03:54
Thank you.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:03:54
Okay, thank you, Bruce. And again, I'm sort of

[David Miller - Century West] 18:03:59
delving in and out of roundtable mode, but I think this is a great opportunity

[David Miller - Century West] 18:04:04
to discuss what Bruce had described amongst yourselves and sort of see if there's

[David Miller - Century West] 18:04:11
I know that there has been work done sort of on the side to

[David Miller - Century West] 18:04:18
layout, you know.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:04:21
proposed roadway alignments on the private land and so on. And I just think it would be

[David Miller - Century West] 18:04:26
I think whatever happens off of the Odav on property

[David Miller - Century West] 18:04:31
you know that that you know if that's the direction that it would have considers ultimately

[David Miller - Century West] 18:04:37
That's fine. I'm curious, too, because there are

[David Miller - Century West] 18:04:40
There are portions of the preferred alternative concept that have

[David Miller - Century West] 18:04:46
sections of the

[David Miller - Century West] 18:04:48
VSR, Vehicle Service Road.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:04:50
in the central terminal area around the tower

[David Miller - Century West] 18:04:53
And it'd be in my airport planner world mind, I just think in terms of connectivity

[David Miller - Century West] 18:04:58
kind of north to south. So concept sketch would be helpful just anything that could

[David Miller - Century West] 18:05:03
If there's a way that that can help inform our evaluation, that'd be great. So I encourage you all

[David Miller - Century West] 18:05:09
kick that around tonight in the conversation.

[Bruce Bennett - Airport user, property & business owner] 18:05:12
Excellent. We do have the 2012 master plan had an internal

[Bruce Bennett - Airport user, property & business owner] 18:05:18
a vehicle service road

[Bruce Bennett - Airport user, property & business owner] 18:05:20
Or I'm not sure if that's the proper name for it with an fa speed

[Bruce Bennett - Airport user, property & business owner] 18:05:25
You know what I'm talking about. And it could use some fine tuning but it's significantly better than the one thrown

[Bruce Bennett - Airport user, property & business owner] 18:05:31
Right next to the taxiway. And just one more

[Bruce Bennett - Airport user, property & business owner] 18:05:35
I want to reiterate that the main airport access road, the way the control tower gets

[Bruce Bennett - Airport user, property & business owner] 18:05:40
to work every day.

[Bruce Bennett - Airport user, property & business owner] 18:05:42

is on private property. And so I understand the need for

[Bruce Bennett - Airport user, property & business owner] 18:05:49
complete.

[Bruce Bennett - Airport user, property & business owner] 18:05:51
control, but I believe an easement does that just as good as

[Bruce Bennett - Airport user, property & business owner] 18:05:57
ownership in this case saving hundreds of thousands of dollars

[Bruce Bennett - Airport user, property & business owner] 18:06:03
For the state.

[Bruce Bennett - Airport user, property & business owner] 18:06:07
Remember, we're not just talking about private versus private

[Bruce Bennett - Airport user, property & business owner] 18:06:10
versus public land but

[Bruce Bennett - Airport user, property & business owner] 18:06:12
an easement.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:06:15
I understand. Thank you for that. And just to reiterate or clarify what I my comment on that

[David Miller - Century West] 18:06:19
I think it's our understanding that if we talk about the development of a vehicle service road, if it's on Odev on property, it would be eligible for FAA funding.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:06:29
developed on private land likely not to be eligible for FAA funding. That's the main distinction.

[Bruce Bennett - Airport user, property & business owner] 18:06:35
Thank you.

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 18:06:35
Yeah. Hey, David, we can probably get

[David Miller - Century West] 18:06:36
That's fine. Yes.

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 18:06:37
we can probably get clarification from Tim.

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 18:06:41
Right. He's on.

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 18:06:43
I think. Do you want to ask them?

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 18:06:46
Yeah, Tim, let me make sure that you can speak. Let's see here.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 18:06:51
Okay, Tim, I just

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 18:06:53
allowed you to unmute.

[Tim House - FAA] 18:06:59
There we go.

[Tim House - FAA] 18:07:05
All right.

[Tim House - FAA] 18:07:06
And I hope my name is written correctly. I couldn't tell which way the mirror works or not.

[Tim House - FAA] 18:07:12
reset all my settings when we joined the

[Tim House - FAA] 18:07:15
ODAP meeting.

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 18:07:16
It's backwards.

[Tim House - FAA] 18:07:18
Is it backwards?

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 18:07:18
Just kidding

[Tim House - FAA] 18:07:20
Well, I get…

[Tim House - FAA] 18:07:22
You know, I look goofy a lot of times, so I'm not too worried about it, but…

[Tim House - FAA] 18:07:29
And the clarification you were asking for.

[Tim House - FAA] 18:07:32
Sorry?

[David Miller - Century West] 18:07:32

vehicle service road, my comment was my understanding is that um

[David Miller - Century West] 18:07:38
as it's proposed, the plan includes vehicle service road improvements

[David Miller - Century West] 18:07:42
that those would be eligible for FAA funding typically

[David Miller - Century West] 18:07:46
Because they're on airport property. But if an alternative approach was to route a service road on private land, it would not typically be eligible.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:07:54
Is that accurate?

[Tim House - FAA] 18:07:54
Right, right. No, it would not be available for eligible for FAA funding to be on the private

[Tim House - FAA] 18:08:01
land. So your savings of hundreds of thousands of dollars for the land would cost millions of dollars for construction of the facility.

[Bruce Bennett - Airport user, property & business owner] 18:08:12
Even on leased land, or I'm sorry even on easy with a permanent easement

[Tim House - FAA] 18:08:17
FAA only constructs on airport property, only funds construction on airport property to FAA standards.

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 18:08:24
Hey, Bruce, you willing to donate?

[Tim House - FAA] 18:08:28
There we go. That's the way to solve it. Hundreds of thousand dollars.

[Tim House - FAA] 18:08:32
and you get a tax rebate or a deduction because you won't have to pay property taxes on it either.

[Bruce Bennett - Airport user, property & business owner] 18:08:37
Actually, there's others on this.

[Bruce Bennett - Airport user, property & business owner] 18:08:41
on this call that will donate. So it would end up being a huge net savings.

[Bruce Bennett - Airport user, property & business owner] 18:08:46
after the construction costs.

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 18:08:50

That's awesome. Good to know. Thanks. Thanks, Bruce.

[Bruce Bennett - Airport user, property & business owner] 18:08:53
Sure, absolutely.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:08:54
Yeah, I think back to my earlier comment just to sort of

[David Miller - Century West] 18:08:58
If there's input provided

[David Miller - Century West] 18:09:00
Along those lines and there's also input provided that the landowners would be willing to consider

[David Miller - Century West] 18:09:08
selling the property. It would be helpful, again, back to our point about the

[David Miller - Century West] 18:09:13
the larger area of property acquisition that I know a lot of people are upset about the the entire

[David Miller - Century West] 18:09:20
east side of the airport, essentially, the privately owned lands

[David Miller - Century West] 18:09:22
Again, the purpose of that was simply to create a pathway for willing sellers, anyone that

[David Miller - Century West] 18:09:28
might want to sell their parcel to ODAV. If it's not depicted on the airport layout plan, it would not typically be eligible.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:09:37
Same would probably be true for a proposed off

[David Miller - Century West] 18:09:41
currently off airport off airport

[David Miller - Century West] 18:09:43
Odav owned property, VSR.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:09:46
Again, the more detail that you all can be in your input at this stage, if that's a direction you'd like to see ODAP consider, I think

[David Miller - Century West] 18:09:55
The more detail you can provide, the better.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 18:09:58

Great. Thank you both. And we can come back and have more conversation. Erin, I know you've had your hand raised for a little while.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:10:16
I'm sorry, Brandy, did I add somebody?

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:10:17
Yeah, I could, you know, just just to just

[David Miller - Century West] 18:10:19
Oh, it's Aaron. Hi, Aaron.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:10:21
continue that subject just for one second, but I have other things to focus on.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:10:27
I think, you know, people have already donated land for donated land

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:10:32
the road that's shown on the road

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:10:34
the 2012 and have offered it

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:10:38
to ODev in the past with the prior

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:10:42
director. So I think, you know, that 2012 plan

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:10:46
should be looked at again. And I know the scheme that was submitted by

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:10:52
the aviation stakeholders.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:10:55
shows it back where it was shown on 2012.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:10:58
And I think it's, you know, realistically, that's the practical

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:11:03
place to put it. I think there's a couple of key things that I think this plan is just not

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:11:10
acknowledging and the first is that this airport has always been a public-private partnership, even as a military

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:11:19
airport. The runway was public.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:11:23
And the place that the military planes parked was private and

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:11:27
This is just a continuation you know through the years

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:11:31
We all know Senate Bill 680 was passed

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:11:35
even promoted the concept of a public-private partnership

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:11:38
And I think it's great, you know, the FAA has their limitations of where they can put funds.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:11:44
That's fine, but that doesn't mean there can't be a partnership with the private sector.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:11:50
It doesn't mean that ODAV's funds

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:11:53
can't be used just the way Bruce was pointing out.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:11:57
You wouldn't be able to get to the tower today if it wasn't for an easement over private land.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:12:03
and a cooperative arrangement.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:12:05
And obviously that the road that's shown in 2012 is the interior

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:12:11
circulation road could be done the same way and was

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:12:15
offered to the previous

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:12:17
director and there were discussions of how to accomplish it with easements and so forth. So I hope you'll reconsider that.

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 18:12:23

Hey.

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 18:12:25
Eric, question for you.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:12:26
Sure.

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 18:12:28
So for that 2012 internal circulation road

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 18:12:32
What would happen if we did put that in the master plan

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 18:12:37
as acquisition, would there be objection to that? I mean, it would move that

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 18:12:45
road interior

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 18:12:47
And what are your thoughts on that? Just curious.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:12:48
I think you could propose it for sure yeah

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 18:12:50
Yeah. Okay. I'm just curious.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:12:52
Yeah. Yeah. I mean, but, you know, I would then focus also on your easement coming in

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:12:57
If you want to gain control of that. But I think that's a legitimate thing to bring up as a proposal, sure.

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 18:13:04
Okay. All right. Cool. Thank you.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:13:06
um

[David Miller - Century West] 18:13:06
Great. Yeah.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:13:08
And, you know, we did submit we meaning and and most of you know

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:13:14

many of you know, I've worked with many of the landowners there

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:13:20
I've worked on probably 30 airports in Oregon

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:13:25
I work in New York State, in Washington. I have projects really all over. So I do a lot of aviation related work.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:13:32
Both planning and construction, not construction but

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:13:36
facility planning.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:13:38
But I'm going to focus on the master plan here.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:13:43
Which I've done a fair amount of in some of my earlier career.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:13:47
But I first wanted to say you

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:13:50
the whole concept of a public-private partnership is that there's interaction between

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:13:55
companies between the whole group.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:13:59
And…

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:14:00
So the concept of the

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:14:03
circulation road

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:14:05
the way it's prepared it's

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:14:08
proposed on the

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:14:09
current alternative, preferred alternative.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:14:12

would be more like a PDX where you're moving luggage you're putting you're getting

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:14:18
meals out to the plains.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:14:20
But here what's happening is there's interaction between the businesses

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:14:24
So it's on the other side.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:14:27
of um you know of

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:14:30
you know, we all talk about the Amazon drivers who end up out in the runway

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:14:34
you know that's part of the interaction that's going on between businesses.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:14:39
And literally, I'm here representing HTS today. They couldn't be beyond this.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:14:45
I did their facilities. I know what their needs are very well and i can

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:14:50
speak for them.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:14:54
But the other location that's on the 2012 plan

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:15:00
was specifically because it allows interaction between the businesses

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:15:04
and therefore promotes the airport really as a cluster of businesses.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:15:09
The other subject I want to get to is the modification of standards.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:15:13
And I'm sure it was submitted previously. I prepared a whole

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:15:19
very detailed modification of standards

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:15:22
that was based on ones that have been approved at other airports

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:15:26
Some of those airports have even scheduled service.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:15:30
There's modification standards that at

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:15:34
most large airports

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:15:36
Just because the criteria change.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:15:40
I want to remind everyone, particularly those who aren't airport planners.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:15:45
that the size of the rofa

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:15:47
for Aurora Airport is exactly the same size.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:15:51
At Portland International.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:15:53
At SeaTac, that's the largest

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:15:57
runway object-free area that exists in the FAA's world.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:16:01
And it's designed for triple seven sevens

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:16:04
And every gigantic military aircraft and any aircraft in the world today.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:16:10
And it should be kind of

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:16:13
obvious that an airport like Aurora

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:16:17
doesn't, for the same level of safety

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:16:20
that's at portland international

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:16:23
Obviously, Aurora wouldn't need that same amount. We're not going to have

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:16:27
Triple sevens, we're not going to have 737s landing

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:16:32
there and they're there

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:16:34
in the material that I submitted.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:16:37
The pro bono for the good of the pro bono

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:16:40
airport and the community

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:16:42
I run through all the standard criteria, all the different advisory circulars.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:16:47
And to my knowledge, there is no

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:16:51
nothing written that the FAA

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:16:53
has that would say you could not submit that

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:16:57
tomorrow and and see what their response is.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:17:00
And I would encourage you to do that.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:17:03
And David, I heard you say that

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:17:06
Right now, they're telling you that it's

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:17:08
It's for consideration during design, not master plan

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:17:13
other master plans have included it.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:17:16
you know fairly recently

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:17:18

And I can tell you, we have gone to every FAA official

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:17:23
that we have learned through ODF.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:17:27
have said this or maybe has said this

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:17:29
And we cannot get any FAA person to raise their hand and say, yes, I'm the one who

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:17:37
They're making this requirement.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:17:39
So I guess we'd ask…

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:17:41
And I think it's been asked before.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:17:44
We'd ask it again, the actual name of who is

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:17:49
setting this requirement

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:17:52
Because it does not seem to comply with the advisory circulars.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:17:57
And they should be treating us equal

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:18:03
other airports that are allowed

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:18:06
the modification of standards.

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 18:18:09
So.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:18:09
And I brought it up the difference between the 777 landing

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:18:12
And it's not going to land at Aurora.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:18:16
the whole purpose of the modification of standards

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:18:19
is to allow for that slippage that that

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:18:23
no standard is going to be perfect for any one airport.

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 18:18:28
Aaron, can I chime in real quick?

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:18:31
Well, just let me finish my concept here. So because

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 18:18:32
Oh, sure, sure.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:18:35
the whole, you know, the minute you go down that rabbit hole

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:18:39
that there cannot be a modification of standards.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:18:42
you end up with the $200 million project

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:18:48
that that's never going to happen.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:18:50
And that's under master planning, you're not supposed to have a project that can actually never

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:18:56
fiscally be accomplished.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:18:57
I'll stop there on the modification. I have some other things, but go ahead.

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 18:19:00
Yeah. Yeah. You'll be able to continue after after

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:19:03
Yeah, yeah.

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 18:19:04
So I'm going to go ahead and throw Tim under the bus again.

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 18:19:11
Can you comment on that officially?

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 18:19:14

In terms of the modification of standard and a master plan.

[Tim House - FAA] 18:19:19
Yes, modification of standards are not to be considered during the master plan.

[Tim House - FAA] 18:19:24
They are to be considered as a part of a construction project.

[Tim House - FAA] 18:19:29
the master plan must

[Tim House - FAA] 18:19:31
meet standards.

[Tim House - FAA] 18:19:33
We're not trying to land a 777 at this airport.

[Tim House - FAA] 18:19:38
That is D4, D.

[Tim House - FAA] 18:19:41
we're looking at C2s. Yes, they are the same size.

[Tim House - FAA] 18:19:47
But that is the current standard.

[Tim House - FAA] 18:19:49
that has been devised by the FAA.

[Tim House - FAA] 18:19:53
Same requirement. That's not me saying we don't consider modifications of standards.

[Tim House - FAA] 18:19:58
in master plans. That is the FAA standards.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:20:03
Okay, but even under the rules for modification of standards, it talks about

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:20:08
having a sequence, an iterative process

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:20:11
to getting somewhere.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:20:14
And so, you know.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:20:17
the master plan then could just say, you know, of course, we're going to apply for

a modification of standards

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:20:24
Once we initiate any project.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:20:26
And that's fine, but it would acknowledge that they're available.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:20:31
And that that is a part of the process.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:20:34
that would be considered

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:20:36
And I understand, okay, you know, eventually someday in the future we'll move

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:20:41
551…

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:20:44
when there's 100 million available or something

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:20:49
But there's not a good reason why there's not a good reason

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:20:53
to hold up the entire airport

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:20:55
on that basis. Of course, it's iterative.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:20:59
And in my submission, I pointed out we can move the fence right now

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:21:04
And get, you know, 95%

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:21:07
of where we want to be. So that's an iteration.

[Tim House - FAA] 18:21:11
So what you're asking us to do, you've already exceeded the standards of C2.

[Tim House - FAA] 18:21:16
you are operating at C2.

[Tim House - FAA] 18:21:19
and you're asking for a further extension.

[Tim House - FAA] 18:21:22
to allow larger aircraft

[Tim House - FAA] 18:21:24
to operate on a more regular basis.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:21:27
No, I don't think they are.

[Tim House - FAA] 18:21:27
So that's why we have, what's the extra 500 foot doing?

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:21:32
It's safety.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:21:36
Why did the 2000…

[Tim House - FAA] 18:21:36
For the larger aircraft, if they can't calculate that they can't operate.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:21:38
Why did the 2012

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 18:21:40
Hold on. Hold on, guys. Hold on, guys. Okay. One at a time. Let's bring the temperature down.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:21:44
Yeah. Well, I'll let Bruce answer that one. I mean, it's it's

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:21:48
It's because the existing C2 aircraft

[Tim House - FAA] 18:21:51
And our standards are safety as well.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:21:53
Beautiful.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:21:55
Yeah. Yeah. Well, I mean, yeah, well.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:21:57
I'm surprised you would say that, but to my knowledge, it's not the large

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:22:02
have any larger aircraft. It's just to allow existing aircraft

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:22:05

to take off with full fuel and

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:22:08
and load on a hot day. It's that simple.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 18:22:12
So it sounds like we need to get

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 18:22:15
clarification about this.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:22:17
Yeah, I think that's an important thing to clarify.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:22:20
Because I've interpreted that even in David's presentations

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:22:25
that the length of the runway is just for the design aircraft.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:22:29
And it came down from 1,000 feet extension to

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:22:33
500 on this.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:22:35
It's the same airport design guide, two different consultants got different numbers.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:22:42
So we could look at that, why that occurs, but still the age came up with

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:22:48
with an increase

[David Miller - Century West] 18:22:50
I think the…

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:22:50
But I don't want to get stuck on that. And Tim, I appreciate your comment but

[David Miller - Century West] 18:22:55
Yeah.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:22:56
But let's keep looking at that subject. I don't think there's any

[David Miller - Century West] 18:22:58
Yeah.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:23:00
intend here to do larger aircraft.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:23:02
I can clarify just a bit. I think going back to the facility requirements chapter, what we looked at was the current fleet mix and the forecast.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:23:11
And really what's happening is that those aircraft that require

[David Miller - Century West] 18:23:16
at the upper end, we'll say at the upper end of the range of the business jets that are representative of C2.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:23:24
There are conditions, high temperature conditions, where

[David Miller - Century West] 18:23:29
As Aaron pointed out, those aircraft aren't able to operate at a full payload, either passengers or fuel.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:23:36
So really, you're both right. What Tim is describing is the runway extension

[David Miller - Century West] 18:23:44
as analyzed would allow those large aircraft to operate without

[David Miller - Century West] 18:23:48
the same level of constraint.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:23:51
It isn't the next category up. There are some C2 aircraft that cannot

[David Miller - Century West] 18:23:56
And Bruce would probably agree, and probably some B-2 aircraft that cannot

[David Miller - Century West] 18:24:00
operate off the current runway

[David Miller - Century West] 18:24:03
at full load on extreme warm days.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:24:06
So that's part of the evaluation.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 18:24:08
Okay, great. Thanks for that clarification. Erin, do you have additional comments that you'd like to bring up?

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:24:13
Yes, I do. So the back to just…

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:24:15
briefly on the modification of standard.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:24:18
And I know there was some discussion of

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:24:22
going back to a b2

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:24:24
And I know, again, I think it was the FAA that said just you don't want to do that.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:24:29
But I would point out, and this is where it feels like Aurora is getting the short end of the stick.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:24:37
that, oh, what

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:24:38
What's the airport right up in Seattle with the 737s taking

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:24:44
taking off and landing all the time in a B2 airport. What is that? I'm forgetting the…

[Tim House - FAA] 18:24:49
Boeing Manufacturing Plant.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:24:49
Rented, rented, of course.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:24:51
you know and they just finished their master plan and somehow they ended up with a B2 with 737s taking off and landing

[Tim House - FAA] 18:24:52
Right.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:24:58
all the time. So it just shows

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:25:00
There's leagueway here somewhere and I hope that same sense of leeway and understanding

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:25:07

can be given to Aurora

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:25:10
what was given to Renton. And I'm sure Boeing was uh

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:25:15
a bigger opponent to tell them they couldn't do it.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:25:19
But I would just ask to try to be

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:25:22
fair to our C2 aircraft here at least.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:25:27
So I covered the i covered

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:25:29
public-private kind of partnership, modification of standards

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:25:33
the internal circulation

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:25:38
I want to just mention that the whole drain field thing

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:25:42
is not a request for a modification

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:25:45
And I think we've already submitted it. If we haven't.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:25:49
There's an NV5 geotech. They're a national firm. They work in Seattle airport every, you know, all over.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:25:56
They did a study that showed if we add some

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:26:00
geofabric.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:26:02
to the top of the drain field

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:26:05
It supports the C2 aircraft and and

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:26:09
fire trucks and everything else

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:26:11
So it's not a matter of a modification.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:26:14
We have a submittal.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:26:16
that shows compliance.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:26:19
with the support.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:26:20
And I would ask you to consider

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:26:23
you know, consider that closely.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:26:24
And I don't believe there's anything in the advisory circulars that say utility systems

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:26:30
cannot be in a runway safety area. They're in all the time.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:26:34
It even talks about them in the advisory circular.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:26:42
Lastly, and this is particularly for HTS,

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:26:46
they they

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:26:49
really incredibly strongly opposed to having their property shown as potentially being acquired

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:26:55
or desired to be acquired by the state

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:26:58
I think you all know there are you all know

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:27:01
you know, they're not just a national company they work internationally

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:27:06
They work in Africa, Europe.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:27:10
Asia, and this is their U.S. headquarters

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:27:15
They're best known, obviously, as firefighting all over the West, but they're much bigger than that.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:27:22
And I hope we…

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:27:24
respect them as a company and welcome them in oregon

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:27:30
for what they are.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:27:32
And showing their property being desired to be acquired by the state, I think they feel a real sense of

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:27:40
betrayal that that would ever occur.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:27:44
And they obviously they fly fixed wing as well

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:27:48
It's very important for firefighting

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:27:52
to be able to bring aircraft parts and things to wherever the fire is so they have fixed wing that are

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:27:59
servicing that. They need the runway. They wouldn't be here without the runway.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:28:05
And the other airport facilities.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:28:09
They're strong supporters of the airport.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:28:12
And if there's anything they can do to help us

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:28:15
I'm sure they would like to be a partner as well. We just have to ask them.

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 18:28:20

Aaron, question for you.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:28:22
Yeah.

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 18:28:22
So is the objection that…

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 18:28:26
that it just shows that

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 18:28:29
For example, if they

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 18:28:31
end up, hey, we want to move. We've outgrown it

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 18:28:34
we're a willing seller. Is the objection to that

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 18:28:38
that it's shown that if it comes up for sale

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 18:28:43
that we could use

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 18:28:45
federal funds if it's available to purchase it. Is that the objection that it's shown that way because

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 18:28:50
The only thing that we're looking for is really if somebody says, hey, we got it for sale. We're like, oh, cool. That'd be nice to be able to get that for state property.

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 18:29:00
we can't leverage federal funds unless it's shown on a master plan. So is that the problem or is there an issue? I just want

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 18:29:08
Clarification.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:29:09
I think what it does is it muddies their

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:29:14
Their title, it muddies…

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:29:17
you know, anything they're doing

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:29:20
I would recommend just ask, you know, is there anyone in the airport that's considering selling

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:29:26
And we can put your property, we can show your property for acquisition

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:29:31
And then it's a friendly offer.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:29:33
to the airport to the airport

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:29:36
companies, the private companies

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:29:39
Or like the private road, we could work with the different

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:29:46
private owners for that to whether they they're willing to

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:29:50
put that portion on as available for sale.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:29:54
But, you know, there's a term for it but that

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:30:00
The minute the government says it's going to buy something

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:30:03
then it devalues the property. It suddenly is worth less because no one wants to

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 18:30:05
Yeah, I heard that. Yep.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:30:09
to get in a fight with the government, they have you know too much

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:30:12
Too many attorneys, too much

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:30:15
It's kind of like you never win so it's uh

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:30:19
it's not doesn't look

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:30:21
Positive.

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 18:30:22
It's a worry that the ODAB would go through condemnation process. Is that the biggest concern?

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:30:26
Sure, sure. That's part of it, yeah.

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 18:30:29
Okay.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:30:29
Because you could.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:30:32
You know, and I guess what I don't really understand is

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:30:37
You can update an ALP and let's let's say there's suddenly a

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:30:43
a seller who comes up, he's very willing to sell to the state

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:30:48
Can't you do an update to the ALP to show that?

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 18:30:53
Okay, good points. Thank you.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:30:55
Yeah, I think I'll stop there and I can come back on any points that's helpful.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:31:01
I was going to say…

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:31:01
And I want to give my personal statement that

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:31:04
that I'm happy to help on anything, you know, any of these issues that

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:31:08
that could help the airport.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:31:11
Thank you, Aaron. Brandy, James Kirby with Century West is available and if

[David Miller - Century West] 18:31:18

If you can unmute him.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:31:20
Perhaps he can…

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 18:31:20
Oh yeah, I think, James, you can unmute.

[James Kirby - Century West Engineering] 18:31:22
Yeah, I'm unmuted now. Thank you.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:31:24
There you go. If you wanted to, James, if you wanted to add some technical detail on the drain field issue, please.

[Tim House - FAA] 18:31:25
Oh.

[James Kirby - Century West Engineering] 18:31:29
Yeah, so the drain field issue came up, obviously, and there's a lot of reasons it's not in compliance right now.

[James Kirby - Century West Engineering] 18:31:37
It can't support aircraft loads. It has…

[James Kirby - Century West Engineering] 18:31:41
structures in place right now that can't

[James Kirby - Century West Engineering] 18:31:44
support aircraft loads and exceed the surface for the ground

[James Kirby - Century West Engineering] 18:31:49
And it doesn't comply with grading requirements either. So there's a number of issues surrounding the existing one.

[James Kirby - Century West Engineering] 18:31:55
And we did receive the proposal from NB5 that Aaron mentions.

[James Kirby - Century West Engineering] 18:32:01
And there was an email conversation and a technical examination of that proposal

[James Kirby - Century West Engineering] 18:32:06
And that proposal as it stands today still wouldn't meet requirements. There was a number of

[James Kirby - Century West Engineering] 18:32:13
Request for technical information for an expanded design that didn't

[James Kirby - Century West Engineering] 18:32:18
come to anything. We never did see that.

[James Kirby - Century West Engineering] 18:32:19
There's a number of issues surrounding that. They're still outstanding.

[James Kirby - Century West Engineering] 18:32:24
The other piece of that was that proposal was basically

[James Kirby - Century West Engineering] 18:32:29
treating the issue by adding a cap.

[James Kirby - Century West Engineering] 18:32:31
to the existing drain field, which

[James Kirby - Century West Engineering] 18:32:34
Because it doesn't comply with grading standards now, adding a cap to it would worsen the issue of noncompliance with grading standards.

[James Kirby - Century West Engineering] 18:32:43
So without additional technical information surrounding that proposal.

[James Kirby - Century West Engineering] 18:32:48
As well as essentially a reconstruction of a reconstruction of

[James Kirby - Century West Engineering] 18:32:53
the entire drain field from scratch

[James Kirby - Century West Engineering] 18:32:56
Which at that point, I mean, FAAs weighed in and said that the drain field is not really a

[James Kirby - Century West Engineering] 18:33:04
a compliant facility for that area of the airport for being in the RSA.

[James Kirby - Century West Engineering] 18:33:09
Obviously, B2, it was compliant, but

[James Kirby - Century West Engineering] 18:33:13
At C2, when we're in that RSA already

[James Kirby - Century West Engineering] 18:33:17
And we're not meeting a bunch of those standards.

[James Kirby - Century West Engineering] 18:33:21
And reconstruction is really what would need to happen to even

[James Kirby - Century West Engineering] 18:33:25
Approach repairing the drain field and making it compliant where it's currently located

[James Kirby - Century West Engineering] 18:33:32

But still inside an RSA, which is problematic.

[James Kirby - Century West Engineering] 18:33:36
that's not something that's compatible with where we're at today with C2.

[James Kirby - Century West Engineering] 18:33:41
So.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 18:33:43
Erin, did you have a follow-on question?

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:33:43
Yeah. Well, I just want to

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:33:47
follow up that we had those conversations

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:33:51
But they didn't go anywhere. We wanted our geotech to talk to your geotech

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:33:56
that was denied.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:34:00
And we never received whatever you're talking about.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:34:04
You wanted additional information.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:34:07
And we're prepared to have the grading be correct. Yes, and it would be a rebuilding of it.

[James Kirby - Century West Engineering] 18:34:14
But it would have to be somewhere else, right? It still can't be inside the RSA given the structures you're proposing and the

[James Kirby - Century West Engineering] 18:34:21
we can actually evaluate it to know whether it's not it's actually going to carry aircraft objectively.

[James Kirby - Century West Engineering] 18:34:26
There just was not enough information given in those proposals to be able to make that examination.

[James Kirby - Century West Engineering] 18:34:31
by us or by our geotech.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:34:33
I would just ask that to be opened up again, because in my mind, it never got

actually

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:34:39
there was never a discussion. We proposed it and it just nothing ever came back to us.

[James Kirby - Century West Engineering] 18:34:44
There's an email chain that was back and forth that just kind of dead ended without any additional information from NV5. There was

[James Kirby - Century West Engineering] 18:34:50
know where we could go further with that examination so

[James Kirby - Century West Engineering] 18:34:53
That's where that dead ended.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:34:53
Yeah. Well, I have a different view. Yep.

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 18:34:55
Hey, Aaron, is there a way to have them provide additional information by the 23rd? Because that's the time that we're going to

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 18:35:03
be closing public comment.

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 18:35:06
If you can get that information, great. That'll be helpful for

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 18:35:12
the Century West team.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:35:15
I will do that if you will.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:35:18
provide to us something that actually says you can't have a drain field

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:35:22
in the runway safety area, because I don't see it in any of the

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:35:25
And we've proposed a method that it would work

[James Kirby - Century West Engineering] 18:35:29
Well, there's emails from FAA from around that time frame that said

[James Kirby - Century West Engineering] 18:35:34
you can't have a dream anymore.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:35:35
But I mean, I don't mean just just a word on a piece of paper. I want to see it in the advisory circulars. Where does it say it?

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:35:43
It needs to be a standard.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:35:46
It can't just be someone's opinion.

[James Kirby - Century West Engineering] 18:35:48
Well, you can have a structure that won't bear the load of aircraft in an area that has to be designed to bear the loads from aircraft.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:35:55
But that's the point. We showed how with geofabric it does

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:36:00
you know, maybe you've never used the geo fabric

[James Kirby - Century West Engineering] 18:36:03
If you bury a drain field, it's non-functional. It has to be towards the surface. It has to breathe. It's a living thing.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 18:36:10
I see Tony.

[James Kirby - Century West Engineering] 18:36:10
You can't bury it under a foot of rock.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 18:36:12
I see you, Tony, shaking your head. I'm going to get to you in just a second.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:36:13
Yeah.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 18:36:17
So, okay, so I'm hearing that there needs to be some

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 18:36:19
Now's not the time to debate that, so I agree.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 18:36:21
Okay, so there needs to be a loop of closed

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 18:36:24
closing this loop is what I'm hearing and doing that by email so um

[James Kirby - Century West Engineering] 18:36:30
Yeah.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 18:36:30
So it sounds like that can happen. Okay, so let me, Tony, it looks like you want to follow up.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 18:36:37
And so I just gave you the unmute. And then I just wanted to let you know that next up is Jamie Stickle and then

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 18:36:46
David Wagner. And just really quick, Tony, if anyone, PAC members, if you put something in the chat

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 18:36:54
I'm going to switch it over to everyone. And so just to let you know, and it looks like Brian Asher, it looks like you need to leave

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 18:37:02
For a council meeting. So thank you for letting us know. But just so that people who are attending can see the chat, just make sure you

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 18:37:13
list it as everyone and then everyone can see that. So again, Tony, I'll hand it off to you. Then it'll be Jamie, then David Wagner, and then Ted Miller, Millar.

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:37:24
Okay, four points. First off, on the drain field, because I'm the chair of HDSC and I was in that thread with James Kirby and Betty Stansbury.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 18:37:25
Sorry.

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:37:37
To be clear.

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:37:38
We went back and forth and shared information.

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:37:41
Additionally, ODAV retained Century West to do a study on the drain field situation and where the stuff could be ported to.

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:37:53
Century West met with zero participation from the airport to gather data

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:37:57
about people's influence until HDSC stepped in and started helping find that data.

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:38:04
And then I asked Betty Stansberry what happened with that potential study to port

everything up to the north end of the airport.

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:38:12
to Columbia Helicopters who has the capability to take all the sewage.

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:38:15
And it was a potential solution to a big problem

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:38:19
But it evaporated it stopped.

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:38:22
And part of this, James, and Dickenji, you too, that takes me to my second point.

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:38:28
of all we're asking for is a collaborative effort to sit down at a table

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:38:34
and have a discussion.

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:38:36
The challenge I see with these Zoom calls is exactly what's going on.

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:38:41
when we speak.

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:38:43
You can chime in any time and devalue and dismiss our comments

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:38:48
at will. You can bring in multiple people to do so.

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:38:51
And we just have to take it. Right now, Aaron is muted. He can't talk because Brandy has him muted and he can't unmute himself.

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:38:58
He can't share information that would bolster my point.

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:39:01
what i know but my point is, this is not the way to do this, which takes me to ORS 8

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:39:09
36, 642, which was based on Senate Bill 680.

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:39:13
Aurora State Airport is a public

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:39:17

private partnership airport. It is a through the fence

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:39:21
airport. None of this

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:39:23
where we got to now on this master plan

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:39:26
should have got to where we are.

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:39:28
because of stovepipe mentality of designing a master plan that, as David Miller said.

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:39:34
we can only put a vehicle service road

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:39:38
on public property.

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:39:40
Because we are unique in the entire nation.

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:39:44
There are very few airports like us.

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:39:47
we should be working collaboratively

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:39:50
to establish things like Bruce did long time ago with Stenbach way so that the state would have access

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:39:57
to their property and the tower.

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:39:59
Just like we put the drain field out on the state property to help HDSE.

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:40:05
Just as in the previous master plan, the internal circulation road

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:40:11
different from a VSR. The internal circulation road was primarily put on private property where people volunteered to do that. We still have

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:40:21
The ability to put it on private property because Ted has volunteered to put a portion of it on his property if we can ever use it.

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:40:29
But that would cover dang near, I believe, Naren, shake your head because you were muted. Is it 75 or 80% of the internal circulation road would be on private property?

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:40:41
Yeah, pretty close.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 18:40:42
And Erin i just

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 18:40:44
Did you want to unmute?

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:40:45
Well, that's the point. Brandy, we shouldn't have to ask to unmute. And that's the whole point of when we're in the room.

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:40:52
we can have a collaborative effort to come up with something that makes sense for everybody involved.

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 18:40:57
So don't.

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:40:57
I'd like Ben Williams at the table.

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 18:41:00
Tony, you know.

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:41:01
Yeah, I'd like John Bickford at the table. I like all these people at the table so that we can figure this out.

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 18:41:03
we we

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 18:41:06
We want to have accessibility to everybody and everybody, it's hard to do that.

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:41:07
Bye.

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 18:41:11
I know it's a holdover and I know being in a room is great because that's how I operate.

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:41:12

No.

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 18:41:16
But at the same time, it's sort of like what we've done and we're pretty much

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:41:20
but now that we're getting we're getting reasons just like i said kenji exactly what i said just happened

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 18:41:22
through the process to a point where we've

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 18:41:25
we've gotten to hear, and this is what we're going to go forward with. Tony, if you let me finish speaking.

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:41:27
You just devalued my suggestion and told me why

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 18:41:32
We're getting to a point where…

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 18:41:36
You've told folks like

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 18:41:38
this is the way you as the agency

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 18:41:42
have chosen to do it so you know

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 18:41:46
future master plans, I agree with you, but I think to this point, this is how we're doing things for accessibility purposes.

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 18:41:52
And we've been very transparent. I get where you're coming from. I see your perspective.

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 18:41:56
But I think at this point in the process, we continue as is. I hear your concerns and I understand.

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:42:04
Kenji, I hear your concerns and I value what you have to say.

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:42:08
The thing is.

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:42:11

Century West, ODAV, you all go home at night and you get a paycheck.

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:42:16
you're looking at condemning property.

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:42:18
And that is a taking that is going to ruin people.

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:42:22
And that's why

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:42:24
it is never too late to shift course. This thing has not been adopted. It has not been

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:42:29
It's not too late. You keep telling me it is, but it's not. So let me finish.

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 18:42:30
Tony. Tony, Tony, Tony, Tony, quick thing for you.

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:42:35
Yeah.

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 18:42:35
What did I say at the beginning of the meeting?

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 18:42:38
Do you remember? We are open.

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 18:42:42
to refining the preferred alternative.

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 18:42:45
So make sure you give suggestions, right?

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:42:50
Yes, keep the drain field in place. Stop trying to condemn property and then don't

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:42:55
put the private property out to Airport Road up for purchase by the state. There's no need for any of that.

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 18:43:02
Okay.

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:43:02
We don't need to tear down the hangers. The vehicle service road does not, it's not conducive

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:43:08
to business and economic development. I talked to Art Chappett at Biz Oregon.

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:43:12
And we all invested in this airport so that we could have business and bring jobs.

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:43:18
in light of, you know, not in light of but you know in accordance with the statute

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:43:23
But what the state's doing by producing this plan

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:43:27
is it puts that at jeopardy.

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:43:30
I'd urge you to remove the VSR, the vehicle circulation road, because that's something that goes at PDX.

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:43:36
There's another significant point. Let me finish. There's another significant point, the parallel taxi lane.

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 18:43:37
I want…

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 18:43:39
Sure.

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:43:43
Not the taxiway. Two different things.

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:43:45
About three years ago, I met with Betty Stansbury out on the apron and we looked at across the front of CCAP.

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:43:52
And I offered to paint green lines, private enterprise would pay for the green, what is John Bickford call them, the putting greens.

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:44:01
The only caveat to that is that the easement that exists for CCAP owners

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:44:08
to taxi their aircraft across that to gain access to the ramp because the ramp would be tight.

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:44:14
And we explored that.

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:44:16
But that would and we would still explore that

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:44:19
with some conditions that I think we could do.

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:44:22
But it doesn't cost the state anything. It reduces the cost of your whole project.

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:44:27
But those are the kind of things that we should be talking about and should have been talking about a long time ago before we threaten to condemn hangers.

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 18:44:29
Yeah.

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:44:35
So…

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 18:44:35
So what are some of the conditions?

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 18:44:36
I'm curious. You mentioned…

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:44:38
Right now, Raul has told us that if somebody taxis into that green area, he is required to do some sort of report, report it to the state. It gets investigated because according to

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 18:44:43
Yeah.

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 18:44:47
Okay.

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:44:50
Some FAR, you cannot taxi across one of those green putting greens. So let's not paint it green. Let's paint it as some other conditional area.

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:44:59
some other way so that we can cause the aircraft leaving the ramp to not have direct access

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:45:05
to the runway. We're willing to do that.

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:45:08
But that would eliminate the need for the parallel taxi lane

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:45:13
and the vehicle service road.

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:45:15
If we could get into a collaborative mode and do some brainstorming, there's some absolutely crazy ideas out there.

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:45:22
Going back to the drain field, when I hear people say, no, it has to support an aircraft, Tehachapi pumps raw sewage

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:45:30
raw sewage into a field that is in their RSA.

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:45:35
How do they get away with that?

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:45:38
That's raw sewage. How does that support an aircraft?

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:45:40
But we can show you that we can have our drain field that supports

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:45:46
an aircraft and the emergency vehicles

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:45:50
But we're told we can't even discuss it.

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:45:53
So these things that these things that

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:45:55
they're very, very frustrating because they're very frustrating

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 18:45:57
Yeah, I get it.

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:45:57
We keep trying to bring people to the table. And we were told tonight we couldn't bring two people to the table

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:46:03
that had valuable information, which we really think that's a wrong position for you guys to take.

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 18:46:09
To that point, remember what I also said at the beginning?

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 18:46:13

They'll have full access in public comment. We just have to get through the three minutes and then but

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 18:46:20
The PAC process is certain there's certain members of the pack and you know we can't do last minute

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:46:20
Shenji.

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:46:26
We'll table that discussion till later, because that's not a fight you want to have with me.

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 18:46:28
We'll discuss it later.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 18:46:33
Okay.

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:46:34
But going back to the collaborative effort, we need to figure out a way to get this done collaboratively

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 18:46:38
Yeah.

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:46:39
to move this forward because taking people's property and threatening them, even though that there is no money to do it, it creates pre-condemnation blight and that's damaging.

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 18:46:50
Yeah. Yeah. To…

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:46:50
it's that's that's a horrible

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:46:53
horrible thing to do to people.

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 18:46:55
To your first point, I want to mention, would you be open to the idea if we talked about it, sort of what I mentioned to aaron

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 18:47:06
about the circulation road, the internal circulation road, but actually putting that on our match plan.

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 18:47:11

with the idea that we could

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 18:47:15
put it there's put it there

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 18:47:17
for acquisition so we can actually use FAA funds for it. Because remember, it has to be

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 18:47:24
pretty much built, right? And then we're going to need to maintain it as well.

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:47:28
Two points. People have already volunteered their private property for that use. And if we had collaborative

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 18:47:32
Yeah.

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:47:35
conversations a long time ago like we asked for to have that discussion to look at the need for a vehicle service road

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:47:43
not a vehicle service road, but an internal circulation road

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:47:48
which achieves similar but different goals. It promotes economic success at a ga airport

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:47:56
what a vehicle service road does is it promotes the support of airline traffic at an airline airport like PDX.

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:48:03
it isn't conducive to a GA airport in which we are. We're not a part 139 airport.

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 18:48:03
Yeah.

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 18:48:07
Okay. Okay.

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:48:08
So let's look at a GA report and make it successful GA. And the private properties, because of the through the fence agreements.

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 18:48:13
No, you're…

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 18:48:17
Yeah.

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:48:17
They were already bound to be bound

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:48:20
for aviation use. So what we'd like to do is work with the state to keep those in aviation use

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:48:26
put in an internal circulation road that promotes economic development and jobs.

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:48:32
And anyway, I'll stop.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 18:48:34
Okay. Did you get your four points mentioned, Tony?

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:48:37
Yeah, that was all four of them.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 18:48:39
Okay.

[Tony Beach - ODAV] 18:48:40
Can I have one clarifying question for Tony?

[Tony Beach - ODAV] 18:48:44
I'm curious, so we got a lot of input from the pack throughout this process on including vehicle service road.

[Tony Beach - ODAV] 18:48:51
In the master plan.

[Tony Beach - ODAV] 18:48:53
And then we got a lot of pushback when we showed one on property that the state would own.

[Tony Beach - ODAV] 18:48:59
When Kenji just asked about acquiring property

[Tony Beach - ODAV] 18:49:03
further back

[Tony Beach - ODAV] 18:49:06
But then you just mentioned tony that a lot of

[Tony Beach - ODAV] 18:49:09
private property owners have already volunteered and and have

[Tony Beach - ODAV] 18:49:13
basically already agreed to do that. I'm just wondering, what do you need from ODAB? Why is it so important for the master plan

[Tony Beach - ODAV] 18:49:20
process right now.

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:49:23
Because the parallel taxi lane

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:49:26
And the VSR is depicted in the pervert alternative

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:49:30
are the cause and the basis

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:49:32
for taking the front row hangers.

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:49:34
We don't need those, either one of those things.

[Tony Beach - ODAV] 18:49:38
Okay, I hear you.

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:49:39
Therefore, we don't need to take

[Tony Beach - ODAV] 18:49:40
I hear you on that.

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:49:41
Okay, therefore we don't need to take front ringers. So let me finish. The ICR, internal circulation, wrote two different things.

[Tony Beach - ODAV] 18:49:43
But for…

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:49:48
Because you know about that road. You and I worked on that together since you started.

[Tony Beach - ODAV] 18:49:49
Right.

[Tony Beach - ODAV] 18:49:51
Sure. Sure.

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:49:52

The thing is, is almost all of the road

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:49:56
currently the pavement currently exists.

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:49:59
there is a section that does not exist.

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:50:02
The owner of that property is willing to make it available. And if you'd unmute him, he'd probably even say so.

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:50:08
But we can have that internal circulation road to get tugs, fuel trucks, like Bruce said

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:50:14
a pickup truck full of airplane parts up and down. Somebody needs their radio fixed can run it down the other end of the airport without having to go out on airport road.

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:50:24
we can have bicycles on it. We can have walkers. We have people who want to exercise.

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:50:29
But you can't do that on a VSR. The VSR, and I ask you this via email, Tony, I ask you, who are you going to allow on a VSR?

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:50:37
that is up in front of the ramp on the state land. And the answer I got back was it would be only people who were qualified

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:50:44
by the state to drive on that road and allowed by the state. And I asked specifically, would I be able to drive my personal vehicle on that road if I needed to run from Wilson's hangar

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:50:53
up to the north end of the airport to dr dave

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:50:57
Wagner for just a private purpose.

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:50:59
And the answer I got back was only vehicles allowed by the state.

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:51:04
And it's undetermined and undefined at this time.

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:51:07
an internal circulation road, anybody can use it.

[Tony Beach - ODAV] 18:51:11
So Tony, my question is, if the property owners are willing and if they're unwilling to sell, but they're willing to create the vehicle service road.

[Tony Beach - ODAV] 18:51:20
I'm trying to understand how it's relevant to the master plan

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:51:23
It's called an easement. It's called an easement. It's easy. Just the same way that the state

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:51:29
operates on Stenbach. It is an easement.

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:51:33
That's simple. Yeah. And see, that's the point. I mean, Dave has information he'd like to share

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 18:51:36
Oh, David, are you okay

[Tony Beach - ODAV] 18:51:38
Okay.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 18:51:39
Yeah, go ahead, David.

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:51:40
Yeah.

[Tony Beach - ODAV] 18:51:40
Well, so Tony, I think my main point is we can continue that conversation.

[Tony Beach - ODAV] 18:51:45
outside of the master plan on what you consider the internal circulation road

[Tony Beach - ODAV] 18:51:49
If it's not going to, if we're not going to show property acquisition in the master plan

[Tony Beach - ODAV] 18:51:54
or we're not going to consider, or if you're proposing we

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:51:54
Yeah.

[Tony Beach - ODAV] 18:51:57

go away from the vehicle service road the way we've shown it in our preferred alternative

[Tony Beach - ODAV] 18:52:02
then it's separate from the master plan discussion.

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:52:04
How did it get in the last ALP?

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:52:06
on private property? How did the FAA approve it and adopt it in the last ALP in 2012?

[Tony Beach - ODAV] 18:52:11
This master plan is, as David Miller showed earlier, is looking at state property only.

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:52:19
This is that stovepipe problem. And this is that problem with this is not collaborative, Tony. This is everybody else is muted except you and me. Dave has information and yeah, this is

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 18:52:28
No, David, you're unmuted.

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:52:32
Yeah.

[David Waggoner (Willamette Aviation & Tri-Prop)] 18:52:32
Oh, thank you very much. Tony's perhaps i can help answer Tony Beach's question as to

[David Waggoner (Willamette Aviation & Tri-Prop)] 18:52:38
what does the internal circulation road have to do with the master plan?

[David Waggoner (Willamette Aviation & Tri-Prop)] 18:52:42
I think the answer to that is really simple.

[David Waggoner (Willamette Aviation & Tri-Prop)] 18:52:45
If we get the internal circulation road approved and as it's been already stated.

[David Waggoner (Willamette Aviation & Tri-Prop)] 18:52:50
it's almost complete.

[David Waggoner (Willamette Aviation & Tri-Prop)] 18:52:52
It just hasn't been put into effect yet.

[David Waggoner (Willamette Aviation & Tri-Prop)] 18:52:54
If we can do that, then the master plan is affected because we're not going to need the vehicle the vehicle uh

[David Waggoner (Willamette Aviation & Tri-Prop)] 18:53:03
service road and we're not going to need the taxi lane. So that frees up additional

[David Waggoner (Willamette Aviation & Tri-Prop)] 18:53:08
That's how it will affect the master plan.

[Tony Beach - ODAV] 18:53:10
No, I get that. And, you know, what I've said years ago is if you're willing and you guys have the property, great, do it.

[Tony Beach - ODAV] 18:53:18
the state portion, we already have laid out what that would look like on the state portion of the property.

[Tony Beach - ODAV] 18:53:24
My question is when we're getting that feedback for a vehicle service road in the master plan.

[Tony Beach - ODAV] 18:53:30
And just trying to clarify, you know, are we looking at property acquisition? Are we looking at including it in state property now?

[Tony Beach - ODAV] 18:53:37
then then what is that going to look like in this master plan? And if not, if it is like you just mentioned, you know.

[Tony Beach - ODAV] 18:53:43
unwilling private property owners that they're going to maintain ownership

[Tony Beach - ODAV] 18:53:46
then that's a separate discussion outside of the master plan.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 18:53:51
Ted, it looks like you want to chime in.

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:53:54
Yeah.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 18:53:57
you should be able to unmute.

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 18:54:01
that internal circulation road.

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 18:54:04
Tonight is the first time that I heard that they couldn't spend funds

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 18:54:09
on an easement and they had to own it. So that's never been proposed to the

property owners.

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 18:54:16
There are other things that are affected that could maybe be considered

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 18:54:20
Because you have what they call setbacks

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 18:54:24
against roadways and things like that.

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 18:54:27
So if there's some other kind of an agreement that can be worked out with Marion County.

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 18:54:32
So that the existing hangars that abut this internal circulation road

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 18:54:37
don't have to have an additional 25 foot

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 18:54:40
setback or a 30 foot setback from this road if the state owns it

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 18:54:46
Maybe that's something we could all consider, but it goes back to what Tony said, if you would just sit down and work with us instead of trying to prove

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 18:54:56
that we're wrong and that we don't have anything to say.

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 18:55:00
It's a different category of airport than PDX it has

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 18:55:03
It's just like trying to take these same PDX rules and apply them to Pacific City.

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 18:55:09
Or Cresswell. There are different categories of airports and they have different needs.

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 18:55:15
And this one is what they call a cluster

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 18:55:19
business airports.

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 18:55:21
And this was put together by the state

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 18:55:24
Economic Development Department, Senator Wyden, Senator Smith.

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 18:55:30
Or some of the original ones.

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 18:55:32
that had that and they put together what they call clusters of businesses. And this airport has been designed and

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 18:55:41
built out according to their recommendations

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 18:55:45
For all the companies that are on there work back and forth together.

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 18:55:50
So that one company provides a service that the others can use.

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 18:55:54
and the ability to go back and forth makes it that way.

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 18:56:00
What we have is we've got private ownership of 56

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 18:56:05
of the airport footprint.

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 18:56:07
But yet we get less than 6% of anything to say about it.

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 18:56:12
In fact, we get nothing to say about it. We've asked for meetings.

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 18:56:16
They say, okay, you can have the meeting

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 18:56:19
But we can't discuss the master plan.

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 18:56:21
it's like a kangaroo court

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 18:56:25
you're making the decisions

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 18:56:27
you're analyzing our information and then you come back and say we analyzed your information but

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 18:56:33
We don't like it, so here's the way it is.

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 18:56:35
Your idea of a public partnership

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 18:56:38
private public partnership is, okay, we're partners. I'll tell you what to do and you do it.

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:56:45
Yep.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 18:56:47
Tony Beach, did that answer your question about the internal circulation

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 18:56:53
and its relationship to the master plan.

[Tony Beach - ODAV] 18:56:56
No, I just wanted to be, I mean, thank you, Ted, for your comments, but…

[Tony Beach - ODAV] 18:57:01
But I just wanted to

[Tony Beach - ODAV] 18:57:04
be clear, I think I've made it clear where the

[Tony Beach - ODAV] 18:57:08
the vehicle service road and the internal circulation road kind of fit within the

[Tony Beach - ODAV] 18:57:13
the scope of the master plan in this discussion. So if there's anything to add on that or if anyone wants to

[Tony Beach - ODAV] 18:57:21
add on to what Ted was discussing.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 18:57:24
I do want to get, I mean, Jamie was next up. And so I do want to get to her, but I want to make sure that we kind of

[Tony Beach - ODAV] 18:57:31
Yep.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 18:57:32
close out this conversation. Again, I know it's hard to be virtual and

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 18:57:37
And so we're trying. It is nice because so many PAC members can attend virtually.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 18:57:45
So David and Ted, are there other things? And then Tim, I see your hand up as well, that you want to

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 18:57:52
comment on for this

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 18:57:54
part of the conversation, what Tony Helbling raised um and this

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 18:57:58
part of the conversation.

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 18:58:01
Brandy, can I just ask Tony Beach

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 18:58:02
Yeah.

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 18:58:05
Is Tony or Tim, are they saying?

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 18:58:08
the state.

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 18:58:10
could buy that internal circulation road that we have shown.

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 18:58:14
And if you were to do that.

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 18:58:17
Can we change?

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 18:58:18
the other rules by working with Marion County for the planning and things like that.

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 18:58:23
to eliminate the setback requirements.

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 18:58:27
So that…

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 18:58:29
You know, who cares who owns the thing? We're all going to use it. It would be to use

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 18:58:33

of the overall airport. So maybe that's something that

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 18:58:37
owners would consider but they have to

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 18:58:41
Then solve two other problems that that

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 18:58:44
may cause. One would be the setbacks.

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 18:58:48
The other is we'd have to have easements in reverse then

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 18:58:52
that would allow all of the

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 18:58:54
private property owners to access

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 18:58:57
that new circulation road that the state would then own.

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 18:59:01
there's just a whole bunch of things.

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 18:59:03
If they could be worked out in a collaborative fashion like

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 18:59:07
Tony suggested, we're open to see if we can't make it work.

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:59:12
their idea is that if we can collaboratively come up with and and i'm i'm Ted, I'm not saying your idea is crazy

[Tony Beach - ODAV] 18:59:13
Yeah.

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:59:18
And I know that Marion County is on here too, but if we could work with Marion County to look at variances on a county road and establish this as a county road.

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:59:28
on private property or something along those lines. But if you get the people at the table, you come up with crazy ideas that when you start putting them together, it makes sense and it moves this whole thing forward in a public-private partnership.

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:59:39

Instead of making a plan that, and I get what you're saying, Tim House and Tony Beach, I get what you're saying. You have rules and regulations. You can hold up and quote all day that make you say what you have to say. I get it.

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:59:50
But it doesn't change the fact that if we work together and figure out a path forward.

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 18:59:57
we can boom this airport even bigger than it is. I mean, if you look at all the property on the airport.

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:00:03
most of what it is not developed belongs to the state.

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:00:07
Everything else has exploded.

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:00:10
so

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:00:11
Tim, do you want to respond to that?

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:00:13
Yeah.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:00:15
Or Tony?

[Tim House - FAA] 19:00:16
I was jumping in on something from the previous session and Tony touched on as well about changing the alp

[Tim House - FAA] 19:00:24
after they've been asked

[Tim House - FAA] 19:00:27
if they want to sell the property.

[Tim House - FAA] 19:00:30
the whole concept of the master plan is engaging the public interest.

[Tim House - FAA] 19:00:34
getting the input, getting the comments.

[Tim House - FAA] 19:00:38
So just saying, oh, we got somebody that came up for sale on their property and we want to add it to the ALP and change that ALP.

[Tim House - FAA] 19:00:46
there's no public input. There's no public engagement there. That's very difficult for us to be able to do that.

[Tim House - FAA] 19:00:53
and represent that it is therefore eligible for FAA funding.

[Tim House - FAA] 19:00:58
It either gets shown as to be acquired and sometimes they have that discussion and it gets acquired.

[Tim House - FAA] 19:01:04
Or it doesn't and you go through some type of public process

[Tim House - FAA] 19:01:08
to get that property added

[Tim House - FAA] 19:01:11
to the exhibit A, so it could be acquired with grant funds.

[Tim House - FAA] 19:01:15
That's what I wanted to speak towards.

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:01:18
I'll speak for South End Air Park, and I'll tell you right now, nobody down in that area wants the state to ever acquire that property.

[Tony Beach - ODAV] 19:01:19
And…

[Tony Beach - ODAV] 19:01:27
I just wanted to add to what

[Tony Beach - ODAV] 19:01:31
version that Ted had mentioned about the reverse of what was proposed

[Tony Beach - ODAV] 19:01:36
the state acquiring the property and then

[Tony Beach - ODAV] 19:01:37
entering some kind of agreement for people to use it.

[Tony Beach - ODAV] 19:01:41
In that case, it would need to be shown as property acquisition on the master plan.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:01:50
Okay.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:01:52
anything i know we have time. We have about 30 minutes for the pack before we get

to the public comments.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:02:02
Ted, anything you wanted to add to this? I know you had your hand up from before too, and we can get back to you.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:02:08
But I just want to check in. Jamie had her hand up next.

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:02:15
I guess what you're asking me, Brandy?

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:02:18
Yeah, I just wanted, I know you were chiming in on

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:02:22
some things that Tony and David was as well. Some things that Tony had said, and I just wanted to make sure we close that loop before we move on to Jamie.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:02:31
So David and Ted, if there's anything you want to add to close this out.

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:02:32
I guess…

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:02:35
Yeah, just a couple of things because most of the things I had on my list we're already talking about one is the

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:02:41
working collaboratively on a public-private partnership concept.

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:02:46
to see if we can't solve these other problems.

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:02:50
the sewer.

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:02:51
And the SEP system, I would like to encourage you to do the same thing. Let us have a

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:02:57
meeting with our consultants.

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:02:59
Century West and see if we can't

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:03:03
prove that what we proposed already

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:03:06
would meet the requirements.

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:03:09
The second is that

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:03:12
TLM Holdings, my company

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:03:14
that owns a church property and submit and submitted

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:03:18
like 97 page.

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:03:22
of articles on things we think need to be done

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:03:26
And that was in previous

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:03:29
PAC meetings that we've never heard from them.

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:03:32
they've never been acknowledged.

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:03:34
I'd like to ask those to be brought back into this.

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:03:40
So we don't have to resubmit them, bring them back into this

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:03:43
PAC meeting so that it's

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:03:45
part of it and if we're going to have these open discussions

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:03:49
I think the combination of what we submitted

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:03:52
what Aaron Fagry has submitted, what Tony Hebling

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:03:55
and some of the other airport PAC members.

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:03:58

You're going to find there's a lot of commonality.

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:04:01
But I think the major thing

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:04:03
that we're against is against

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:04:06
the parallel taxiway

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:04:09
the internal circulation road that

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:04:12
The state has prepared that

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:04:14
goes along the runway. We want them to use our internal circulation road

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:04:17
Yeah, sure. Yes, sir.

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:04:19
And that eliminates 90% of the objections to the preferred master plan.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:04:28
Okay, great. Thank you, Ted.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:04:31
I'm going to

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:04:33
jump over to jamie.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:04:35
And then I can check back in because I know David and Ted had their hands up. And so I just want to make sure that we get their comments.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:04:44
So Jamie, go ahead. I know you have a comment.

[Jamie Stickel, City of Canby] 19:04:48
Good evening, everybody. Jamie Stickle. I'm the Director of Economic Development for the City of Canby.

[Jamie Stickel, City of Canby] 19:04:55
And in anticipation of tonight's meeting, I met with our city administrator and Canby's mayor

[Jamie Stickel, City of Canby] 19:05:01
And the mayor sent a letter. We emailed it to Brandy, Tony Beach, and Alex Thomas earlier tonight, and I'm happy to share it with whoever in the group.

[Jamie Stickel, City of Canby] 19:05:11
But I'll read that as part of our public comment because I think it bolsters a lot of what has been said this evening.

[Jamie Stickel, City of Canby] 19:05:18
So my name is Brian Hodson and I serve as mayor for the city of Canby, a position I have served in for the last 12 years.

[Jamie Stickel, City of Canby] 19:05:24
During my tenure, the Aurora Airport has been the subject of many decisions and deliberations

[Jamie Stickel, City of Canby] 19:05:29
planning and process. The City of Canby views the Aurora Airport as an economic driver for the region.

[Jamie Stickel, City of Canby] 19:05:35
It serves as a vital facility for businesses housed in Canby, as well as neighboring cities.

[Jamie Stickel, City of Canby] 19:05:41
The Aurora Airport and growth around the airport is important to the industry and can be now and as we look to the future.

[Jamie Stickel, City of Canby] 19:05:49
The City of Canby's position has not changed as far as the Aurora Airport is concerned.

[Jamie Stickel, City of Canby] 19:05:54
The City of Canby supports the airport as an economic driver.

[Jamie Stickel, City of Canby] 19:05:58
We support the businesses that utilize the airport and house their airplanes on site.

[Jamie Stickel, City of Canby] 19:06:03
Furthermore, we support the long-range planning efforts currently underway with the effort to update the Aurora Airport Master Plan.

[Jamie Stickel, City of Canby] 19:06:11
As the master planning efforts have continued, we have learned of concerns brought forward through the Aurora Master Plan Pack.

[Jamie Stickel, City of Canby] 19:06:18
In fact, it would appear these differences may damage the businesses who rely on the airport to run their day-to-day operations.

[Jamie Stickel, City of Canby] 19:06:25
and therefore impacts the economic development opportunities Canby is pursuing.

[Jamie Stickel, City of Canby] 19:06:30
We have heard the requests of at least one business who has asked

[Jamie Stickel, City of Canby] 19:06:34
for a process that is conducive to collaboration.

[Jamie Stickel, City of Canby] 19:06:38
The City of Canby requests a process that is collaborative and transparent.

[Jamie Stickel, City of Canby] 19:06:42
As members of the Aurora Airport PAC have requested an opportunity for stakeholders to meet in person and determine a plan that will be beneficial to all.

[Jamie Stickel, City of Canby] 19:06:50
We echo this request.

[Jamie Stickel, City of Canby] 19:06:52
The City of Canby would be willing to host such a meeting in order to support the overarching goal that this project serves many.

[Jamie Stickel, City of Canby] 19:06:59
Not just the few who are driving it.

[Jamie Stickel, City of Canby] 19:07:00
Thank you for your time and consideration. And I would just note, in addition to that, I heard what

[Jamie Stickel, City of Canby] 19:07:07
what Kenji said about making sure that it's an accessible process. And I would just note that the city of canby has

[Jamie Stickel, City of Canby] 19:07:14
buildings that are ADA accessible. We have Zoom capabilities and we provide very good snacks.

[Jamie Stickel, City of Canby] 19:07:20
When you're going through a process and people are begging for in-person meetings and begging for something that's collaborative and we can work together, I don't think that the

[Jamie Stickel, City of Canby] 19:07:29
process should just continue. We're doing it this way. It might be time to just put a small pause

[Jamie Stickel, City of Canby] 19:07:35
bring people together, allow those who are able to come into the room can be

centrally located. We'd love to house you all and find a solution that

[Jamie Stickel, City of Canby] 19:07:43
moves forward, just like Kenji said at the beginning of the meeting and then again to Mr. Hubbling, that this is an opportunity for all of us to engage.

[Jamie Stickel, City of Canby] 19:07:49
For us to work together. I even wrote it down. Open to refining the preferred alternative.

[Jamie Stickel, City of Canby] 19:07:54
I think that it's time and I think that I'd love to see your faces in person.

[Jamie Stickel, City of Canby] 19:07:58
Thank you very much.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:08:00
Great. Thank you, Jamie. And thank you to the mayor for um

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:08:05
spending or getting that message through to you.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:08:09
So I would propose it's 708. I would propose we take a two minute break

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:08:14
come back because I know we've been at this for two hours now. So take a two minute break, come back at 710.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:08:22
And then I see John and I'll check in with David and Ted. And I think I might have seen Aaron kind of raise your hand. So let's just take a two minute break.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:08:32
We'll come right back and continue this conversation and then get to the public.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:08:37
At 7.30.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:10:28
All right.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:10:35
Those two minutes flew by.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:10:38
So we'll um so we'll

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:10:40
bring you all back now.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:10:43
And we'll all

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:10:45
pop over here to you, John.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:10:55
Oh, I can't hear you for some reason.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:11:07
Maybe try again. Let's try again.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:11:12
I can't hear you still.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:11:16
Um…

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:11:25
Hmm.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:11:27
I wonder if we could have you leave and rejoin maybe

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:11:34
or check

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:11:35
your audio. Let's see. If you go to your little microphone and then there's a little arrow up.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:11:41
And maybe just check

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:11:43
which microphone you're using.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:11:56
Oh, did we…

[Jon Bickford(Atlantic Aviation)] 19:11:57
You got me now?

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:11:58
Yeah, there we go.

[Jon Bickford(Atlantic Aviation)] 19:12:00
Well, I got a feedback here.

[Jon Bickford(Atlantic Aviation)] 19:12:05
Hopefully you only hear one of them.

[Jon Bickford(Atlantic Aviation)] 19:12:07
Okay. So anyway…

[Jon Bickford(Atlantic Aviation)] 19:12:10
Kudos to the young lady from Canby. I think it'd be a great place we all get together. Snacks are good, so what I hear.

[Jon Bickford(Atlantic Aviation)] 19:12:16
But talking about the preferred alternative

[Jon Bickford(Atlantic Aviation)] 19:12:21
I'm not really impressed with how it's laid out i mean the

[Jon Bickford(Atlantic Aviation)] 19:12:24
The back vehicle road, if we can make that work, that would be great.

[Jon Bickford(Atlantic Aviation)] 19:12:29
But the…

[Jon Bickford(Atlantic Aviation)] 19:12:31
Just speaking from my end of the field alone

[Jon Bickford(Atlantic Aviation)] 19:12:35
The collaborative side of this ain't really doing that good because we closed down for a week. I came back and there's a green spot painted across the front of my ramp, effectively shutting down my

[Jon Bickford(Atlantic Aviation)] 19:12:43
main source of my airplanes getting off on my ramp.

[Jon Bickford(Atlantic Aviation)] 19:12:47
With no explanation, no talking, no nothing. It was just there. And then my pilot started getting written up automatically.

[Jon Bickford(Atlantic Aviation)] 19:12:53
And if you look at the new preferred alternative, they extend that

[Jon Bickford(Atlantic Aviation)] 19:12:57
pretty much all the way across the front of my ramp, closing off my other entrance to get around the green space they've already painted.

[Jon Bickford(Atlantic Aviation)] 19:13:04
That allows me one way to get airplanes in and off my ramp and then the hangers that sit behind my ramp

[Jon Bickford(Atlantic Aviation)] 19:13:10
would have to cross through my ramp to try to get in and out that one spot. So not

exactly pro-business in this case.

[Jon Bickford(Atlantic Aviation)] 19:13:18
I wish there was some more explanation about it. I like Tony's idea of maybe we can just paint it some way.

[Jon Bickford(Atlantic Aviation)] 19:13:25
So that the pilots don't get written up, that we can still use it. But as a deterrent.

[Jon Bickford(Atlantic Aviation)] 19:13:30
And so that really affects me. And then see the other ways they painted across the front of South End Airport.

[Jon Bickford(Atlantic Aviation)] 19:13:36
Not conducive to the people that are currently there in the hangers.

[Jon Bickford(Atlantic Aviation)] 19:13:40
I know they're not happy about what's coming.

[Jon Bickford(Atlantic Aviation)] 19:13:45
The minute they put this in a master plan and they go with the preferred alternative, property values are going to tank.

[Jon Bickford(Atlantic Aviation)] 19:13:51
There's a lot of other things that could keep going on that other people already touched on, and I'm trying to free up space for other people, but I want to put my two cents in there that

[Jon Bickford(Atlantic Aviation)] 19:13:59
I think we need to sit down and really go over the details all face to face. So hopefully we have that conversation

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:14:08
Great. Thank you, John.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:14:11
I see.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:14:13
Patrick has your hand raised.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:14:18
And then I'll circle back with David and Ted if you'd like to speak.

[Wilsonville Chamber P. Donaldson] 19:14:25
Well, the Chamber of commerce has

[Wilsonville Chamber P. Donaldson] 19:14:28
enjoyed this process.

[Wilsonville Chamber P. Donaldson] 19:14:31
From the very beginning. And what was the setting for our engagement with this was that

[Wilsonville Chamber P. Donaldson] 19:14:37
When I first arrived in November of 2019, I received briefings from the Chamber of Commerce, the City of Wilsonville.

[Wilsonville Chamber P. Donaldson] 19:14:45
Civics Academy, city council meetings

[Wilsonville Chamber P. Donaldson] 19:14:48
Charbonneau's board of directors, our government affairs consultant. So I received a lot of information.

[Wilsonville Chamber P. Donaldson] 19:14:54
And what I stepped into was this characterization of the previous master plan

[Wilsonville Chamber P. Donaldson] 19:15:00
Which had a general sense that it had kind of

[Wilsonville Chamber P. Donaldson] 19:15:03
ended with just didn't end well and that people didn't have belief in the process.

[Wilsonville Chamber P. Donaldson] 19:15:10
So watching this process begin, we were excited and anticipating and something

[Wilsonville Chamber P. Donaldson] 19:15:15
happening in a very positive way.

[Wilsonville Chamber P. Donaldson] 19:15:19
like a state fair ride, a couple of meetings ago, it certainly veered off of what I thought was and what we observed

[Wilsonville Chamber P. Donaldson] 19:15:27
to be a process that would lead to a consensus conclusion. Not everybody

[Wilsonville Chamber P. Donaldson] 19:15:32
was pleased, but they felt that it was a fair and transparent process. And I have not felt that in the last couple of meetings. And this meeting is a characterization of that as well.

[Wilsonville Chamber P. Donaldson] 19:15:41
is that this doesn't really pass the test.

[Wilsonville Chamber P. Donaldson] 19:15:45
of comfort.

[Wilsonville Chamber P. Donaldson] 19:15:46

In terms of a path forward.

[Wilsonville Chamber P. Donaldson] 19:15:49
that not only is there a high ticket price for these kinds of things, but people don't feel that they're being

[Wilsonville Chamber P. Donaldson] 19:15:55
engaged and heard

[Wilsonville Chamber P. Donaldson] 19:15:56
in a way that there's a dialogue. And I think that's a theme that I've observed from afar.

[Wilsonville Chamber P. Donaldson] 19:16:03
And I think there's a reasonable proposal that's been put out here. When I remember how we were set up at the very beginning, there was a covenant made between this process and the PAC members

[Wilsonville Chamber P. Donaldson] 19:16:14
And I think that we've kind of gotten off

[Wilsonville Chamber P. Donaldson] 19:16:17
kilter a bit. And I think we have an opportunity

[Wilsonville Chamber P. Donaldson] 19:16:21
Just sort of revisit those original commitments that were made

[Wilsonville Chamber P. Donaldson] 19:16:25
and reorient and recommit to that.

[Wilsonville Chamber P. Donaldson] 19:16:27
So that's what I would say.

[Wilsonville Chamber P. Donaldson] 19:16:31
I want to look forward to supporting this and not having the thoughts that people had about the previous master plan, which was that it wasn't complete

[Wilsonville Chamber P. Donaldson] 19:16:39
wasn't transparent, didn't have integrity. I think there's an opportunity to get back on that.

[Wilsonville Chamber P. Donaldson] 19:16:44
that path again.

[Wilsonville Chamber P. Donaldson] 19:16:46
So thank you.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:16:47
Great. Thank you. Thank you, Patrick.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:16:53
I want to check in David. Ted, do you want to add anything do you

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:17:01
Okay.

[David Waggoner (Willamette Aviation & Tri-Prop)] 19:17:05
Thank you for letting me chime in here. And Kenji, I am so delighted

[David Waggoner (Willamette Aviation & Tri-Prop)] 19:17:10
that you started this meeting by saying that you are open to rethinking

[David Waggoner (Willamette Aviation & Tri-Prop)] 19:17:14
the preferred alternative is you have in front of it now because I am absolutely opposed to it.

[David Waggoner (Willamette Aviation & Tri-Prop)] 19:17:20
And my first piece of opposition comes from

[David Waggoner (Willamette Aviation & Tri-Prop)] 19:17:23
what's going to happen to our neighbors outside of the airport?

[David Waggoner (Willamette Aviation & Tri-Prop)] 19:17:28
The preferred alternative when it moves Highway 551 is going to

[David Waggoner (Willamette Aviation & Tri-Prop)] 19:17:34
going to displace some homes on the other side, the west side of 551.

[David Waggoner (Willamette Aviation & Tri-Prop)] 19:17:39
These are people, many of them retired, some on fixed incomes.

[David Waggoner (Willamette Aviation & Tri-Prop)] 19:17:44
And to have that property devalued or actually displacing the residents is something that I cannot fathom is acceptable.

[David Waggoner (Willamette Aviation & Tri-Prop)] 19:17:55
And certainly in this environment where we have a housing shortage, especially in affordable housing.

[David Waggoner (Willamette Aviation & Tri-Prop)] 19:18:02
shortage in the state of Oregon. And I think that runs

[David Waggoner (Willamette Aviation & Tri-Prop)] 19:18:06
completely contrary to what the governor is trying to do.

[David Waggoner (Willamette Aviation & Tri-Prop)] 19:18:10
And I think that would be a terrible, terrible thing for the airport to do, to turn around to our neighbors.

[David Waggoner (Willamette Aviation & Tri-Prop)] 19:18:15

And say, no, you simply got to move because we want your property.

[David Waggoner (Willamette Aviation & Tri-Prop)] 19:18:21
Another area that's a major concern to me

[David Waggoner (Willamette Aviation & Tri-Prop)] 19:18:24
is that on our property we've got

[David Waggoner (Willamette Aviation & Tri-Prop)] 19:18:27
We've got a couple of organizations there that are designed specifically to support the state of Oregon and its citizens

[David Waggoner (Willamette Aviation & Tri-Prop)] 19:18:34
During times of disaster and emergency.

[David Waggoner (Willamette Aviation & Tri-Prop)] 19:18:37
One of which is the Civil Air Patrol.

[David Waggoner (Willamette Aviation & Tri-Prop)] 19:18:41
And we have donated a building essentially to the Civil Air Patrol

[David Waggoner (Willamette Aviation & Tri-Prop)] 19:18:45
which they have established as a permanent emergency operations center.

[David Waggoner (Willamette Aviation & Tri-Prop)] 19:18:49
And the mission of the Civil Air Patrol, as far as the Emergency Operations Center goes.

[David Waggoner (Willamette Aviation & Tri-Prop)] 19:18:54
is to work with federal and state authorities in the time of emergency.

[David Waggoner (Willamette Aviation & Tri-Prop)] 19:18:59
They have search and rescue missions that they run out of there. They have homeland security missions that they run out of there.

[David Waggoner (Willamette Aviation & Tri-Prop)] 19:19:06
And this is a permanent installation for them.

[David Waggoner (Willamette Aviation & Tri-Prop)] 19:19:10
Along with the search and rescue and the Homeland Security missions.

[David Waggoner (Willamette Aviation & Tri-Prop)] 19:19:15
That building also houses the cadet squadron for the local Civil Air Patrol.

[David Waggoner (Willamette Aviation & Tri-Prop)] 19:19:20
And the cadet squadron is where they're dealing with young men and women

[David Waggoner (Willamette Aviation & Tri-Prop)] 19:19:23
who are in the civil air patrol moving through leadership training, values training, education.

[David Waggoner (Willamette Aviation & Tri-Prop)] 19:19:31
And if the preferred alternative

[David Waggoner (Willamette Aviation & Tri-Prop)] 19:19:35
continues as established, that building will have to go.

[David Waggoner (Willamette Aviation & Tri-Prop)] 19:19:39
The only reason that we can have them in that building at no cost is because

[David Waggoner (Willamette Aviation & Tri-Prop)] 19:19:45
This is our extension into the private partnership, private public partnership.

[David Waggoner (Willamette Aviation & Tri-Prop)] 19:19:51
If that building goes, we do not have a facility where we can move the Civil Air Patrol.

[David Waggoner (Willamette Aviation & Tri-Prop)] 19:19:57
That building also houses

[David Waggoner (Willamette Aviation & Tri-Prop)] 19:20:00
the disaster airlift Response Team.

[David Waggoner (Willamette Aviation & Tri-Prop)] 19:20:03
Which, if you remember the news stories from the hurricanes that have blown up the East Coast.

[David Waggoner (Willamette Aviation & Tri-Prop)] 19:20:09
all of the private pilots with their little two and four seat airplanes taking emergency supplies out to isolated communities.

[David Waggoner (Willamette Aviation & Tri-Prop)] 19:20:17
That's what the Oregon Disaster Response Airlift Team does.

[David Waggoner (Willamette Aviation & Tri-Prop)] 19:20:23
Our facility at Aurora Airport is the North Oregon hub for that.

[David Waggoner (Willamette Aviation & Tri-Prop)] 19:20:30
Right now, we are currently warehousing for dart

[David Waggoner (Willamette Aviation & Tri-Prop)] 19:20:34
some emergency food supplies and a significant amount of emergency surgical supplies.

[David Waggoner (Willamette Aviation & Tri-Prop)] 19:20:41
Now, if we need that stuff.

[David Waggoner (Willamette Aviation & Tri-Prop)] 19:20:42
We have volunteer pilots that are going to come in, pick it up, and take it out to the isolated communities that need it.

[David Waggoner (Willamette Aviation & Tri-Prop)] 19:20:49
If the master plan goes forward as it stands right now.

[David Waggoner (Willamette Aviation & Tri-Prop)] 19:20:54
that will not be able to do that because we can no longer support this we can no longer service the hub.

[David Waggoner (Willamette Aviation & Tri-Prop)] 19:21:01
So I am completely opposed to the alternative and just absolutely delighted to hear

[David Waggoner (Willamette Aviation & Tri-Prop)] 19:21:07
that you're willing to consider a change.

[David Waggoner (Willamette Aviation & Tri-Prop)] 19:21:10
Because we want this airport to really be what it's designed to be. And that is a very effective

[David Waggoner (Willamette Aviation & Tri-Prop)] 19:21:16
piece of the state's transportation system

[David Waggoner (Willamette Aviation & Tri-Prop)] 19:21:20
And the Federal Aviation System.

[David Waggoner (Willamette Aviation & Tri-Prop)] 19:21:23
So things that would impinge on that is a major problem.

[David Waggoner (Willamette Aviation & Tri-Prop)] 19:21:29
The extension to the runway within the fence is a great idea because that makes the airport more effective as the transportation

[David Waggoner (Willamette Aviation & Tri-Prop)] 19:21:37
device that it's really meant to be.

[David Waggoner (Willamette Aviation & Tri-Prop)] 19:21:39
But I think we can do that without impinging on the neighbors and without without

[David Waggoner (Willamette Aviation & Tri-Prop)] 19:21:44
denigrating the emergency support services that we have for the state of Oregon.

[David Waggoner (Willamette Aviation & Tri-Prop)] 19:21:50
So Kenji, thank you very much for saying that you're willing to reconsider things. I appreciate it.

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 19:21:55
Yeah, no problem. We're definitely looking. We're open to it like i said

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 19:21:59
refinements. There are a couple of things at play though in terms of the FAA requirements in terms of the ROFA.

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 19:22:06
Those are immutable, so to speak so it's

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 19:22:10
We were looking at a whole bunch of options.

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 19:22:11
Do we move it east the runway? That would wipe out a lot of stuff.

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 19:22:16
Do we keep it in place and sort of balance it? Or do we move completely west

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 19:22:22
where we wipe out even more homes.

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 19:22:24
It's, you know, it's a tough pickle, right? And it's it's

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 19:22:30
where we are today, but you're right. There are some potential

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 19:22:35
refinements that given everybody's feedback today that we can explore.

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 19:22:41
And analyze and analyze

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 19:22:44
So I'll just leave it at that. We are open to refinements.

[David Waggoner (Willamette Aviation & Tri-Prop)] 19:22:49
Thank you.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:22:50
Okay, great. I want to check on with Ted and then I'd like to do a quick roundtable. I do see Tony and Aaron, you have your hands raised again.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:22:59
But I do want to check in with other PAC members who haven't had a chance to speak before we get to public comments.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:23:06
So Ted, if you can unmute.

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:23:12
Yes. I don't know if I have the ability to screen share or maybe Tony could

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:23:18
Or Aaron could put it up. I have an aerial

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:23:21
photograph of the entire airport

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:23:25
that goes

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:23:27
west of highway 551 and covers everything within the roadway boundary

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:23:33
Then I'd be happy to share with you. And we could even email a copy to you.

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:23:38
It's already submitted in some of our other documents, but it also clearly shows

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:23:44
Our proposed internal circulation road

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:23:47
in yellow that was already part of the master plan.

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:23:51
In 2012.

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:23:52
The only other thing I wanted to add

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:23:55
Is it in the preferred alternative that you now have proposed

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:24:00
it shows the boundary of the airport use boundary

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:24:06
to include everything within the roadway

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:24:09
boundary. And of course, I own that church property

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:24:13
The old church property and i would like

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:24:16
in addition to my other comments, I forgot to add

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:24:19
that we'd like to see that maintained

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:24:23

where that church property could be maintained within the

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:24:28
airport use boundary

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:24:31
as a future development and added to the airport.

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:24:36
And I've already submitted other documents to show that.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:24:41
Great. And it looks like Erin, maybe you're sharing this

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:24:45
So thank you for sharing that.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:24:50
Okay, great. Thank you, Ted.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:24:52
I do want to check in with the rest of the PAC members because I know we haven't heard

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:24:58
from all of you.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:25:00
And so I'm just going to go down the list and just check in.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:25:05
um so

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:25:10
You can obviously just pass if you want to. But Alvin Claussen with Marion County, is there anything you'd like to say?

[Alvin Klausen (Marion County)] 19:25:20
No, I'm just listening on behalf of Commissioner Cameron.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:25:24
Okay, great. Bell Graup with the Aurora CTE.

[Bill Graupp | Aurora CTE] 19:25:30
I'm good. I'm good.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:25:31
Okay, great.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:25:35

see um chris

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:25:37
Namsu with City Wilsonville.

[Chris Neamtzu, City of Wilsonville] 19:25:41
We have no comments at this time, Brandy. Thank you very much.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:25:43
Okay, great. Oops, oops, sorry, clicked on you a second time, Chris.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:25:50
Dave Malk with Charbonneaux Country Club, is there anything you'd like to say?

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:26:03
We can't hear you if you're speaking.

[Dave Mauk | Charbonneau Country Club] 19:26:05
Randy, thanks for the opportunity.

[Dave Mauk | Charbonneau Country Club] 19:26:08
Nothing. Thank you.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:26:08
Okay, so…

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:26:09
Okay, great. Thanks, Steve.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:26:13
Okay.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:26:15
It looks like Dave Tibbetts with Columbia Helicopters.

[Dave Tibbetts | Columbia Helicopters] 19:26:20
Now we're okay for now, thanks.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:26:21
Okay, great.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:26:25
Okay, I'm just…

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 19:26:26
Randy, Dave, are you flying right now?

[Dave Tibbetts | Columbia Helicopters] 19:26:33
Nope, just the heater running.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:26:35
Oh, good.

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 19:26:35
Okay. I was wondering if it sounded like you were flying, so I was just curious.

[Dave Tibbetts | Columbia Helicopters] 19:26:38
It's not noisy enough for a Chinook, sorry.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:26:43
Okay, Melissa Ahrens with DLCD.

[Melissa Ahrens, DLCD] 19:26:47
No comments at this time. Thank you

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:26:51
Great. All right.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:26:54
Naomi Zordling with ODOT.

[Naomi Zwerdling, ODOT] 19:26:58
As stated earlier in the meeting, ODOT did provide comments on the preferred alternative in regard to the highway shift.

[Naomi Zwerdling, ODOT] 19:27:05
And that was put into the record. So I don't have any more comments than that.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:27:10
Okay, great. Thanks, Naomi.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:27:13
Pam Barlow Lind with Confederated Tribes of Siletse Indians.

[Pam Barlow Lind -CTSI] 19:27:22
Thank you, Brandy. I don't have anything more to add this time. Been listening, though.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:27:26
Okay, great. Yeah, thanks for being here, Pam.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:27:31
Okay, and I think we're getting down to the bottom of the list. Okay, Whitney Stewart um

[Whitney Stewart - OR Dept of EM] 19:27:40
No, nothing. Just monitoring for the agency. Thank you.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:27:41
department.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:27:43
Okay, great. And I'm sorry, Whitney, with the Oregon Department of Emergency Management.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:27:52
Okay, I think that is all of the PAC members that are on tonight. If I missed someone and you would like to speak, please raise your hand.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:28:01
Otherwise, I'm going to go back to Tony and then aaron.

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:28:08
Okay, a couple of things. One, the internal circulation road discussion on why can't we put it on the ALP. It strikes me as odd that we're going to put

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:28:19
Highway 551

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:28:21
on the alp um and it's outside the state's property

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:28:25
So it strikes me as it's okay to do on one side of the plan, but not the other.

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:28:30
So I don't know what the

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:28:32
what the problem is there. The other thing that I would also look at is if we go way back to one of the first slides that we showed.

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:28:40
Conspicuously absent in that goal slide is the goal of item 3E of the ORS statute

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:28:47
Which is to protect investment.

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:28:49
And I had a conversation earlier today with what I think is going to be a good friend. And she asked me a really good question.

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:28:56
If ODAV is charged according to the statute to protect the investment made at the airport at Aurora State Airport, called out specifically in the statute.

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:29:05
Whose investment are we talking about?

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:29:06

We're talking about the state's investment or are we talking about the private enterprise investment?

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:29:10
And I guess what I'd ask Kenji and the board at OAB and the consultant and the staff at ODEV

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:29:18
Why can't it be both? Why aren't we protecting the investment in both? There's nothing wrong with

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:29:23
private enterprise building hangars and employing people and putting money into Wilsonville, into Canby, into Aurora, and into Woodburn. There's nothing wrong with that.

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:29:32
Because that's why we locate our businesses close to the airport.

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:29:37
So why is not protecting the airport in the investment previously made

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:29:44
into why isn't that one of the goals? It really should be one of the goals of this master plan as a whole.

[Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association] 19:29:51
So that's my two cents. Thanks, Brandi.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:29:54
Okay, thank you, Tony. All right, Erin.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 19:30:00
Yeah, I wanted to get back to Kenji, if I can find you on the

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 19:30:05
And there, there you are.

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 19:30:06
Yo, hey.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 19:30:07
You know, the highway 50

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 19:30:11
551 is so important to this whole

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 19:30:15
thing, you know, in terms of how the faa wants

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 19:30:19
the ROFA resolved.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 19:30:21
And we're talking about, you know.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 19:30:24
one lane plus in my mind, at least some gravel

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 19:30:27
So probably 24 feet of

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 19:30:31
moving things over.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 19:30:34
And I know, or perhaps it sounds like ODOT has given you a formal letter

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 19:30:38
Saying that if you want to do anything there, you have to give them a

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 19:30:42
100 feet back somewhere else

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 19:30:44
But, you know, you report to the governor

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 19:30:48
And, you know, this is something between two

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 19:30:51
state agencies, they're not using the 100 feet. It's in the middle of it right now.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 19:30:57
They've got 24 more feet over there they could

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 19:31:01
move the road in terms of a long-term plan

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 19:31:05
Why not take the time

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 19:31:08
to push this issue, have a real meeting

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 19:31:12
Talk about the pluses and minuses of everything

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 19:31:18
you know, it would make it such a simpler project to move that road if it just

stays within the easement.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 19:31:26
And in a common world sense, that's the obvious solution.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 19:31:30
So why not take the time to really have that discussion at a higher level

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 19:31:36
within the state.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 19:31:38
So that's just a suggestion.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 19:31:41
And I think there are a number of questions that came here that I hope there's time to actually get answers on.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 19:31:48
And carry through conversation a bit more.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 19:31:51
So that's all I had. Thank you.

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 19:31:53
Thanks, Aaron.

[Tony Beach - ODAV] 19:31:57
If I can just jump in for a second, I do want to add, I want to read a couple points.

[Tony Beach - ODAV] 19:32:03
We, you know, throughout this entire process have

[Tony Beach - ODAV] 19:32:06
communicated that there is a very difficult decision to make with this airport.

[Tony Beach - ODAV] 19:32:12
Because some of the challenges, some of the non-standard items

[Tony Beach - ODAV] 19:32:17
are very difficult to address.

[Tony Beach - ODAV] 19:32:20
I also…

[Tony Beach - ODAV] 19:32:22
I hear you all, and I just want to make clear that we appreciate all your concerns and interests in protecting

[Tony Beach - ODAV] 19:32:30
the airport as well as the private investment that's been made

[Tony Beach - ODAV] 19:32:34
And we believe through this process that we believe this

[Tony Beach - ODAV] 19:32:37
This is how we are doing that by doing

[Tony Beach - ODAV] 19:32:41
protecting the airport for the long-term future so it can continue to serve

[Tony Beach - ODAV] 19:32:46
all of the airport users

[Tony Beach - ODAV] 19:32:49
and the development that relies on the airport's continued use.

[Tony Beach - ODAV] 19:32:53
So that is our primary goal, just to make sure the airport can

[Tony Beach - ODAV] 19:32:57
continue to operate safely and effectively for everyone

[Tony Beach - ODAV] 19:33:01
that is based at the airport as well as aviators in Oregon and nationwide.

[Tony Beach - ODAV] 19:33:08
So I just, I thank you all for your comment and appreciate your discussion on

[Tony Beach - ODAV] 19:33:15
on all of the items in our preferred alternatives.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:33:21
Great. Thanks, Tony. So Ted and Bruce, officially we're kind of cutting into the public comments, but I'm going to let you go. And if you could just keep it brief.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:33:31
And then we can get to Doug and then Lucas and then wendy

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:33:36
who have asked to speak

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:33:39
Again, any public people who are here or if you would like to speak, please just continue to raise your hand and I'll just track

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:33:47
those of you who raise your hands. Go ahead, Ted.

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:33:51
Yeah, all I'd like to ask is

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:33:54
Could I formally request?

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:33:57
Then we have one more of these

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:33:59
open PAC meetings.

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:34:01
hopefully in person.

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:34:03
or at least mostly in person or both.

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:34:05
before they go to the

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:34:07
ODAB decision making because there's a whole bunch of things that have been brought up

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:34:12
Some innovative things that could be discussed.

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:34:15
And so we have a chance to have a chance

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:34:18
review these comments and see if we can't even

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:34:20
up with some more better hybrid

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:34:24
solutions before it goes to the board

[Ted Millar | AABC/TLM Holdings] 19:34:27
to be decided.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:34:30
I can't answer that question, but I…

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:34:34
I definitely hear that very strongly from you and from others.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:34:39

this desire to continue this conversation.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:34:43
um so

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:34:44
I will check in with. I'm not sure if ODAB is ready to respond to that.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:34:50
today, but I think we can get you an answer in the next couple of days. And then I can email out when I send you all

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:35:00
When I send you all the meeting, when the meeting recording is up on the website, which should be tomorrow, along with the PowerPoint, but I'll just send you an email and then maybe we can respond to that question.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:35:14
Okay, Bruce.

[Bruce Bennett - Airport user, property & business owner] 19:35:19
Thank you. I'll be as quick as I possibly can. Just wanted to

[Bruce Bennett - Airport user, property & business owner] 19:35:24
make sure everyone understands the internal circulation road

[Bruce Bennett - Airport user, property & business owner] 19:35:28
is mostly the 2012 planned one is mostly on ODAV property

[Bruce Bennett - Airport user, property & business owner] 19:35:35
from near the rotating beacon to just past 10 block way that's all that's all

[Bruce Bennett - Airport user, property & business owner] 19:35:42
I think that's an important point.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:35:45
Okay, great. Thanks, Bruce.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:35:48
Okay, so we are going to pop over to public comments.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:35:53
And so I will have a timer. But again, we've left a longer time today so that you can have more conversation.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:36:03
But what we'll do is we'll do three minutes. I'll have the timer and then we'll get through our first three people who want to speak. If there are no other people who would like to speak.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:36:13
to date, then we can go back to anyone who wants to continue providing comments to the PAC or to ODAB directly.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:36:23
So I will just remind you that there will be that three minutes

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:36:28
Again, you can also put things in the Q&A. I've seen things coming through there. And then of course we will

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:36:34
be collecting comments always on the website, but especially through the 23rd, which is in about two weeks.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:36:41
from today when um from today when

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:36:44
we will be collecting comments that will go into the meeting summary and can be addressed and responded to.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:36:52
Okay, so that was a big spiel. So let me get my timer up and ready and then um

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:37:00
I will…

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:37:02
bump it over to you, Doug so you have

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:37:06
three minutes. So go ahead.

[Doug Wilson] 19:37:09
Oh, well, thank you very much. Let me um

[Doug Wilson] 19:37:12
Can I undo my camera from my 10-year-old self in a Cessna 150?

[Doug Wilson] 19:37:16
1986.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:37:17
Well, let's see. Shoot.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:37:21
Let me see. Sorry about that.

[Doug Wilson] 19:37:23

That is definitely me.

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 19:37:26
This won't count against your three minutes. Don't worry.

[Doug Wilson] 19:37:28
Okay, and that's me.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:37:28
Yeah, let me sorry

[Doug Wilson] 19:37:30
38 years ago, by the way.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:37:32
Yeah.

[Doug Wilson] 19:37:32
Here it is. That's how long I've been at this game, ladies and gentlemen.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:37:34
No.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:37:37
Okay, sorry, all my little things, all my little windows disappeared here for a second.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:37:45
So let me just see here.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:37:48
So start video.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:37:51
I'm not sure if I can get your video.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:37:56
So I apologize for that.

[Doug Wilson] 19:37:57
Wow.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:37:58
Doug, we're just going to have to look at your previous version of yourselves.

[Doug Wilson] 19:38:02
That's just fine if you're able to hear me.

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 19:38:04
Yep, they can hear you.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:38:04
Yes, we are. And so, okay, great. I'll start your timer.

[Doug Wilson] 19:38:09
That's fine. Evidently, the 10-year-old version of myself is far less confrontational.

[Doug Wilson] 19:38:15
I've been…

[Doug Wilson] 19:38:17
Just by way of introduction, my name is Doug Wilson. I'm the owner and operator of a consultancy called FBO Partners.

[Doug Wilson] 19:38:25
I have been in the business and general aviation industry.

[Doug Wilson] 19:38:28
since technically age 10, employed since age 16, I'm 48. I've been doing this for 32

[Doug Wilson] 19:38:33
from the East Coast to the West Coast.

[Doug Wilson] 19:38:35
I am familiar with AIP funding, grant assurance matters.

[Doug Wilson] 19:38:41
I worked with Century West, who is an excellent engineering firm. I wish to compliment them on

[Doug Wilson] 19:38:47
work I've done with them on AWOS programs.

[Doug Wilson] 19:38:51
The question I have, I put into the

[Doug Wilson] 19:38:55
chat a little bit.

[Doug Wilson] 19:38:56
I've been at this for a while. I work out an office out of Boeing Field today. I've been there for about 15 years or so.

[Doug Wilson] 19:39:03
My Cessna 182 is currently at Aurora Airport getting an avionics upgrade through PCA.

[Doug Wilson] 19:39:10

Early in the early

[Doug Wilson] 19:39:11
presentation, it was noted that the FAA is requiring that non-standard conditions be brought into compliance.

[Doug Wilson] 19:39:18
Several airports in the same ADO region, that is the Seattle ADO, have non-standard conditions.

[Doug Wilson] 19:39:24
And those conditions will never

[Doug Wilson] 19:39:26
be brought into compliance as a result of a number of factors.

[Doug Wilson] 19:39:30
Boeing Field, for example.

[Doug Wilson] 19:39:32
has its utility runway, which is the short runway next to the main runway, which is a non-standard distance between the two runways.

[Doug Wilson] 19:39:40
It has been looked at at being closed.

[Doug Wilson] 19:39:43
It has not. The Georgetown steam plant, which is also at Boeing Field.

[Doug Wilson] 19:39:48
is well within the FAR 77 area of penetration for the transitional surfaces.

[Doug Wilson] 19:39:55
It will never be removed. It is a federally protected building.

[Doug Wilson] 19:39:59
Under the Historic Preservation Act.

[Doug Wilson] 19:40:02
What has been mentioned here a few times is the concept of modification.

[Doug Wilson] 19:40:06
However, I certainly understand the difference that modification

[Doug Wilson] 19:40:11
to airport compliance is far more difficult.

[Doug Wilson] 19:40:16
to adjudicate than a deviation.

[Doug Wilson] 19:40:19
It sounds to me what isn't being said by ODAV and others is that AIP funding

[Doug Wilson] 19:40:26
evidently is being withheld from Aurora until it's brought into standard.

[Doug Wilson] 19:40:30
i.e. the concept of, oh, we can only maintain the runways

[Doug Wilson] 19:40:35
Because we can't use AIP funds for new development.

[Doug Wilson] 19:40:39
So in this case, my question is pretty straightforward. Why has a deviation

[Doug Wilson] 19:40:44
not been explored by ODAV with the Seattle ADO.

[Doug Wilson] 19:40:49
Like every other airport that has non-centered conditions that will never be met in order to receive AIP funding.

[Doug Wilson] 19:40:54
So my question is outside the airport compliance manual of 5196B, please point me to the recent FAA dogma.

[Doug Wilson] 19:41:02
that states that deviations would not be honored or considered

[Doug Wilson] 19:41:06
Because I am unfamiliar with any laws that have been passed in Congress on FAA funding, or is this an ADO position?

[Doug Wilson] 19:41:12
that is a personal position.

[Doug Wilson] 19:41:15
Thank you.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:41:17
Great. Thank you so much, Doug.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:41:22
Okay, let me go back to

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:41:25
our other participants. Okay, so I'm going to go to um lucas

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:41:31
Nickerson, you should be able to

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:41:35
Speak.

[Lukas Nickerson] 19:41:37
Hello, can you all hear me?

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:41:39
Yes, we can.

[Lukas Nickerson] 19:41:41
I'm Lucas Nickerson, Aerometal International and Pacific Skies Aviation here at Aurora. We've been here since about 2005.

[Lukas Nickerson] 19:41:51
But I'd just like it added to the record that I'm opposed to the proposed master plan put forth by the state.

[Lukas Nickerson] 19:41:59
all the other airport stakeholders have really already brought up my major points.

[Lukas Nickerson] 19:42:07
I have one other question directed at Mr. Miller and the Oregon Department of Aviation.

[Lukas Nickerson] 19:42:13
Can you share with us approximately what percentage of the

[Lukas Nickerson] 19:42:18
proposed approximate $200 million cost associated with the master plan

[Lukas Nickerson] 19:42:24
is directed to corrections of non-standard conditions versus other development that the ODAV would like to do at the state at the airport.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:42:39
Brandy, was that a question directed to me? I'm sorry.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:42:41
I believe, yeah, I believe that was a question and I'm not sure if you'll be able to answer it in this meeting.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:42:47
Not specifically, but I will tell you that as we went through in the last meeting, the majority of the costs that we walked through

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:42:48
Bye.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:42:54

were related to bringing the airport up to standards.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:43:00
and go back to the information presented at the last meeting and it breaks that out a little bit, but I don't have those numbers directly in front of me.

[Lukas Nickerson] 19:43:07
Okay.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:43:08
we could respond in writing also.

[Lukas Nickerson] 19:43:10
Okay, yeah, that would be great if you could respond in writing. It occurs to me that most of the costs associated with it are for these items like the vehicle service road and the parallel taxiway.

[Lukas Nickerson] 19:43:24
And my understanding is those have nothing to do with bringing the airport to standard.

[Lukas Nickerson] 19:43:29
that's…

[Lukas Nickerson] 19:43:32
That wraps up my questions. Thank you.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:43:34
Yeah, I can just, just to elaborate, we made the distinction in the last meeting in October

[David Miller - Century West] 19:43:41
that…

[David Miller - Century West] 19:43:43
the…

[David Miller - Century West] 19:43:46
proposed preliminary alternative

[David Miller - Century West] 19:43:49
a portion of the costs were associated with essentially

[David Miller - Century West] 19:43:55
We had the runway extension. We had the highway realignment, which included Bright of Way.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:44:03
acquisition, highway reconstruction, property acquisition portions or some entire parcels.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:44:11
You are accurate in the…

[David Miller - Century West] 19:44:14
the costs that were estimated for the east side impacts, namely the hangars.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:44:20
were driven in large part by the addition of the vehicle service road and the

[David Miller - Century West] 19:44:28
parallel taxiway and you are correct that that's an important distinction. Those were items, as Tony has mentioned and Genji, I believe.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:44:37
Those

[David Miller - Century West] 19:44:39
represented by feedback provided by the PAC and the concepts were presented because

[David Miller - Century West] 19:44:44
They came up through the master planning process.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:44:47
that isn't the standards.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:44:49
compliance issue the way the runway object-free area is or the runway safety area. So thank you for that question.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:44:56
Okay, great. Thank you, Lucas. Okay, I see, sorry.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:45:03
Click the wrong button here. Okay, so Wendy Kellington.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:45:07
And then I see Doug has your hand raised again, so we'll circle back to you.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:45:13
Sorry, let me restart the timer.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:45:17
Wendy, are you able to speak?

[Wendie Kellington] 19:45:20
I am. Can you hear me?

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:45:21
Okay, wonderful, wonderful. Yes, we can hear you. Okay, I'll start your time.

[Wendie Kellington] 19:45:25
all right i have i'm a lawyer and I've been in this process a long time, as you know, and I have three things I want to say.

[Wendie Kellington] 19:45:32
And one of them is that we are mixing a lot of concepts here that have nothing to do with each other.

[Wendie Kellington] 19:45:39
The first one is that a master plan must show all aviation related uses now and in the future for the airport.

[Wendie Kellington] 19:45:47
And Aurora is unusual in the sense that some of those are going to be private and every single master plan for the Aurora Airport since 1976 to 2012 has always shown

[Wendie Kellington] 19:45:59
the areas of the airport that we're going to develop with privately with aeronautics related uses. And to the extent that that is, we're tone deaf to that, we should look at the statute that the Oregon legislature

[Wendie Kellington] 19:46:13
has directed ODAB has directed

[Wendie Kellington] 19:46:16
to incorporate the through the fence operations as a part of the airport boundary. They use the word shall

[Wendie Kellington] 19:46:24
And that they shall be coordinated with the airport master plans, that they shall conform with the airport master plans.

[Wendie Kellington] 19:46:33
There is no possibility that the Aurora Airport public-private partnership

[Wendie Kellington] 19:46:40
can be blown up in this master plan effort or that ODAP can take the position legitimately that we're only going to plan

[Wendie Kellington] 19:46:48
for the areas that we own. No, there is no federal law that supports that. And importantly, there is no state law that allows that. So that is just wrong. We need to get that out of our head.

[Wendie Kellington] 19:47:00
is this other idea that is very different that the feds won't fund anything that ODAB doesn't own.

[Wendie Kellington] 19:47:06

And Tony points out that there's a whole lot that's being planned here that ODAB doesn't own like moving 551. So that dog really doesn't hunt but assuming

[Wendie Kellington] 19:47:15
that that dog hunts.

[Wendie Kellington] 19:47:18
Who cares? Odiev has no business trading $150 million basic price tag

[Wendie Kellington] 19:47:25
for a useless, bad public policy

[Wendie Kellington] 19:47:29
service road that wipes out 150 plus million dollars

[Wendie Kellington] 19:47:34
of private business jet hangers a thousand jobs

[Wendie Kellington] 19:47:38
All those things just so that it can avoid

[Wendie Kellington] 19:47:43
10, maybe $1,000 to pave a service road

[Wendie Kellington] 19:47:47
That's insanity. That is neither efficient nor effective, nor an aeronautics interest that is not consistent with the purpose of a master plan.

[Wendie Kellington] 19:47:55
that dog doesn't hunt. And the third one that I want to be sure that we understand is that that runway

[Wendie Kellington] 19:48:02
is the only safety issue that we are talking about now. And that runway has needed to be lengthened for the aircraft that use the airport right now as of 2012.

[Wendie Kellington] 19:48:11
This is not about accommodating new, better improved airport or airplanes or bigger ones.

[Wendie Kellington] 19:48:17
This is about accommodating the ones that are there right now. And the fact that we have a one in a thousand year chance of having a problem because 551 is located where it is, we got a problem right now with the runway not being long enough. We need to take care of that right now. If we care about safety.

[Wendie Kellington] 19:48:33
we're extending that runway right now and we're saying, okay, yeah, we will extend, we'll move 551 at the end of the master plan period if we have money. But by golly.

[Wendie Kellington] 19:48:45
we are going to extend that runway so pilots don't die. How about that?

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:48:50
Thank you so much, Wendy.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:48:55
Okay, I'm going to circle back with Doug and then we can check in if anyone else would like to speak from the public.

[Doug Wilson] 19:49:05
Thank you so much, Brandy, and I apologize. I'm not trying to take my more than three minutes, but I did notice that David was kind enough to answer the question to the speaker who followed me.

[Doug Wilson] 19:49:15
But I've not yet received a response to the question that I posed, which was.

[Doug Wilson] 19:49:20
What has changed in FAA Dogma regarding compliance with non-standard conditions at airports and AIP funding?

[Doug Wilson] 19:49:27
That has not occurred. I've not received an answer to that.

[Doug Wilson] 19:49:30
So I'd appreciate that. And that would be super great. And also, I am also curious

[Doug Wilson] 19:49:36
where the gentleman from the FAA, oh, and there's Kenji as well. I was just trying to hear those answers from those personnel.

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 19:49:40
Hey, hey.

[Doug Wilson] 19:49:42
Directly, I return my time to them. Thank you.

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 19:49:45
So him, question.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:49:46
All right.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:49:47
Go ahead.

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 19:49:48
Deviations.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:49:50
Okay, Tim, are you here?

[Tim House - FAA] 19:49:54
Yeah.

[Tim House - FAA] 19:49:55
If I can get everything working again properly.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:49:57
Okay, great.

[Tim House - FAA] 19:49:58
I think you're clicking and I'm clicking.

[Tim House - FAA] 19:50:01
Yeah, modifications are modification of standards are available.

[Tim House - FAA] 19:50:05
They are not considered in a part of the master plan.

[Tim House - FAA] 19:50:09
We need to present a plan that meets standards.

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 19:50:13
So Tim, question for you. Is there a difference between a mod to standard and a deviation? Or is a mod to standard? Because that was the question

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 19:50:23
That's what…

[Tim House - FAA] 19:50:25
Well, but it sounds like what he's saying is…

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 19:50:28
Doug, could you…

[Tim House - FAA] 19:50:29
Give us a modification of Stan, give us a modification of standards while we're planning it.

[Doug Wilson] 19:50:34
Can I be unmuted?

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 19:50:34
Yeah, yeah, you're unmuted.

[Doug Wilson] 19:50:36
Am I unmuted? Okay, I speak your language, gentlemen. I speak grand assurance. I speak AIP funding.

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 19:50:37
Yeah, yeah.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:50:38
Yeah.

[Doug Wilson] 19:50:42
talk brass tacks. Okay. So a 7460 is the most basic concept of a modification for the transitional surfaces for FAR 77. For everybody who's on the call.

[Doug Wilson] 19:50:51
Transitional surfaces are the 701 slope available from the main center line of the runway along with areas such as the RSA,

[Doug Wilson] 19:50:59
RFA, et cetera. So when one builds a hangar and they need to penetrate the 74 they need to penetrate the far 77,

[Doug Wilson] 19:51:07
they file a 7460. It's reviewed by the FAA to see if it's a hazard to navigation, etc.

[Doug Wilson] 19:51:12
That is a deviation, a modification is a request to change the actual dogma and the actual language within the FAA itself as to what

[Doug Wilson] 19:51:20
how AIP monies are determined via master planning, et cetera. I'm asking about a deviation, not a modification.

[Doug Wilson] 19:51:26
I'm also further asking to use my example I provided, Boeing Field.

[Doug Wilson] 19:51:31
which has the Georgetown steam plant, which is a federally protected building that penetrates Far 77.

[Doug Wilson] 19:51:37
As well as the utility runway that is too close to the main instrument runway, they continue to receive AIP funding.

[Doug Wilson] 19:51:45
my statement earlier is that it appears, although it has not been stated, and I would love it if Kenji would.

[Doug Wilson] 19:51:51
that the ODAV.

[Doug Wilson] 19:51:53

is unwilling to put forth a master plan

[Doug Wilson] 19:51:56
to the FAA that is not exactly in compliance because there is not AIP funding available.

[Doug Wilson] 19:52:02
Is that a true statement or a false statement?

[Doug Wilson] 19:52:04
Are you stating, is the FAA, is the FAA dogma changed in the last two to three years?

[Doug Wilson] 19:52:10
that one cannot have a deviation. I'm not talking about the master planning process.

[Doug Wilson] 19:52:15
I understand the difference between a new greenfield airport and an existing airport with nonconformities, which is what we're discussing.

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 19:52:24
Tim?

[Tim House - FAA] 19:52:26
You said you have your you have

[Tim House - FAA] 19:52:30
business at Boeing Field.

[Tim House - FAA] 19:52:33
Have you been a part of the current master plan that's ongoing there?

[Doug Wilson] 19:52:36
That's a great question. It's an irrelevant question, but to be sure.

[Tim House - FAA] 19:52:40
No, it's very relevant. It's very relevant.

[Doug Wilson] 19:52:41
I am actually on the airport planning committee. I was also part of the hiring committee for the current director of that airport.

[Tim House - FAA] 19:52:45
Okay.

[Tim House - FAA] 19:52:50
You are aware, I'm assured then too, that they are relocating taxiway Bravo

[Doug Wilson] 19:52:56

Which is on the far side of the utility runway and does nothing for the center line between those two runways.

[Tim House - FAA] 19:52:57
Okay.

[Tim House - FAA] 19:53:02
And do they have simultaneous operations between those two runways?

[Doug Wilson] 19:53:05
they do today. Do you know something different?

[Tim House - FAA] 19:53:08
simultaneous operations.

[Doug Wilson] 19:53:10
I fly it every day.

[Tim House - FAA] 19:53:11
simultaneous operations.

[Doug Wilson] 19:53:13
I understand what the word simultaneous means. Are you asking if there's a Boeing 777 next to me on final? The answer is yes.

[Tim House - FAA] 19:53:22
Okay.

[Doug Wilson] 19:53:25
Do you care to contact the tower to confirm that, Tim?

[Tim House - FAA] 19:53:29
It is my understanding that because the separation is not there?

[Tim House - FAA] 19:53:33
that they do not have simultaneous operations.

[Doug Wilson] 19:53:36
And I apologize that you are misinformed, Tim, and I invite you to come out to Boeing Field any day of the week.

[Tim House - FAA] 19:53:42
Appreciate that. The runways do not have proper separation. They're not supposed to have simultaneous operations.

[Doug Wilson] 19:53:49
They're not supposed to, but the question around AIP funding

[Tim House - FAA] 19:53:50
They are also not receiving FAA funding.

[Tim House - FAA] 19:53:54
for that small runway.

[Doug Wilson] 19:53:56
Okay, so I understand what you're referring to then is the small runway. So in this case, as what was being referred to, Aurora was

[Doug Wilson] 19:54:04
maintenance versus an extension. Is that a correct statement?

[Doug Wilson] 19:54:07
You were talking about that, or maybe Kenji was only referring to that maintenance monies could be provided, but not AIP funding. Is that what we're getting at?

[Doug Wilson] 19:54:15
The master plan is a function of AIP funding, right? 80, 20, 90, 10, grant assurances. Is that a correct statement?

[David Miller - Century West] 19:54:16
I mean…

[Doug Wilson] 19:54:22
Kenji?

[David Miller - Century West] 19:54:22
That was actually my comment. And the distinction is FAA is indicated, and this is true at other airports.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:54:29
that there's a distinction between

[David Miller - Century West] 19:54:32
rehabilitating, maintaining existing runways versus upgrading to meet

[Doug Wilson] 19:54:34
Sure.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:54:37
pavement weight bearing capacity or runway length. So that's what I was specifically talking about.

[Doug Wilson] 19:54:42
Understood. Understood. Okay.

[Doug Wilson] 19:54:44
Okay.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:54:46
Could I add one thing too, and I don't want to get down into the weeds beyond

[Doug Wilson] 19:54:48
Sure. My question is around if the dogma has changed, and I've not heard that answer in the formative.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:54:50
Well, I just want to

[David Miller - Century West] 19:54:54
You specifically cited Part 77 and deviations and and you know.

[Doug Wilson] 19:54:58
I have.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:54:59
7460s. I would point out 7460s are required for anything built in an airport.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:55:03
Not just something that might penetrate a surface.

[Doug Wilson] 19:55:05
Of course.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:55:05
But what I would say is because I'm from Alaska.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:55:07
And a lot of the airports that I learned to fly at are penetrated severely by terrain.

[Doug Wilson] 19:55:12
Yeah, yeah.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:55:13
There is no way to

[David Miller - Century West] 19:55:15
mitigate that. And so it's not treated the same way

[Doug Wilson] 19:55:16
Which is where R&P approaches came from.

[Doug Wilson] 19:55:19
Yeah.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:55:19
It isn't treated the same way as

[David Miller - Century West] 19:55:21
a non-standard runaway safety area. Part 77 airspace is non-modifiable

[David Miller - Century West] 19:55:26
In that sense, you either have penetration or they don't, you attempt to mitigate through design where you can.

[Doug Wilson] 19:55:27
Of course.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:55:31
I just want to make that point.

[Doug Wilson] 19:55:33
You raise an excellent point. And again, I cannot

[Doug Wilson] 19:55:36
Sing Century West's praises enough. The notion, however, is that one has a document within the FAA they can file

[Doug Wilson] 19:55:43
for a non-standard matter, in this case, a 7460 for if you do need to penetrate, and I can share with you a

[Doug Wilson] 19:55:50
hangar that was just built at Boeing Field that in fact penetrates that.

[Doug Wilson] 19:55:54
So I guess my question is.

[Tim House - FAA] 19:55:55
Park 77 is a notification surface

[Doug Wilson] 19:56:00
Is there not a process?

[Doug Wilson] 19:56:02
In this plan that we're referring to that

[Doug Wilson] 19:56:04
Well, let me go back to a basic question.

[Doug Wilson] 19:56:07
really basic is the FAA withholding aip funding

[Doug Wilson] 19:56:11
for airports that are not in compliance, yes or no?

[Tim House - FAA] 19:56:21
There are…

[Tim House - FAA] 19:56:23

We are making incremental improvements

[Tim House - FAA] 19:56:26
to get to meeting the standards.

[Tim House - FAA] 19:56:29
The way that we do that is we have a master plan that shows

[Tim House - FAA] 19:56:34
they meet standards.

[Tim House - FAA] 19:56:36
And we execute projects.

[Tim House - FAA] 19:56:38
Along that 20-year plan

[Doug Wilson] 19:56:41
Mm-hmm.

[Tim House - FAA] 19:56:41
to get the airport to standard.

[Tim House - FAA] 19:56:43
So as long as an airport is making progress towards meeting standards, we will continue to fund the airport.

[Tim House - FAA] 19:56:49
If we get to a point

[Tim House - FAA] 19:56:51
Where we are not trying to make any progress. We don't care about your standards.

[Doug Wilson] 19:56:55
Sure. Sure.

[Tim House - FAA] 19:56:57
You're basically saying, and that's what we've stated in the past

[Tim House - FAA] 19:57:01
the term maintenance mode was used. It's not an FAA term, but that term was used with this group, so I'll continue it here.

[Doug Wilson] 19:57:03
Yep.

[Doug Wilson] 19:57:10
Yeah.

[Tim House - FAA] 19:57:10

we would not

[Tim House - FAA] 19:57:12
fund an extension.

[Tim House - FAA] 19:57:14
We would not fund a

[Tim House - FAA] 19:57:18
reconstruction of the runway.

[Doug Wilson] 19:57:20
Yeah.

[Tim House - FAA] 19:57:20
a pavement strengthening of the runway.

[Doug Wilson] 19:57:22
Sure.

[Tim House - FAA] 19:57:23
pavement strengthening for the taxiway.

[Tim House - FAA] 19:57:26
If we continued funding with a airport that is not willing to meet our standards, not willing to pay attention to their grant

[Tim House - FAA] 19:57:35
assurances

[Doug Wilson] 19:57:37
Sure.

[Tim House - FAA] 19:57:38
The maximum we would do with that would be to provide maintenance to keep the pavement usable.

[Tim House - FAA] 19:57:42
And I say that's the maximum that we would do.

[Tim House - FAA] 19:57:45
If they're in noncompliance, there are provisions that say that the grant funds will be removed.

[Doug Wilson] 19:57:52
Absolutely. And I also want to speak to an earlier comment about people asking about FA funding on non-airport land. Totally get it. No questions asked on that one. You're never going to get an argument out of me on that. Okay.

[Doug Wilson] 19:58:03

Understood. And again, we're never going to solve this on this call, but I do want to key into the term

[Doug Wilson] 19:58:09
an airport making progress.

[Doug Wilson] 19:58:12
I believe in the preferred alternative that may bring the airport fully into compliance. Is that a true statement?

[Doug Wilson] 19:58:21
or close? You're close.

[Tim House - FAA] 19:58:21
The preferred alternatives that they've got out there, I'll say i would say

[Doug Wilson] 19:58:25
Sure.

[Tim House - FAA] 19:58:26
likely all of the alternatives that they have.

[Tim House - FAA] 19:58:28
show the airport being in compliance with all of those activities completed.

[Doug Wilson] 19:58:29
Yeah.

[Doug Wilson] 19:58:32
Right. And so I guess to me, and the only thing I would

[Doug Wilson] 19:58:36
give thought to is the notion that the term progress is rather fun.

[Doug Wilson] 19:58:41
And being able to move directly to full compliance versus incremental progress are two different things.

[Tim House - FAA] 19:58:47
Certainly.

[Doug Wilson] 19:58:48
So I just encourage that sort of line of thinking.

[Doug Wilson] 19:58:53
And beyond that, I'm a non-confrontational guy. I love this opportunity. I love FAA dogma. I love understanding it. If there's anything I can do to help.

[Doug Wilson] 19:59:03
And I also, Tim, want to give you a big shout out because I don't mean to say it

like this, but

[Doug Wilson] 19:59:08
Let's be honest, government employees after 5 p.m.

[Doug Wilson] 19:59:11
Thank you so much for being part of this.

[Doug Wilson] 19:59:14
I very much appreciate it. And I'll refrain from further comment and I look forward to working with you guys so much.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:59:21
Thanks, Doug. Thanks, Tim.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:59:21
Thanks, Doug. Also, Randy.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:59:23
I just want to say that we're actually just about to time.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:59:28
And so I do see a couple of other hands, but I want to check in with you, David, and then Kenji. And then I think we

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:59:38
might need to wrap it up, but we're still collecting comments through Monday, December 23rd, right before the holiday season starts.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:59:46
So that we can include all the comments. If anyone isn't here and they're watching later, you can chime in on any of the comments or questions that have been raised so far.

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 19:59:47
Ready.

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 19:59:58
I saw Wendy's hand up, so let's get her. And then Erin's got his hand up as well. So let's make sure we get to them.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 19:59:59
Yes.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 20:00:03
Okay.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 20:00:06
Okay, great. So we'll stay. And I think those were the only wrap up next step items. So it's just get your comments in by the 23rd. You can do that via email or

through the website.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 20:00:17
So I will jump over to Wendy and um

[David Miller - Century West] 20:00:22
I will. Randy, I'm going to step out for just about 30 seconds. I'll be right back.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 20:00:25
Okay. Okay. Sounds good. Thanks, David.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 20:00:28
All right. Wendy, you should be able to speak.

[Wendie Kellington] 20:00:32
Thank you. I want to really echo what we just heard.

[Wendie Kellington] 20:00:38
Dave and Tim talking about

[Wendie Kellington] 20:00:41
So the reality here

[Wendie Kellington] 20:00:43
is that there is a path forward

[Wendie Kellington] 20:00:46
That does not put this internal service road in the middle of a bunch of business jet hangers and destroy the airport.

[Wendie Kellington] 20:00:54
And that allows the runway to be extended.

[Wendie Kellington] 20:00:58
that has the master plan include a plan

[Wendie Kellington] 20:01:03
to move Highway 551 and for Odav to work real hard to make that happen.

[Wendie Kellington] 20:01:11
All of those things are possible. This is not the binary

[Wendie Kellington] 20:01:15
set of choices where we either destroy the golden goose that gave us Aurora in the first place

[Wendie Kellington] 20:01:21
by destroying the business jet hangers

[Wendie Kellington] 20:01:25

And we continue to have an unsafe runway situation for the aircraft that use the airport.

[Wendie Kellington] 20:01:31
And we can aspire to work toward moving 551

[Wendie Kellington] 20:01:37
Maybe we make incremental changes along the way, as Tim said. Maybe we move the fence.

[Wendie Kellington] 20:01:44
Maybe we do little things.

[Wendie Kellington] 20:01:46
And we can strengthen

[Wendie Kellington] 20:01:49
the drain field, if people just talk to each other, Kenji we've learned

[Wendie Kellington] 20:01:53
that there's probably a path forward to make the drain fields also comply with standards. And I think we would be

[Wendie Kellington] 20:02:01
absolutely reckless if we did not pursue the olive branches

[Wendie Kellington] 20:02:07
to get to a yes that works for the aeronautics

[Wendie Kellington] 20:02:12
stakeholders works for ODE,

[Wendie Kellington] 20:02:15
works for the FAA.

[Wendie Kellington] 20:02:17
And if we just let this opportunity go and the next thing we see is this preferred alternative the way it is.

[Wendie Kellington] 20:02:23
I mean, shame on you guys.

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 20:02:26
Wendy, remember what I said at the beginning?

[Wendie Kellington] 20:02:30
I heard it and I'm thinking that's probably true and I'm hoping it is because I have never heard such a wonderful olive branch

[Wendie Kellington] 20:02:37

at the end of a public meeting as I heard here.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 20:02:43
Okay, great. Thank you, Wendy. I'm going to pause that timer and jump over to you, Erin.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 20:02:53
Yeah, and I was just going to comment. Wendy said some of what i was going to say

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 20:02:59
And it's kind of to you, Tim.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 20:03:01
that it makes complete sense that if we have an incremental

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 20:03:07
path to get to compliance.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 20:03:11
And with the ROFA, it seems to me that it's

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 20:03:15
there's a pretty simple

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 20:03:18
Which is…

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 20:03:20
The first phase is negotiate with ODOT

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 20:03:22
you know through the governor's office

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 20:03:24
to move the fence closer to the road, which really is kind of a non

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 20:03:33
It shouldn't be that hard.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 20:03:38
negotiate with ODOT

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 20:03:40
to keep the road within the hundred foot

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 20:03:43
easement and add a lane and a half

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 20:03:46
to the west, you know, there's a sequence

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 20:03:50
that makes a lot of sense.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 20:03:52
And I would just encourage the ODAV and FAA

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 20:03:58
to look at it, that that's a positive solution

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 20:04:02
that's actually doable.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 20:04:05
You know, without the $100 or $200 million.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 20:04:09
Just a suggestion.

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 20:04:10
And Aaron, we had been talking phasing for a while so

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 20:04:15
Yes.

[Aron Faegre representing HTS] 20:04:16
Good.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 20:04:18
Okay, well, thank you, everyone. I think this has been a really good conversation and allowed some good

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 20:04:25
dialogue and back and forth. So again, as always, we will include a meeting summary that will

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 20:04:33
address any comments or questions that were not answered during the meeting. We will try to get that up as soon as possible on the website. I've also promised you a follow-up email to PAC members

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 20:04:45
about answering the question about our future meetings.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 20:04:50
In the meantime, please do send any additional comments.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 20:04:54
to us either through the website or via email. It can come to me or it can come to Tony.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 20:05:02
Tony Beach, sorry, should have clarified. And

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 20:05:07
before December 23rd, that's almost two weeks from today. So we just want to make sure that even if a PAC member wasn't here tonight or if you've thought of something.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 20:05:17
Please send that over to us by that time. And thank you so much for staying

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 20:05:22
Just five minutes late, but we really appreciate you being part of this conversation. I want to just check in with Tony Beach and Kenji. Anything you want to do to close out the meeting?

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 20:05:33
Tony Hubbling would have loved to get all the pack emails. No, but seriously, it was great to chat with people and ask questions. And, you know, nothing beats an in-person meeting. I get it.

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 20:05:50
We are where we are at. And I appreciate everybody's feedback and especially spending a Tuesday

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 20:05:56
night doing this because I know and understand and value the folks at Aurora and the surrounding communities as well.

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 20:06:04
You are all very important stakeholders and I appreciate all the input that you give to us so

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 20:06:09
From the bottom of my heart, thank you.

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 20:06:12
And yeah, we will take everything into consideration. And as I stated before

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 20:06:20
We are open to refining the

[Kenji Sugahara (ODAV)] 20:06:23
preferred alternative. So thank you so much and have a wonderful night. And I'll hand it over to Tony to see if he has any comments as well.

[Tony Beach - ODAV] 20:06:31
I can't add anything more than that. Just want to reiterate thank you and um

[Tony Beach - ODAV] 20:06:36
And then looking forward to updating the pack and meeting again in February.

[Tony Beach - ODAV] 20:06:42
for our next meeting.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 20:06:45
All right. Thank you, everyone. That officially closes meeting eight. We'll add the video to the website and we'll send you a follow-up email.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement] 20:06:54
Thank you, everyone, and have a lovely evening.

[David Miller - Century West] 20:06:58
Thank you, everyone. Appreciate it.

17:08:12 From Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement to Everyone:
Just a reminder that we are recording the meeting. The recording will be posted to the website in the next 48 hours; the meeting summary will be posted when it is complete https://publicproject.net/AuroraAirport. Public comments can be submitted through the website and through the Q&A section of this meeting.
17:08:31 From Jen Winslow | JLA Public Involvement to Dave TibbettsAnd all panelists:
Hi Dave, you are logged in twice but I want to promote you to panelist. Can you please log off the second one?
17:12:33 From Dave Mauk to Hosts and panelists:
Did log off work?
17:15:32 From Tim House - FAA to Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement(direct message):
George Buley - FAA has my other log in. He either did not have a link, or it did not work.
17:16:59 From Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement to Tim House - FAA(direct message):
Thanks
17:17:25 From Tim House - FAA to Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement(direct message):
He was able to get the name changed.
17:18:52 From Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement to Tim House - FAA(direct message):
Perfect
17:25:28 From Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement to Everyone:
PAC Members - feel free to use the chat feature if you have questions or comments tonight. Please just use the "Everyone" setting so that attendees can see what you've written.
17:27:01 From Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement to Everyone:
For attendees listening in tonight you can submit comments and questions on the project website or using the Q&A section of the Zoom meeting. We will respond to all questions and comments in the meeting summary, which will be posted to the website: https://publicproject.net/AuroraAirport
17:31:40 From Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement to Everyone:
Just a reminder that we're recording this meeting. We'll be post the recording and presentation to the website tomorrow.
17:53:59 From Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement to Everyone:
Sorry for the duplicate screens!
17:54:35 From Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement to Everyone:
Next up, we have Bruce Bennet, then Aron Faegre and Tony Helbling
17:58:16 From Pam Barlow Lind to Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement(direct message):
This is helpful to have the speaker's names here. Thanks!
17:58:43 From Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement to Pam Barlow Lind(direct message):
I agree! It's like name tags; so helpful.
18:04:59 From Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement to Everyone:
Just a reminder that we will have time for the public/attendees to speak following the PAC roundtable conversation.
18:05:57 From Jamie Stickel, City of Canby to Brandy Steffen | JLA Public

Involvement(direct message):
Brandy - I emailed a letter from Canby's Mayor Hodson. Is that sufficient for public comment or shall I read it during this roundtable?
18:08:00 From Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement to Jamie Stickel, City of Canby(direct message):
Thanks Jamie. It is up to you, but the group may like to hear it during the roundtable. Did you email that to me? If so, I don't think it's come through yet.
18:09:02 From Jamie Stickel, City of Canby to Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement(direct message):
Yes, I emailed right before the meeting. I would be happy to read it and if you need me to send again, I can do so.
18:09:24 From Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement to Jamie Stickel, City of Canby(direct message):
That sounds good. Thanks Jamie
18:14:46 From Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement to Everyone:
Next up Tony Helbling, then Jamie Stickel
18:15:18 From Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement to Everyone:
Then David Waggoner
18:31:38 From Ken Ivey | Aurora Butteville Barlow Community Planning Org to Hosts and panelists:
Mr. Faegre said that the 2012 consultants recommended a 1,000 foot extension. However, the original recommendation to ODAV was "No Extension". The plan was then changed to satisfy ODAV.
18:32:56 From Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement to Everyone:
Just sharing this with everyone. This chat was from Ken Ivey: "Mr. Faegre said that the 2012 consultants recommended a 1,000 foot extension. However, the original recommendation to ODAV was "No Extension". The plan was then changed to satisfy ODAV."
18:32:57 From Bruce Bennett - Airport user, property & business owner to Everyone:
The improved runway length is NOT for "bigger" aircraft but for the aircraft that have been using Aurora since 1943. Please understand that the only safe action during an emergency for a small single engine aircraft is to always land straight ahead, also please study "balanced field lengths" for any twin, including light twins as required by FAA regulation 135.
18:36:29 From Brian Asher | City of Aurora to Hosts and panelists:
I have a council meeting and will be leaving this meeting thanks
18:49:02 From Bruce Bennett - Airport user, property & business owner to Everyone:
much of the priorly planned ISR is on ODAV property
18:54:23 From Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement to Jamie Stickel, City of Canby(direct message):
Do you still want to share your/the mayor's comments?
18:55:08 From Jamie Stickel, City of Canby to Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement(direct message):
yes please
18:55:16 From Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement to Jamie Stickel, City of Canby(direct message):
Perfect! I'll call on you next
18:57:51 From Bruce Bennett - Airport user, property & business owner to Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement(direct message):
can we take a 5 minute break?

18:59:31 From Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement to Bruce Bennett - Airport user, property & business owner(direct message):
Let me check!
19:14:43 From Bruce Bennett - Airport user, property & business owner to Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement(direct message):
THANK YOU
19:14:55 From Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement to Bruce Bennett - Airport user, property & business owner(direct message):
Of course!
19:16:45 From Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association to Everyone:
would like this in the PAC record.,,
19:17:03 From Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association to Everyone:
It has been started that “The FAA is requiring that non-standard conditions be brought into compliance.”
Several airports in the same ADO region have non-standard conditions and will NEVER be brought into compliance as a result of a number of factors. Boeing Field, which is a far higher profile airport than Aurora, will NEVER be in compliance as a result of federally-protected historic buildings, etc.
It *sounds* to me that what isn’t being said, is that AIP-funding will be withheld from Aurora until it is brought into standard; however, airports all over the country continue to receive AIP funding with non-standard conditions. There has always been a path for deviations within the ADO, why is that not-being explored by ODAV?
Outside of the Airport Compliance Manual FAA 5190.6B, please point to the “recent” FAA dogma that states that deviations would not be honored/considered?
Has a law been passed within Congress of FAA funding that changes past practice? Or is this an ADO leader’s personal position?
19:22:25 From Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement to Everyone:
We'll be starting public comment soon. If you are interested in speaking, please raise your hand. You may also type your comments/questions in the Q&A area or submit them via the website through 12/23/24.
19:22:48 From Bill Graupp | Aurora CTE to Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement(direct message):
Are you recording now?
19:23:14 From Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement to Bill Graupp | Aurora CTE(direct message):
Yes, we are
19:29:32 From Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement to Everyone:
For public comments, I see Doug Wilson, Lukas Nickerson, and Wendie Kellington. You'll each have 3 minutes. If no one else wants to speak, we can have you speak for additional time until 7:50 when we will finish public comments.
19:33:16 From Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement to Everyone:
Please continue to raise your hands if you'd like to speak.
19:35:34 From Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association to Everyone:
the record needs to show - short 2.5 hour PAC meetings controlled electronically - when we're talking about the destruction of hundreds of millions of dollars is not the way to do business.
19:42:32 From Tony Helbling | Aurora Airport Improvement Association to Everyone:
Doug Wilson's idea is exactly the outside the box we're talking about - if we could work collaboratively rather than under threat and control... we could move

this thing forward!
20:06:52 From Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement to Everyone:
Thanks everyone!

Jeff Lewis 05:58 PM
at 557pm, Miller says they are looking at numbers showing recent increases in IFR jets, etc. The people need to see the data he claims being looked at post-pandemic. What will be done to maximize transparency of data through at least September 2024? When will we see it?
Jeff Lewis 06:08 PM
Bruce also noted a long history of master plans, going back to CH2M Hill in 1976. Some of us have seen them all. Can we confirm the fact that ALL master plan forecasts have failed... that there has never been a forecast of operations met going forward? And how does this resonate with Ben's excellent question, about the true iability of a no-build alternative?
Jeff Lewis 06:16 PM
Is Faegre eligible to attend as an alternate to HTS, as the posted member list does not show him as that role (he is alternate to Ted Millar)?
Jeff Lewis 06:21 PM
at ~610, Faegre repeatedly cites SB680 and claims it is about public private partnership... but those words do not occur in the text of SB680. It is about TTF, and it was created by Betsy Johnson, all in service of the Aurora pilot community. Can someone please clarify the context of SB680 as a TTF legislative act that is NOT about PPPs?
Doug Wilson 06:26 PM
It has been started that “The FAA is requiring that non-standard conditions be brought into compliance.” Several airports in the same ADO region have non-standard conditions and will NEVER be brought into compliance as a result of a number of factors. Boeing Field, which is a far higher profile airport than Aurora, will NEVER be in compliance as a result of federally-protected historic buildings, etc. It *sounds* to me that what isn’t being said, is that AIP-funding will be withheld from Aurora until it is brought into standard; however, airports all over the country continue to receive AIP funding with non-standard conditions. There has always been a path for deviations within the ADO, why is that not-being explored by ODAV? Outside of the Airport Compliance Manual FAA 5190.6B, please point to the “recent” FAA dogma that states that deviations would not be honored/considered? Has a law been passed within Congress of FAA funding that changes past practice? Or is this an ADO leader’s personal position?
Jeff Lewis 06:27 PM
At 625, Faegre notes KRNT has a recent APMP showing a B-II airport despite alll the B737s that takeoff their after manufacture. How many of these larger-than-B-II ops happen at KRNT each year? Is Faegre correct that the KRNT example means KUAO can select a B-II designation in this current master plan?
Jeff Lewis 06:32 PM
If we are going to entertain including HTS as a possible airport acquisition, and if Faegre is suggesting they may be interested in leaving, is it not appropriate that the APMP document more thoroughly the role of HTS at KUAO? And should this documentation note their history: leaving the Corvallis airport, building anew near KUAO but with no airport access, running an outfit that is completely independent of ODAV's land holding?

Jeff Lewis 06:34 PM
Kirby discussed the drainfields at 631. How did it come to be that the drainfields existed prior to the 2012 Master Plan yet were completely missing from that APMP. and APMP process? Also, if FAA had known about the septic drainfields when they signed the plan in 2012, would they have annotated a modification of standards?
Jeff Lewis 06:49 PM
Is it possible that Tony and Aron are too obsessed with the idea that 'partnership' means no longer having to conform with higher regulations, safety standards, etc? Is it also possible that Tony's repeated expression of condemnation fears fails to see that a B-II airport with no runway extension does in fact ensure no condemnation threat? Why not face the facts: this airport is a mess BECAUSE of this BS 'partnership TTF' concept, and FAA is FINALLY doing the right thing, saying 'enough is enough' on the MOS's?
Jeff Lewis 06:53 PM
At 651, Helbling states a belief that an easement is sufficient to create the vehicle service road. But, is he failing to recognize FAA's significant security concerns, which are the core reason for a VSR being very restrictive (not for him to just zip up to Willamette to chat w Waggoner)? What precisely are FAA's SECURITY concerns? And what precisely are the concerns by ATC, to manage moving aircraft safely and efficiently witbhout surpris pickups, etc.?
Jeff Lewis 06:56 PM
Is it reasonable for the public to expect a full disclosure from key PAC members, as to what financial history and gains some of these members are accruing from the current messy TTF situation at KUAO? This especially about the fiscal interests of Millar, Bennett, and Faegre, and to a lesser extent Helbling?
Jeff Lewis 07:02 PM
At 700, Tim House noted the need for meaningful public engagement, as a primary goal of the APMP process. Can I say, THANK YOU, TIm!?
Jeff Lewis 07:06 PM
Does the data confirm that, on a daily average, for 2024, we are seeing on average 5.5 'air taxi' classified operations per day, but close to 100 small planes in the closed pattern? Given that air taxi is a close proxy metric for larger jets, doesn't it make sense that KUAO remains strongly a B-II airport, serving almost exclusively small planes?
Julie Fitzgerald, Mayor of Wilsonville 07:25 PM
From Julie Fitzgerald, Mayor of Wilsonville. Thank you for the opportunity to comment. I hear many valid concerns and ideas with merit, worth considering. Another point: the Boone Bridge is, as we know. out of date, undersized and not capable of withstanding a major seisimic event. To keep or freight moving, a major point of Oreogn's economiy, it must be replaced, and rebuilt with a much needed S bound auxiliary lane. The current estimated price tag, to the best of my knowledge, $900,000,000. It is not certain that there is funding to replace it in the next 10 or 20 years, unless we can get the state to re-prioritize it. It would be a real shame to see the state move Highway 51 before identifying how and when to replace the Boone Bridge. I hope the preferred alternative recognizes the need to prioritze the Boone Bridge, before moving Highway 51, eliminating housing, essential facilities, and before funding the vitally needed Boone Bridge which carries 126,000 vehicles daily.
Julie Fitzgerald, Mayor of Wilsonville 07:31 PM
Clarification: My question above was meant to refer to Highway 551. Thank you.

Ashley Balsom | JLA 05:06 PM
Hi Bruce, here is the correct link https://us02web.zoom.us/j/85045246628
Bruce Bergman 05:13 PM
Well, I got in through the pac link, but a lot of public will be unable to join.
Brandy Steffen | JLA Public Involvement (You) 05:15 PM
Private answer
Thanks Bruce. I'm not sure why it was showing that for you. We double checked and the link works for us. It should allow people to join throughout the meeting tonight until we close at 8:00 pm. Thanks!
Jeff Lewis 06:02 PM
At 601pm, Bruce B is disinforming by declaring the private airport-related lands are part of the airport... and miller is nodding his head. Is that appropriate? This is NOT airport land, especially as regards application of hundreds of millions of FAA grant monies (not even one dollar goes off airport). Would miller please explain why he was nodding at this false statement by Bruce?
Bruce Bennett - Airport user, property & business owner 06:54 PM
All the aircraft businesses and hangars are not airport land? I cannot agree. The are properties zoned, developed, and used sticly for aviation.
Jeff Lewis 07:35 PM
I am finding no means to comment except via Q&A. SO I will state this: thank you all for participating. I believe the only appropriate decision is to stay with B-II, NOT extend the runway, and have ODAV stop allowing excessive overweight use of the current runway. Rely on FAA for maintenance costs. Restore the REAL partnership, not just within, but throughout the larger and more important public. Aurora Airport has a lot of cleanup to do, with the general public. TTF has created a huge mess.
Jen Winslow | JLA 07:38 PM
Hi Jeff, if you would like to speak, raise your virtual hand and Brandy will unmute you when it is your time.

Aurora State Airport
Master Plan Project



Planning Advisory Committee Meeting #8
December 10, 2024

Agenda

Time	Topic
5:00-5:10	Introductions
5:10-5:30	Review Draft Airport Noise Analysis
5:30-5:40	PAC Clarifying Questions
5:40-6:00	Review Nonstandard Conditions & Preferred Alternative
6:00-7:30	Roundtable Discussion • Opportunity for PAC input on the Preferred Alternative including input received from PAC Meeting #7.
7:30-7:55	Public Comments
7:55-8:00	Next Steps Public comments collected through the website **https://publicproject.net/AuroraAirport**

Introductions

Oregon Department of Aviation (ODAV)

Kenji Sugahara
Director

Alex Thomas
Policy, Planning & Program Manager

Tony Beach
State Airports Manager

Brandon Pike
Aviation Planner

Project Team

Agency Oversight & Funding

Airport Owner (Sponsor)

Planning & Engineering

Public Involvement

Cultural Resources

Archaeological Investigations Northwest, Inc.

Environmental Review

AGIS Survey

Project Website Overview

Website Updates

Aurora State Airport Master Plan


Resources & Documents | Meetings | Contact & Comment | What's an AMP? | FAQs | Public Records

AIRPORT MASTER PLAN

Every airport owner/operator needs to look at the current use of their airport, its relationship to other airports, and expectations for how the airport will need to change in the future. This planning effort takes place every 10-20 years (on average) and helps the airport owner figure out what to study further, what to invest in, and what is crucial to fix for safety and operations.

The Airport Master Plan (AMP) is required by the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) to maintain a safe and efficient airport that is economically, environmentally, and socially sustainable. The Airport Master Plan will also:

- Define the current, short-term and long-term needs of the Airport through a comprehensive evaluation of facilities, conditions and FAA airport planning and design standards.
- Look at what is happening around the airport that could affect the future plans, development and operation of the airport such as land use, transportation, environmental, economic development, etc.



This website was Built with Bolt by JLA Public Involvement 🕶 This site uses cookies. Read our privacy policy.

https://publicproject.net/AuroraAirport

PAC Members & Alternates

AURORA STATE AIRPORT MASTER PLAN

PLANNING ADVISORY COMMITTEE (PAC) MEMBERS

Below are the approved committee members; updated 12/04/24.

Organization	Name	Alternate
1000 Friends of Oregon	Roger Kaye	
AABC/TLM Holdings	Ted Millar	Aron Faegre
Atlantic Aviation (formerly Lynx Aviation)	Jon Bickford	
Aurora Air Traffic Control Tower (ATCT)	Raul Suarez	
Aurora Airport Improvement Association	Tony Helbling	
Aurora Butteville Barlow Community Planning Organization	Ken Ivey	
Aurora CTE, Inc	Bill Graupp	
Charbonneau Country Club	Dave Mauk	
City of Aurora	Brian Asher	
City of Canby	Jamie Stickel	Don Hardy
City of Wilsonville	Councilor Dr. Joann Linville	Chris Neamtzu
Clackamas County	Commissioner Tootie Smith	
Columbia Helicopters	Dave Tibbetts	Matt Nash
Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians	Pam Barlow Lind	
Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde Community of Oregon	Cheryl Pouley	
Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon		
Deer Creek Estates HOA	Matt Williams	
Friends of French Prairie	Ben Williams	Wayne Richards
Helicopter Transport Service	Robert Fournier	
Life Flight Network	Michael Weimer	
Marion County	Alvin Klausen	Matt Lawyer
Marion County Planning Department	Austin Barnes	Brandon Reich
Oregon Dept of Aviation	Tony Beach	
Oregon Dept of Aviation Board	Cathryn Stephens	
Oregon Dept of Transportation	Naomi Zwerdling	
Oregon Dept of Land Conservation and Development	Melissa Ahrens	Matt Crall
Oregon Farm Bureau		
Oregon Department of Emergency Management	Whitney Stewart	
Positive Aurora Airport Management	Bruce Bennett	
Regional Solutions	Beth Wytoski	
Vans Aircraft	Rian Johnson	Greg Hughes
Willamette Aviation	David Waggoner	
Wilsonville Chamber of Commerce	Patrick Donaldson	Kevin Ferrasci O'Malley

PAC Meeting Guidelines

Meetings summaries will **include all comments along with responses/ follow up.**

- Meeting time **for all committee members to speak.** We have added more time for dialogue.

- Comments on **non-agenda items** should be provided in writing.

- Committee members are encouraged to **provide comments on draft work products presented within the allotted review period** provided by the Planning Team.

PAC Meeting Guidelines


As a committee, we agree to **approach this work with honesty, openness, and willingness to work together.**

- This includes building trust and **assuming good intentions in others** and ensuring that our behavior supports a successful process.
- We will work with each other and staff to **address issues as they arise, utilize tools to ensure clear communication and robust participation, and meet the communication needs of members.**
- PAC members represent their organization, please keep your constituents informed of public meetings and project information.
- **We need all PAC members to name/identify themselves.** Duplicates will be removed from the meeting.

Project Schedule – Where are we?

Updated December 2024

Aurora State Airport - Airport Master Plan Project Schedule (all future dates tentative)



Review:

Noise Analysis Summary


Noise Analysis Overview

- Airport Noise was modeled using FAA software: Airport Environmental Design Tool (AEDT).

- AEDT creates a model of cumulative noise exposure in terms of annual day/night average sound level (DNL).
  - DNL is a representation of noise exposure over time, **NOT** individual noise events
  - Modeled noise exposure quantified in decibels (dB) DNL
  - DNL applies a 10 dB penalty to night-time operations
  - 65 dB DNL is the FAA standard threshold for significant aircraft noise exposure


Noise Analysis Overview

- Data inputs
  - Aircraft operations – *What aircraft are flying, when, and how often?*
    - FAA approved operations forecast and fleet mix from AMP
    - TFMSC and ADSB data were referenced to assist with further refinement of the fleet mix
  - Flight tracks – *Where are the aircraft flying?*
    - Flight tracks **approximate** the most common paths that aircraft use to fly to, from, or around the airport.
    - ADSB position data were used to identify local pattern tracks
    - Published procedures were referenced to identify for IFR traffic tracks
    - Helicopter tracks were based on operator input




Noise Analysis – Flight tracks


- Tracks for year 2021 were compared against the preferred traffic pattern depicted in the published noise abatement procedures.
- Noise abatement procedures are voluntary. Pilots are ultimately responsible for operating the aircraft in a safe manner based on the conditions at the time.
- During periods when ATCT is in operation, ATC provides clearance and routing.




Noise Analysis – Flight Tracks – 2021




Noise Analysis – Noise Contours – 2021



Noise Analysis – Flight Tracks – 2041



Noise Analysis – Noise Contours – 2041



Noise Analysis – Impacts

	DNL (dB)	Impacted Land Use (Acres)			
		Public (P)	Acreage Residential (AR)	Exclusive Farm Use (EFU)	Total
2021	65-70	69.7	5.5	59.2	134.4
	70-75	54.5	0.4	14.8	69.7
	75-80	36.9	0	2.4	39.3
	>80	22.8	0	0.9	23.7
	Total	183.9	5.9	77.3	267.1
2041	65-70	83.4	5.9	74.3	163.6
	70-75	62.6	0.9	17.1	80.6
	75-80	45.5	0	2	47.5
	>80	27.9	0	0.3	28.2
	Total	219.4	6.8	93.7	319.9

Clarifying Questions

Review:

Nonstandard Conditions

AIRPORT PROPERTY BOUNDARY (EXISTING CONDITION)



Nonstandard Conditions

The below listed nonstandard conditions are the highest priority to FAA for the Airport (ODAV) to mitigate at Aurora State Airport.

- Runway Object Free Area (ROFA)
  - Acquire property within the ROFA
  - Relocate the ASOS, Windcone, Fencing, Roadways outside of the ROFA
- Runway Safety Area (RSA)
  - Remove drain fields out of RSA
  - Mitigate drainage ditch
- Direct Access Taxiways to Runway
  - Relocate or remove taxiways that connect the apron directly to the

Note – mitigating other nonstandard conditions not listed above will be coordinated with FAA on timing and priority.

Reminder – A modification of standards (MOS) is not a planning level solution for any nonstandard conditions in the Airport Master Plan.

Review:

Preferred Alternative

Goals for the Preferred Alternative

The preferred alternative was selected based on feedback received through the planning process. All of the improvements presented met one of the below three goals:


- Projects required to meet FAA nonstandard conditions (ROFA and RSA)
- Projects that improve efficiency in aircraft operations
- Projects that improve safety

Input received on the Preferred Alternative

Feedback we've heard:

- A no build alternative should be considered
  - Reminder, a no build alternative was presented in the preliminary alternatives and not carried forward based on input by FAA that meeting ROFA/RSA standards were required for an approved plan.
- Reduce or eliminate impacts to existing hangars
- A parallel taxilane is not needed
- Relocate the vehicle service road or use existing off-airport roads through the TTF hangar area
  - Reminder, this is a facility plan for on-airport property. Any proposed improvements off-airport will not be included in the Airport Master Plan.
- Shift the Highway within the ROW
  - Look at shifting the highway within the existing ROW to reduce impacts to neighboring properties

PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE - OVERVIEW



Roundtable Discussion

Public Comments?

Next Steps

Next Steps

- Prepare the:
  - Capital Improvement Plan (CIP)
  - Airport Layout Plan (ALP)
  - Draft Final Report
- Next PAC Meeting – Planned for February 4th
  - To discuss the CIP and ALP

Thank You

Alex Thomas – ODAV

Tony Beach – ODAV

Brandy Steffen – JLA Public Involvement

David Miller – Century West Engineering



Project Website: https://publicproject.net/AuroraAirport

As a follow-up to last night's PAC meeting drainfield discussion, I've gone back and revived the email chain included below and the attachments passed along to ODAV by HDSE previously. In response to HDSE's information, clarification requests were sent to HDSE through ODAV as was requested at that time. The round of requests below are where we (CWE) left off in February of 2022.

We have looked through what was sent over and still have questions and information needed. We also still need a copy of the report that opens & displays all the figures (this was stated as included but it was not one of the attachments). Since other questions are focused on details of the proposed improvements we have not received, we have responded to NV5's answers in that area in orange below:

- **Materials/Construction Proposed**

o What materials specification is to be used (ODOT, proprietary, etc.) for the aggregate?

Per the GeoWeb Manufacturer the infill material should consist of one third pulverized topsoil and two thirds crushed aggregate. The aggregate portion should be crushed rock that has a particle size range from 0.375 to 1.0 inches with a D50 of 0.5 inches and a 30 percent void space. The engineered fill should lightly be compacted to allow vegetation growth.

What are the assumed properties of these materials if there are not more specifics as to what might be used? What is "light compaction"? Is there a minimum void space requirement that should be met? Performance spec for infiltration?

o What compaction specifications and test methods are proposed to achieve the proposed Geoweb strengths?

After the cells have been filled the prepared ground surface should be proofrolled with a fully loaded dump truck. Some rutting and deflection is acceptable considering that the FAA specifies the upper 4-inches of subgrade consist loose uncompacted soil over 12-inches of compacted subgrade.

Again, what is the density intended for these layers? We are not analyzing the rest of the RSA and we need to know how much rutting or deflection is being assumed to be "acceptable". We are concerned with what is being proposed and whether it can support aircraft and vehicle loading.

o What compaction specifications and test methods are proposed for soil layers to be placed along with the Geoweb?

The only other soil that will be placed is the washed gravel or drain rock in the drainage trenches. We recommend only light compaction of this material until it is well keyed. Even at this level of compaction we believe its load bearing characteristics will be superior to the soil that exists in the RSA. Over compacting this material will inhibit its drainage characteristics.

What are the assumed properties of these materials if there are not more specifics as to what might be used? What is "light compaction"? Is there a minimum void space requirement that should be met? Performance spec for infiltration? What load bearing characteristics will these yield? Will these layers retain their characteristics when the grass is mowed or a vehicle passes over the top of them?

o What subgrade compaction specifications and test methods are proposed for the expanded drain field areas?

See our response to the two prior questions.

Same.

o What materials are proposed for use in the rest of the elements of the drain field system (pipes, manifolds, perf spec., etc.)?

To be addressed by others. [[Note: Attachment 6 added by Aron Faegre to this memo for providing this information to Tony Beach.]

Attachment Six does not provide enough detail about the weight rating for proposed elements (structures/pipes/manifolds/etc) or even the proposed cross section in any of the different areas with the geoweb installed. The 2005 design also does not address grading in the proposed drainfield area, but shows a "capping fill" which would not meet RSA grading standards. Please provide a detailed design that includes structure weight ratings and grading plans that meet FAA RSA grading standards. Also, please provide proposed typical sections showing the pipes/structures/geoweb/etc.. Include layer depths, typical surface grades, and detail where the proposed sections will intersect proposed drain field structures/drainage elements.

To pick up where this trailed off, we would need answers to the questions above as well as a proposal that would comply with FAA standards. We need to see structures proposed that would carry vehicle and aircraft loads. We would need to see a design package (with grading plans) that addresses reconstruction of the drainfield to push it to depth under the proposed structural layer. The proposal needs to detail features that will allow drainfield functionality while avoiding use of capping fills or protruding pipes/structures that would create primary surface obstructions and violate RSA grading criteria. ODAV would need to

be able to mow and operate equipment over the entire proposed drainfield for maintenance and mitigation of wildlife attractants. We would also need to know if Marion County is willing to issue an Alteration Permit for this system or if a new location (and construction permit) would be needed.

To be clear, this is an uphill battle. FAA has provided guidance to:

"Please reject future proposed septic (drainage) fields under Aurora State Airport's safety areas and *take action to remove existing septic drainage fields under the airport's safety areas at your earliest opportunity. The safety area must remain, "capable, under dry conditions, of supporting snow removal equipment, ARFF equipment, and the occasional passage of aircraft without causing major damage to the aircraft."* Septic (drainage) fields risk compromising this requirement by:

✈ Including elements structurally incapable of supporting these loads either initially or over the length of time the drainage fields remain under the safety area;

✈ Supersaturating the subsurface, undermining the surrounding soil's load bearing capacity.

We allow a temporary reduction in load bearing capacity due to natural precipitation. We will not allow artificial saturation of the subsoil to compromise the safety area's load bearing capacity. If a drainage field Engineer is somehow able to provide documented evidence that the drainage field will not compromise the safety area's load bearing capacity over the length of time the drainage fields remain under the safety area". . . "this would be considered a nonstandard condition and not a Modification of Standards (MOS) in this case because the drainage fields were not federally funded. In addition, we will not approve MOS requests in any case that will diminish the safety area's ability to perform its function"

The burden to show the ability to be standards compliant with this facility falls to the proposer here. We need to see a thorough proposal that will meet these requirements as well as the scrutiny of our geotech. We look forward to reviewing your responses and continuing the conversation.

James Kirby, PE | Senior Project Manager

Century West Engineering

503.887.9061 | jkirby@centurywest.com

From: Aron Faegre <faegre@earthlink.net>
Sent: Tuesday, December 21, 2021 3:07 PM
To: BEACH Anthony <Anthony.BEACH@odav.oregon.gov>; 'Michelle DaRosa' <mdarosa@landandcondolaw.com>; 'Tony Helbling' <helbling@wilsonconst.com>
Cc: STANSBURY Betty <Betty.STANSBURY@odav.oregon.gov>; 'Ted Millar' <tmillar@tlmholdingsllc.com>; 'Martha Meeker' <meekerma92@msn.com>
Subject: RE: HDSE drainfield expansion area at UAO

This message was sent from outside the organization. Treat attachments, links and requests with caution. Be conscious of the information you share if you respond.

Hi Tony,

Attached are the answers to your detailed questions. Does this provide the information you need to approve our proposal?

Aron

Aron Faegre, AIA, PE, ASLA

Aron Faegre Architect

13200 Fielding Road

Lake Oswego, Oregon 97034

503-880-1469

faegre@earthlink.net

www.faegre.org

From: BEACH Anthony <Anthony.BEACH@aviation.state.or.us>
Sent: Thursday, December 9, 2021 4:20 PM
To: Michelle DaRosa <mdarosa@landandcondolaw.com>; Tony Helbling <helbling@wilsonconst.com>
Cc: STANSBURY Betty <Betty.STANSBURY@aviation.state.or.us>; Ted Millar <tmillar@tlmholdingsllc.com>; Aron Faegre - Aron Faegre & Associates (faegre@earthlink.net) <faegre@earthlink.net>; Martha Meeker (MeekerMA92@msn.com) <meekerma92@msn.com>
Subject: RE: HDSE drainfield expansion area at UAO

Hi Michelle, thank you for your patience as we look into the information you have provided.

Our consultants have taken a first pass through the report along with their Geotech GRI, and they came up with the following list of questions/clarifications/additional information needed:

GRI requests the additional data listed below based on reviewing the November 8, 2021 report "Report of Geotechnical Engineering Services: Aurora State Airport Septic Drain Field Improvements for HDSE Sewer System." [*HDSE drainfield expansion Geotech Study AronFA-2-01-110821-geor.pdf*]

- Field Data Collection
    - Date of soil sampling
    - Were any logs prepared to describe the bulk sampling results?
    - Was a sieve analysis and/or Atterberg Limits test performed to validate the Silt visual classification?
    - Was infiltration testing performed? If not, why?
- As-builts or other construction documents pertaining to the existing drain field
- Report references
    - Geoweb design procedure
    - Provide addition discussion on how the 6-inch geoweb, with 2/3 aggregate and 1/3 topsoil, replaces 12 inches of compacted soil.
    - Equivalent Single Wheel Load source
    - Source identifying the critical aircraft type
- Report figures
    - Figure A-1: graphic does not show up in the provided pdf
    - Figure A-2: graphic does not show up in the provided pdf
- "Such stringent compaction is not permitted in the soil cover of drain fields"
    - Where does this statement come from?

In addition to the list above, we will also need specifics on the proposed Geoweb reinforced drain field construction.

- Materials/Construction Proposed
    - What materials specification is to be used (ODOT, proprietary, etc.) for the aggregate?
    - What compaction specifications and test methods are proposed to achieve the proposed Geoweb strengths?
    - What compaction specifications and test methods are proposed for soil layers to be placed along with the Geoweb?
    - What subgrade compaction specifications and test methods are proposed for the expanded drain field areas?
    - What materials are proposed for use in the rest of the elements of the drain field system (pipes, manifolds, perf spec., etc.)?

Could you please provide this information so I may forward it to our consultants for review?

Thank you,

Tony Beach

OREGON DEPARTMENT OF AVIATION

STATE AIRPORTS MANAGER

OFFICE 503-378-2523 **CELL** 503-302-5455

M-F 7:30am – 4pm

From: Michelle DaRosa <mdarosa@landandcondolaw.com>
Sent: Monday, November 15, 2021 3:51 PM
To: BEACH Anthony <Anthony.BEACH@aviation.state.or.us>; Tony Helbling <helbling@wilsonconst.com>
Cc: STANSBURY Betty <Betty.STANSBURY@aviation.state.or.us>; Ted Millar <tmillar@tlmholdingsllc.com>; Aron Faegre - Aron Faegre & Associates (faegre@earthlink.net) <faegre@earthlink.net>; Martha Meeker (MeekerMA92@msn.com)

<meekerma92@msn.com>
Subject: RE: HDSE drainfield expansion area at UAO

> This message was sent from outside the organization. Treat attachments, links and requests with caution. Be conscious of the information you share if you respond.

Re-sending to include Ms. Martha Meeker.

Michelle D. Da Rosa

Attorney at Law

205 SE Spokane Street, Suite 300

Portland, OR 97202

Office: (503) 220-2891

Direct: (971) 600-6307

www.landandcondolaw.com



From: Michelle DaRosa
Sent: Monday, November 15, 2021 3:25 PM
To: Tony Beach (anthony.beach@aviation.state.or.us) <Anthony.BEACH@aviation.state.or.us>; Tony Helbling <helbling@wilsonconst.com>
Cc: Betty Stansbury (betty.stansbury@aviation.state.or.us) <Betty.STANSBURY@aviation.state.or.us>; Ted Millar <tmillar@tlmholdingsllc.com>; Aron Faegre - Aron Faegre & Associates (faegre@earthlink.net) <faegre@earthlink.net>
Subject: FW: HDSE drainfield expansion area at UAO

Dear Betty and Anthony,

This missive from me, in my capacity as the attorney for TLM Holdings LLC and from Tony Helbling, as a director of HDSE Sewer System Owners Association and Chairperson of the Southend Corporate Airpark Condominium Owners Association, requests that you (i) rescind your denial of HDSE's plans to expand the HDSE drainfield on UAO property, (ii) retract ODA's stated intention to not renew HDSE's drainfield lease in 2024, and (iii) issue an approval of the expansion plans as previously submitted earlier this year. The attached study and our explanations below respond to the concerns ODA cited as the reason for its decisions.

The denial of the proposed expansion was sent to me in the email from Anthony dated July 30, 2021 in the email string below. ODA's expansion denial and threat to terminate the drainfield located on the Aurora State Airport that serves HDSE users (all buildings at Southend) sent concerned shock-waves through the Southend Airpark community because of the vital importance of the drainfield to the HDSE Sewer System, and the HDSE Sewer System to the continued operation of all of the property at Southend. The threat to "not renew" was made notwithstanding that the Non-Commercial Site Lease provides HDSE with two 5-year options and that the Utility Easement recorded as Instrument No. 2020-00001957 on January 13, 2020 is perpetual.

The attached geotechnical study by NV5 (formerly known as GeoDesign), dated November 8, 2021 demonstrates through detailed soil analysis that the drainfield areas already are likely capable "under dry conditions, of supporting snow removal equipment, aircraft rescue and fire-fighting equipment, and the occasional passage of aircraft without causing damage to the aircraft" [AC 150/5300-13A, p. 61]. The area is also free of objects, is drained by grading and a perimeter drain system to avoid accumulation of water, and has no ruts, humps, depressions or other surface variations, as required by the FAA's design standards for RSA's.

We propose resolution of this issue by:

1. Making no changes to the existing drainfields as they have been in the RSA for around 20 years now, with no problems occurring, and the gravel filled drainfield trenches already demonstrating regular supporting of tractors for mowing and thus physically demonstrating meeting the RSA vehicle support requirements.
2. For the new expansion drainfields use the addition of the 6 inch geo-fabric in the top layer, which then results in gaining of 95% compaction (in fact with a 1.5 safety factor bearing capacity over that).

In addition, we note as mitigating factors that:

- To promote the functionality of Aurora Airport as a resiliency resource following a major earthquake, the septic system will allow the airport to seamlessly continue operation following an earthquake, whereas those airports relying on urban sanitary systems will generally require from one month to a year to become functional after the earthquake – thus the HDSE's septic system is an advantage to promote at Aurora Airport.
- The existing and proposed drainfields are approximately 150 feet or more to the side of the runway centerline, and thus they are areas that are least likely to be needed for emergency use.
- Many existing areas of the RSA do not currently meet the 95% compaction requirement (as shown in the geotech study).

Sincerely yours,

Tony Helbling

Logistics Manager

Wilson Construction Company

1190 NW 3rd Ave

Canby, OR 97013

Cell: 503-519-6059

Office: 503-263-6882

helbling@wilsonconst.com

www.wilsonconst.com

Michelle D. Da Rosa

Attorney at Law

205 SE Spokane Street, Suite 300

Portland, OR 97202

Office: (503) 220-2891

Direct: (971) 600-6307

www.landandcondolaw.com

From: BEACH Anthony <Anthony.BEACH@aviation.state.or.us>
Sent: Friday, July 30, 2021 10:20 AM
To: Michelle DaRosa <mdarosa@landandcondolaw.com>
Subject: RE: HDSE drainfield expansion area at UAO

Good morning Ms. DaRosa,

I am writing to follow up on your request for 103,104 square feet of additional drain field and reserve area lease space at the Aurora State Airport. We understand your client, HDSE Sewer System Owners Association, already has 61,375 square feet of premises leased for a drain field, reserve area, and piping. We are also aware that the existing lease was entered into with a general understanding that additional space would be needed, and that additional space would be made available by the Oregon Department of Aviation. Though both drain field use and leasing within Runway Safety Areas are unusual in my experience, I have been working to honor that arrangement with the intent of accommodating the expansion.

In initiating the Pen and Ink change to our Airport Layout Plan for this expansion, some concerns were raised by the FAA regarding compatibility of drain fields and Runway Safety Areas (RSA). The RSA enhances the safety of aircraft which undershoot, overrun, or veer off the runway, and it provides greater accessibility for firefighting and rescue equipment during such incidents. There are four requirements that our RSAs must meet, those include being:

1. cleared and graded and have no potentially hazardous ruts, humps, depressions, or other surface variations;
2. drained by grading or storm sewers to prevent water accumulation;

3. capable, under dry conditions, of supporting snow removal equipment, Aircraft Rescue and Fire Fighting (ARFF) equipment, and the occasional passage of aircraft without causing damage to the aircraft; and

4. free of objects, except for objects that need to be located in the RSA because of their function…

To address these concerns we closely evaluated the information you provided, and we analyzed what impacts, if any, a drain field would have on meeting the RSA's design standards. What we have found is that generally leach field soils are not compacted to the densities needed to support vehicle loads. The effluent from the waste stream has to be able to move into the pores of the soil around the drain tiles for the leach field to function. This increases the moisture content of the soils and further reduces their ability to support loads. At best, we are concerned that vehicle loading (including mowers) will reduce the porosity of the leach field soil (resulting in slower infiltration over time) or, at worst, cause damage to the shallow drain tiles and manifolds resulting in surface failures. It is our conclusion that drain fields in the RSA present a potential hazard to aircraft forced to roll out in the RSA. They are especially hazardous for heavier aircraft or those with higher tire pressures.

Due to the decreased soil strength and increased water accumulation caused by a drain field's function, we are unable to expand your client's drain field and reserve areas. Further, because the existing drain field and reserve area are not compatible within the RSA, we will not be able to renew the lease once the current term expires August 30th, 2024. At that time, all pipes and associated equipment will need to be removed by the Lessee, and the site will need to be returned to its original condition.

I am sorry I don't have a better answer for you, please let me know if you have any questions,

Anthony Beach, C.M., ACE

OREGON DEPARTMENT OF AVIATION

STATE AIRPORTS MANAGER

M-F 7:30am – 4pm

OFFICE 503-378-2523 **CELL** 503-302-5455

EMAIL Anthony.Beach@aviation.state.or.us

3040 25TH STREET SE, SALEM, OR 97302

WWW.OREGON.GOV/AVIATION

ENVIRONMENTAL
MANAGEMENT
SYSTEMS, INC.

OR: 503-353-9691
FAX: 503-353-9695
WA: 360-735-1109
www.envmgtsys.com
4080 SE International Way
Suite B-112
Milwaukie, OR 97222

5 November 2020
Report # 19-0054-02

Mr. Ted Millar
c/o: Aron Faegre & Associates
520 SW Yamhill St., Roofgarden 1
Portland, OR 97204

REGARDING: Winter Evaluation for feasibility of onsite wastewater treatment, HDSE Sewer System Association, Aurora State Airport, adjacent to Keil Rd. NE and Hubbard Cuttoff Rd. NE, Aurora, OR 97002. T: 4S, R: 1W, Sec: 11, T.L: 800, 17.79 Acres

Dear Mr. Millar & Mr. Faegre,

As requested, Environmental Management Systems, Inc. (EMS) has performed the following services and provides this report for your use.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The goal of this project is to expand the approved drainfield area for onsite wastewater treatment to serve future expansion of your existing HDSE Sewer System Association facilities located at the Aurora State Airport. The subject property is leased from the Oregon Department of Aviation by the HDSE Sewer System Association. The lease was recently renewed to accommodate expansion to include enough drainfield area to double the existing system's capacity in support of future development. The existing drainfields in this area were approved by DEQ in 2005 and have been functioning with no problems in the intervening 15 years since installation. There have been no documented drainfield problems in these soils. On September 25th, 2019, twelve test pits adjacent to the existing drainfields were evaluated by Marion County for feasibility for onsite wastewater treatment. EMS's analysis was that the soils are similar to the adjacent existing soils and will function acceptably. However, Marion County staff initially denied the application on October 8th, 2019 because they felt there was potential for seasonally high groundwater which could be a problem, and because they believed there was a presence of fill in this area. They recommended that for re-evaluation a tile dewatering system be installed to drain the area, and that a winter evaluation be conducted to determine the actual depth to seasonal water table. EMS designed a tile dewatering system which was installed in January of 2020. A winter evaluation was conducted through the winter of 2020. This report details our methods, findings, and recommendations for next steps and continues to recommend approval of the soils for the expansion use.

SUMMARY:

The average water depth across all twelve wells was 28 inches from the surface, after the tile dewatering system (TDS) was installed on January 23rd, 2020. The longest consecutive number of days that the water table rose above 12" below ground surface anywhere in the drainfield was about 3.8 days. On average, the water table rose above 12" for less than 1 day, with five out of the twelve wells having no shallow water table readings after the TDS was completed. Each well was dry when they were re-inspected in June following excessive rainfall during the previous six weeks. Based on success of the existing system and this study, we recommend approval of the drainfield areas for installation of a shallow pressure distribution drainfield, following Treatment Standard 1 or 2 similar to that currently in use. Permits require review and approval by DEQ.

METHODS: The following methods were used:

Observation x Measurement x Staking x Soil Evaluation x
Sampling x Inspection x Laser Elevations x Total Station x
Gov Records x Interview x Aerial Photo _x_ Soil Survey x
Geologic Maps _x_ Wetland Inventories x other (specify) Weather tracking x

LIMITATIONS: This investigation is limited by the precipitation frequency and duration.

LANDSCAPE SETTING:
The study area consists of Tax Lot 800 in Township 4S, Range 1W, Section 11, in Marion County Oregon, totaling 17.79 acres. The site is outside of the urban growth boundary for Aurora and is zoned P (public) by Marion County. The site is part of a complex of many lots all making up the Aurora State Airport. The onsite wastewater treatment system is owned and operated under a common entity known as the HDSE Sewer System Association. Lot 800 is owned by Oregon Department of Aviation, with part of the site leased by the Association as a private septic system easement. The proposed drainfield area is within the easement, south of the airport runway and on either side (east and west) of the runway flight path and instrument landing system (FAA localizer). An existing drainfield is located at the southeast corner of the easement, south and southeast of the new proposed drainfields. An approved reserve area is in the southwest corner of the easement. No signs of failure, such as surfacing or odors, have been observed in the existing system since its installation in 2005. Also, this state-owned property is fenced and monitored to protect it from unauthorized public access and or contact with sewage.

The site is situated in the lowlands of the Willamette Valley, northwest of the town of Aurora. The average elevation of the site is approximately 193 feet above sea level. The site is fairly flat, sloping 1-2% east and west, with a crown along the runway flight path. The soils in this area were established in 1993 when the runway was extended over existing farmland. There has been no disturbance of those soils in the intervening 27 years. Two drainage swales are located along the east and west property lines, draining surface runoff to the south. Concrete culverts at the southwest and southeast corners of the site convey drainage off site. The property is open and vegetated with grasses and other low-lying forbs. No wetlands are mapped on the property by the National Wetlands Inventory (US Fish & Wildlife), and none were observed during the site visit. According to Oregon Department of Geology and Mineral Industries (DOGAMI) geology of the site is mapped as Quaternary surficial deposits (fine grained sediments) of the Missoula Flood Deposits formation.

The soil on site is mapped by the Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) as Amity silt loam. Amity is described as somewhat poorly drained with a depth to water table of 6 to 16 inches, and depth to restrictive layer over 80 inches. Conditions associated with saturation (redoximorphic features) were observed at 6-16 inches from the soil surface, indicating potential for a seasonally high-water table. Runway construction resulted in the deposition of fill soil along the sides. This soil has remained essentially undisturbed for 23 years.

The new drainfield lease area was surveyed prior to conducting the study. Enough area was included for two new drainfields and reserve areas to support a design flow of approximately 10,000 gpd, thereby doubling the existing system's capacity. Twelve test pits were dug across the site in the summer of 2019, with six on the eastern proposed drainfield area, and six in the western proposed drainfield area. Various depths of the (at least) 27 year old fill were observed over the native silt loam in the 6 eastern test pits dugs on the site (TP's 5-10).

TILE DEWATERING SYSTEMS

Tile dewatering systems (TDS) were installed on the site in mid-January 2020, with completion on January 23rd, 2020. In both the east and west drainfield areas, two adjacent 70' by 350' rectangular dewatering trenches were installed. The field collection tile was installed with a slope of 0.2-0.4 percent at the bottom of the trenches; trench depths vary between 15 and 52 inches from ground surface. The trenches are 1 foot wide and are filled with EZFlow synthetic drain media. Each drainage system is connected to a 4" tight line installed on a 1% slope, which discharges to either the east or west drainage swale. Sediment basins were installed at the inlet end of each outfall pipe.

WATER TABLE MONITORING

While DEQ does not provide guidance on how to evaluate data, research has demonstrated that 21 days per season of actual saturation is needed to create the Redoximorphic Features which form the basis for Oregon DEQ to judge depth to water table. Published guidance from several sources, primarily the Recommended Procedures and Standards for Conducting a Water Table Study from Virginia Tech University[1] (2008) was used for conducting the water table study. On December 4th, 2019, thirteen (13) monitoring wells (piezometers) were installed on the site by registered geologist and licensed well constructor, Roger N. Smith (RG, License #10225).

Within each 70' x 350' tile dewatering area, 3 piezometers wells were installed (12 total). One additional well was installed approximately 20 feet north of the eastern tile system to collect barometric pressure. Each monitoring well consists of a 5-foot long, 1-inch diameter plastic PVC pipe capped with a plastic lid. The wells were installed approximately 3 feet below the surface, with 22-29 inches of pipe above ground surface. Special Standards were requested from and approved by the Oregon Water Resources Department. Silica filter sand was placed in the hole around the piezometer at the lowest 26 inches, followed by a 12-inch bentonite seal to the soil surface. A slit was sawed in the top of each pipe to allow the lid to be easily removed, and to release air pressure inside the well from the rising and lowering water table. Each well was assigned a number (Pz1 – Pz13) which was noted on metal start card tags and written in permanent marker on the pipe itself. Start cards for the wells were registered with the Oregon Water Resources Department.

Table 1. Measured and calculated Barodiver cord lengths relative to grade

Piezometer	Cord length (in.)	Cord length above grade (in.)	Cord length below grade (in.)
Pz1	57	27	30
Pz2	56	25	31
Pz3	57	29	28
Pz4	57	27	30
Pz5	57	28	29
Pz6	58	29	29
Pz7	57.5	27	30.5
Pz8	58	27	31
Pz9	56	27	29
Pz10	57.5	25.5	32
Pz11	57.5	25	32.5
Pz12	57	22	35

[1] Cobb, PR, Conta, JF, Steverson, ED, and Stull RL. Recommended Procedures and Standards for Conducting a Water Table Study, Version 1.0. Crop and Soil Environmental Sciences Department, Virginia Tech, Blacksburg, VA

DATA COLLECTION.

Barodiver data loggers were placed inside Pz's 1-12, between 28 and 35 inches below grade to collect water column pressure. One additional Barodiver was placed in Pz13 above the soil surface to collect atmospheric pressure for the study area. Technical specifications for the Barodiver data loggers are enclosed at the end of this report. The total cord length (CL) and cord length above grade (COG) for each Barodiver was measured manually and recorded (see Table 1). Data was collected automatically every four hours (6 times per day) from January 9th, 2020 until approximately 9:00 am on May 1st, 2020. Data for the date of the installation (January 8th) was omitted to avoid false readings caused by system testing, and an artificially high-water table immediately after the wells were dug. Each piezometer was surrounded by wooden stakes and caution tape for protection (see Figure 1 below).




Figure 1. Piezometers were installed approximately 3 feet below grade and pressure sensors were hung from the top of the pipe. The well was sealed with bentonite clay.

The site was visited once each month during the study; a total of 5 times after setup. Each site visit consisted of the following:

1. Inspect each well to ensure they are still fully functioning and had not been tampered with
2. Download data from Barodiver data loggers onto laptop using USB data port
3. Visually inspect the tile dewatering system and assess flow

After all data was collected, the water level (WL) for each well was then determined using the following equation, where ρ is the density of water (1000 kg/m3) and g is the acceleration due to gravity (9.80665 m/s2s). :

$$WL = COG - CL + 9806.65 \frac{P_{diver} - P_{baro}}{\rho * g}$$

RAINFALL MONITORING

Precipitation data for January 2020 through April 2020 was collected from the Aurora State Airport weather station in Aurora, Oregon (45.2485, -122.7686). Normal precipitation levels were determined using the US Normal Data (1981-2010) from the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), obtained from the NRCS National Water and Climate

Center (https://www.wcc.nrcs.usda.gov/climate/navigate_wets.html). However, because the NOAA uses data from 1981-2010 to determine Climate Normals, this year's precipitation was also compared to the previous two years (2018 and 2019). Precipitation was found to be only 5% drier than last year (2019). Daily precipitation levels were monitored and compared to water table levels.

FINDINGS:

Precipitation

The precipitation for the past three years in the Aurora area has been less than what previously has been considered "normal" based on long term records. Table 2 below shows the monthly precipitation for 2020, 2019, and 2018 from data from the airport weather station. It is unknown whether there is going to be a new normal, however we can say this study was performed under precipitation conditions that were only 5% different than the previous year.

Table 2 – Monthly precipitation totals in inches for 2018, 2019, 2020.

Month	2020	2019	2018
January	7.06	3.49	5.57
February	1.64	3.97	2.06
March	2.53	1.54	2.97
April	1.32	4.24	5.04
Total	**12.55**	**13.24**	**15.64**

Table 3 shows total precipitation for the months of January through April 2020. Although the month of January was above normal, February, March, and April were drier than normal. The expected normal and the measured precipitation for the months of the study were totaled, and overall, the precipitation was found to be 70% of historic normal. Daily precipitation levels are graphed in Figure 2, below.

Table 3 – Percent of NOAA Normal precipitation for January 2020 – April 2020

Month	Normal (inches)	Measured (inches)	Percent of Normal
January	5.87	7.06	120
February	4.75	1.64	35
March	4.23	2.53	60
April	3.13	1.32	42
Total	**17.98**	**12.55**	**70**




Figure 2 –Daily precipitation (inches) from the Aurora State Airport weather station (June 9th – May 1st).

Precipitation for May and June of 2020 was greater than normal, with 2.82 inches of rain in May (119% of normal), and 2.96 inches of rain in the first half of June (147% of monthly normal as of June 16th). EMS returned to the site on June 16th to manually measure the water table in each well. Each of the 12 piezometers was dry (no standing water in the well). 0.24 inches of rain fell on the day the measurements were taken. The ten days prior to the measurements each had precipitation, with the biggest rain event being on June 15th when 0.84 inches of rain fell. Daily climate data for each month is enclosed at the end of this report.

Well data and water table levels

A total of 681 readings were automatically collected every 4 hours from each piezometer during the study. The results were variable across all wells. Some of the wells exhibited periods of time where the water table was less than 12” from the ground surface (up to 37 readings a row in Pz9) whereas others had none at all. The average water table depth across all wells was 21” and 28” from ground surface, before and after the installation of the TDS respectively. Pz4 and Pz11 were always deeper than 12” throughout the study. The shallowest water table depth was in Pz12, at 3” on the dates of 01/16/2020 and 1/29/2020. Most shallow water table readings occurred in January, which had 120% of normal rainfall, and prior to the tile dewatering system being installed. Average and minimum water table depths before the tile dewater system was installed are summarized in Table 4, below. Piezometers are located on either the east or west side of the runway approach and departure areas.

Table 4. Average and highest water table levels, in inches, before the TDS installation (01/09/2020 – 01/22/2020.

Piezometer	Average water level	Highest water level	Location
Pz1	20	8	West
Pz2	19	6	West
Pz3	22	7	West
Pz4	26	13	West
Pz5	28	22	East
Pz6	20	9	East
Pz7	21	9	East
Pz8	17	6	East
Pz9	14	4	East
Pz10	23	12	East
Pz11	29	23	West
Pz12	17	3	West
Average	**21**	**12**	

After the tile dewatering system was completed, only seven of the twelve wells had occurrences of the water table being less than 12” from the surface (Table 5). These shallow water table events were brief periods that to correlate with significant rain events of 0.5 inches of rain or more over a 24-hour period. The average water table depth across all wells was 28” inches from the surface between 01/23/2020 and 05/01/2020.

Table 5. Average and highest water table levels, in inches, after TDS installation (01/23/2020 – 05/2020)

Piezometer	Average water level	Highest water level	Location
Pz1	24	5	West
Pz2	26	7	West
Pz3	27	5	West
Pz4	29	17	West
Pz5	28	10	East
Pz6	28	10	East
Pz7	31	30	East
Pz8	31	28	East
Pz9	28	17	East
Pz10	30	6	East
Pz11	30	17	West
Pz12	25	3	West
Average	**28**	**13**	

Daily precipitation is graphed along with water table levels in the enclosed hydrographs. All shallow water table readings occurred in January, which had 120% of normal rainfall, except for Pz1, which had one reading on 2/16/2020, and Pz12, which had three readings on 2/16/2020. 0.67 inches of rainfall occurred on the previous day (2/15/2020). The longest duration that any well had a shallow water table of 12” or less was 23 consecutive readings (about 3.8 days). See Table 6 below. In Pz1, Pz2, Pz5, Pz6, Pz10, and Pz12, the longest duration of shallow water table conditions occurred around the dates of 01/27/2020 - 01/29/2020, when approximately 1.5 inches of rain fell. On average, the water table was only above 12 inches for about 0.9 days after significant rain events. According to the standards recommended by Virginia Tech, less than 21 consecutive days of high-water table conditions is considered acceptable.

Table 6. Consecutive time of shallow water table conditions for each piezometer, after installation of TDS (01/23/2020 – 05/01/2020).

Piezometer	# of readings	Consecutive hrs.	Consecutive days	Dates
Pz1	13	5	2.2	1/28 - 1/30
Pz2	12	48	2.0	1/27 - 1/29
Pz3	0	0	0	--
Pz4	0	0	0	--
Pz5	4	16	0.7	1/28
Pz6	4	16	0.7	1/23, 1/28
Pz7	0	0	0	--
Pz8	0	0	0	--
Pz9	0	0	0	--
Pz10	10	40	1.7	1/27 - 1/29
Pz11	0	0	0	--
Pz12	23	92	3.8	01/27 - 01/31
Average	**6**	**22**	**0.9**	

Since May and June were wetter than normal, EMS returned to the site on June 16th to manually measure the water table in each well. Each well was dry, with no standing water at the bottom of the well.

Tile Dewatering System

The tile dewatering system was completed on January 23rd, 2020. During each site visit, water was observed flowing from the field collection tile into the outfall pipes. Water was also observed draining from the outlet of the pipe and discharging to the swales near the east and west property lines. Prior to the installation of the TDS, ten out of twelve wells had a high-water table of 12" or less from the surface. After the installation of the TDS, only seven out of twelve wells had a high-water table, and only for relatively short periods during significant rain events. The TDS is functioning as designed and has contributed to lowering the water table.



Figure 3 –Tile dewatering trenches were installed 15-52 inches below grade and filled with 12" EzFlow bundles. 4" pipes at the bottom of the trench sloped are at 0.2-0.4%.



Figure 4 –24" silt traps were installed at the inlet end of each tight line outfall, which discharged toward existing drainage swales on the site. Photo taken facing west toward the west property line (fence) with Hubbard Cuttoff Rd. NE in the background.

CONCLUSIONS:

1. Precipitation for the months of January through April 2020 was only 5% drier than 2019. When compared to the NOAA 1981-2010 Climate Normals, precipitation during the study was 70% of “normal”.

2. May and June were wetter than normal. May had 119% of normal precipitation. In June, 147% of the monthly normal precipitation had accumulated in the first half of the month. EMS returned to the site in mid-June to manually measure the water table levels.

3. Between January 9th and January 22nd, the average water table depth for each piezometer ranged between 14” (Pz9) and 29” (Pz10) from the ground surface and averaged 21” across all wells.

4. After installation of the tile dewatering system on January 23rd, the average water table depth across all wells increased to 28”. In half of the wells, the water table never rose above 12” from the surface after the TDS was installed.

5. Most shallow water table readings (less than 12” from the ground surface) occurred in January, which had 120% of normal precipitation. Spikes in the water table levels appear to correlate with significant rain events of 0.5 inches or more over 24 hours.

6. The most consecutive number of days that the water table was rose above 12” from the soil surface was about 3.8 days in Pz12. On average, the water table lingered above 12” for about 0.9 days, although five out of twelve wells had no shallow water table readings after the TDS was installed. Less than 21 consecutive days of shallow water table is considered acceptable for onsite wastewater treatment.

7. No water was observed in the bottom of the wells when manual measurements were taken on June 16th, 2020. This was following an unusually wet June, which had already accumulated 2.96 inches of the total normal 2.02 inches of monthly precipitation in the first half of the month. 0.84 inches of rain fell the previous day (June 15th). The first half of June's 2.96 inches amounts to 146% of the whole months normal or 293% of the first half's expected 1.01 inches.

8. Onsite wastewater treatment appears feasible. Effluent will be highly treated to Treatment Standard 2 and disinfected, using the existing Advantex AX100 textile filters, or similar technology with Ultra Violet Disinfection when these future repair drainfields are needed. High water table levels only occur after significant rain events and for relatively short durations (less than 21 consecutive days).

9. This site is protected from public access by fencing and constant observation, thereby further limiting the risk of human contact with sewage.

10. Further, the existing drainfield has been in use for fifteen years in similar soils and treatment with no signs of failure.

RECOMMENDATIONS: The following additional steps or services appear to be needed:

1. Feasibility review. The result of this study will need to be presented to and assessed by Marion County and/or Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) to reevaluate feasibility of the site for on-site wastewater treatment.

2. On-site Wastewater Treatment System Design. A final design will need to be prepared that meets DEQ specifications for a Water Pollution Control Facility Permit.

DISCLOSURE: The information and statements in this report are true and accurate to the best of our knowledge. Neither Environmental Management Systems, Inc., nor the undersigned have any economic interests in the project.

Thank you for your business. We look forward to assisting you to achieve your development goals. If you have any questions, please contact Emma Eichhorn, REHS, or me at 503-353-9691.

Sincerely

Robert F. Sweeney, MS, REHS
President
ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS, INC.

Enclosures:
1. Site Plan
2. Tile Dewatering System Details
3. Tax Lot Map
4. Hydrographs for piezometers Pz1 – Pz12
5. Barodiver data logger spec sheet
6. Precipitation data for the Aurora State Airport weather station



EMS 503-353-9691 360-735-1109 www.envmgtsys.com 4080 SE International Way Suite B112 Milwaukie, OR 97222 ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS, INC.	CHECKED: DRAWN:	AABC-HD AVIATION T: 4S, R: 1W, Sec 2 & 11, TL: 200, 203, 400, 401, 800, 900 & 1600 AIRPORT SITE PLAN	19-0054 12/10/2019 1 OF 3

Aurora Airport
Located at Airport & Keil Roads NE
Aurora, OR 97002

52 LF 4" SCH40 PVC TIGHTLINE TO OUTFALL
186.16 ELEV.

EXISTING GROUNDWATER INTERCEPTOR

24" CONCRETE CULVERT
I.E. 186.08'

EXISTING DRAINFIELD
3,000 LF

KEIL RD NE

◆ = TEST PIT
⊗ = PIEZOMETER

FENCE
DRAINAGE SWALE
~70.7'

24" SILT TRAP

B A
70' MAX
140'
70' MAX
C D
350'

TILE DEWATERING SYSTEM
SEE PAGE 3 FOR DETAILS

PROPOSED RESERVE DRAINFIELDS FOR FUTURE USE

PROPOSED EXPANDED LEASE AREA
TOTAL 263.229.5 SQFT
SUBJECT TO CHANGE

RUNWAY

RUNWAY LIGHTS

KEIL RD NE

G F
350'
TILE DEWATERING SYSTEM
SEE PAGE 3 FOR DETAILS
70' MAX
140'
70' MAX
H E

EXISTING RESERVE DRAINFIELD AREA

24" SILT TRAP

GATE

UTILITY BUILDING

DRAINAGE SWALE
FENCE

24" CONCRETE CULVERT
I.E. 186.72'

45 LF 4" SCH40 PVC TIGHTLINE TO OUTFALL
188.0' ELEV.

HUBBARD CUTOFF RD NE

THIS DOCUMENT IS NOT A SURVEY. LOCATIONS OF SITE FEATURES ARE APPROXIMATE.

0 100
SCALE 1"= 100'

19-0054

12/10/2019

2 OF 3

AABC-HD AVIATION

T: 4S, R: 1W, Sec 2 & 11, TL: 200, 203, 400, 401, 800, 900 & 1600


SITE PLAN

CHECKED:

DRAWN:

EMS
4080 SE International Way
Suite B112
Milwaukie, OR 97222
503-353-9691
360-735-1109
www.envmgtsys.com
ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS, INC.

Aurora Airport
Located at Airport & Keil Roads
NE
Aurora, OR 97002




East TDS


POINT	Trench Elevation (feet)	Surface Elevation (feet)	Trench Depth (feet)	Trench Depth (inches)
A	186.72	189.28	2.57	30.79
B	187.59	189.71	2.11	25.36
C	187.94	191.44	3.50	41.94
D	187.07	191.42	4.35	52.24

West TDS


POINT	Trench Elevation (feet)	Surface Elevation (feet)	Trench Depth (feet)	Trench Depth (inches)
E	188.45	189.73	1.29	15.42
F	188.73	192.07	3.35	40.17
G	189.43	192.42	3.00	35.94
H	189.15	190.28	1.13	13.59



SECTION - SILT TRAP
NO SCALE



ROCK
AND PIPE



EZFlow
EZ1203V

DEWATERING TRENCH DETAIL

SCALE : NTS

REFER TO TABLE FOR TRENCH DEPTHS. SLOPE MUST BE 0.2-0.4% IN FIELD COLLECTION DRAINAGE TILE.

19-0054

12/10/2019

3 OF 3

AABC-HD AVIATION

T: 4S, R: 1W, Sec 2 & 11, TL: 200, 203, 400, 401, 800, 900 & 1600

TILE DEWATERING SYSTEM DETAIL

CHECKED:

DRAWN:

EMS
ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS, INC.
4080 SE International Way
Suite B112
Milwaukie, OR 97222
503-353-9691
360-735-1109
www.envmgtsys.com

04 1W 11A



MARION COUNTY, OREGON

NE1/4 SEC11 T4S R1W W.M.

SCALE 1" = 200'

LEGEND

LINE TYPES

- Taxlot Boundary
- Historical Boundary
- Road Right-of-Way
- Easement
- Railroad Right-of-Way
- Railroad Centerline
- Private Road ROW
- Taxcode Line
- Subdivision/Plat Bndry
- Map Boundary
- Waterline - Taxlot Bndry
- Waterline - Non Bndry

CORNER TYPES

- 1/16TH Section Cor.
- 1/4 Section Cor.
- DLC Corner
- Section Corner (16 15 / 21 22)

NUMBERS

Tax Code Number

000 00 00 0

Acreage *0.25 AC*

All acres listed are Net Acres, excluding any portions of the taxlot within public ROWs

NOTES

Tick Marks: A tick mark in the road indicates that the labeled dimension extends into the public ROW

200.00 / 175.00

CANCELLED NUMBERS

101, 200A1, 200A2, 200A5, 201, 202, 203, 204, 207, 300, 401, 402, 405, 406


DISCLAIMER: THIS MAP WAS PREPARED FOR ASSESSMENT PURPOSES ONLY


Marion County OREGON — Assessors Office Cartography Dept


FOR ADDITIONAL MAPS VISIT OUR WEBSITE AT www.co.marion.or.us


PLOT DATE: 2/13/2020


04 1W 11A



Temporary Water Table - PZ1
5.00
0.00
-5.00
-10.00
-15.00
-20.00
-25.00
-30.00
-35.00
2020/01/09 01:00:00
2020/01/10 13:00:00
2020/01/12 01:00:00
2020/01/13 13:00:00
2020/01/15 01:00:00
2020/01/16 13:00:00
2020/01/18 01:00:00
2020/01/19 13:00:00
2020/01/21 01:00:00
2020/01/22 13:00:00
2020/01/24 01:00:00
2020/01/25 13:00:00
2020/01/27 01:00:00
2020/01/28 13:00:00
2020/01/30 01:00:00
2020/01/31 13:00:00
2020/02/02 01:00:00
2020/02/03 13:00:00
2020/02/05 01:00:00
2020/02/06 13:00:00
2020/02/08 01:00:00
2020/02/09 13:00:00
2020/02/11 01:00:00
2020/02/12 13:00:00
2020/02/14 01:00:00
2020/02/15 13:00:00
2020/02/17 01:00:00
2020/02/18 13:00:00
2020/02/20 01:00:00
2020/02/21 13:00:00
2020/02/23 01:00:00
2020/02/24 13:00:00
2020/02/26 01:00:00
2020/02/27 13:00:00
2020/02/29 01:00:00
2020/03/01 13:00:00
2020/03/03 01:00:00
2020/03/04 13:00:00
2020/03/06 01:00:00
2020/03/07 13:00:00
2020/03/09 01:00:00
2020/03/10 13:00:00
2020/03/12 01:00:00
2020/03/13 13:00:00
2020/03/15 01:00:00
2020/03/16 13:00:00
2020/03/18 01:00:00
2020/03/19 13:00:00
2020/03/21 01:00:00
2020/03/22 13:00:00
2020/03/24 01:00:00
2020/03/25 13:00:00
2020/03/27 01:00:00
2020/03/28 13:00:00
2020/03/30 01:00:00
2020/03/31 13:00:00
2020/04/02 01:00:00
2020/04/03 13:00:00
2020/04/05 01:00:00
2020/04/06 13:00:00
2020/04/08 01:00:00
2020/04/09 13:00:00
2020/04/11 01:00:00
2020/04/12 13:00:00
2020/04/14 01:00:00
2020/04/15 13:00:00
2020/04/17 01:00:00
2020/04/18 13:00:00
2020/04/20 01:00:00
2020/04/21 13:00:00
2020/04/23 01:00:00
2020/04/24 13:00:00
2020/04/26 01:00:00
2020/04/27 13:00:00
2020/04/29 01:00:00
2020/04/30 13:00:00
Water Level (in)
Ground
12
Precipitation



Temporary Water Table - PZ2
5.00
0.00
-5.00
-10.00
-15.00
-20.00
-25.00
-30.00
-35.00
2020/01/09 01:00:00
2020/01/10 13:00:00
2020/01/12 01:00:00
2020/01/13 13:00:00
2020/01/15 01:00:00
2020/01/16 13:00:00
2020/01/18 01:00:00
2020/01/19 13:00:00
2020/01/21 01:00:00
2020/01/22 13:00:00
2020/01/24 01:00:00
2020/01/25 13:00:00
2020/01/27 01:00:00
2020/01/28 13:00:00
2020/01/30 01:00:00
2020/01/31 13:00:00
2020/02/02 01:00:00
2020/02/03 13:00:00
2020/02/05 01:00:00
2020/02/06 13:00:00
2020/02/08 01:00:00
2020/02/09 13:00:00
2020/02/11 01:00:00
2020/02/12 13:00:00
2020/02/14 01:00:00
2020/02/15 13:00:00
2020/02/17 01:00:00
2020/02/18 13:00:00
2020/02/20 01:00:00
2020/02/21 13:00:00
2020/02/23 01:00:00
2020/02/24 13:00:00
2020/02/26 01:00:00
2020/02/27 13:00:00
2020/02/29 01:00:00
2020/03/01 13:00:00
2020/03/03 01:00:00
2020/03/04 13:00:00
2020/03/06 01:00:00
2020/03/07 13:00:00
2020/03/09 01:00:00
2020/03/10 13:00:00
2020/03/12 01:00:00
2020/03/13 13:00:00
2020/03/15 01:00:00
2020/03/16 13:00:00
2020/03/18 01:00:00
2020/03/19 13:00:00
2020/03/21 01:00:00
2020/03/22 13:00:00
2020/03/24 01:00:00
2020/03/25 13:00:00
2020/03/27 01:00:00
2020/03/28 13:00:00
2020/03/30 01:00:00
2020/03/31 13:00:00
2020/04/02 01:00:00
2020/04/03 13:00:00
2020/04/05 01:00:00
2020/04/06 13:00:00
2020/04/08 01:00:00
2020/04/09 13:00:00
2020/04/11 01:00:00
2020/04/12 13:00:00
2020/04/14 01:00:00
2020/04/15 13:00:00
2020/04/17 01:00:00
2020/04/18 13:00:00
2020/04/20 01:00:00
2020/04/21 13:00:00
2020/04/23 01:00:00
2020/04/24 13:00:00
2020/04/26 01:00:00
2020/04/27 13:00:00
2020/04/29 01:00:00
2020/04/30 13:00:00
Water Level (in)
Ground
12
Precipitation



Temporary Water Table - PZ3
5.00
0.00
-5.00
-10.00
-15.00
-20.00
-25.00
-30.00
2020/01/09 01:00:00
2020/01/10 13:00:00
2020/01/12 01:00:00
2020/01/13 13:00:00
2020/01/15 01:00:00
2020/01/16 13:00:00
2020/01/18 01:00:00
2020/01/19 13:00:00
2020/01/21 01:00:00
2020/01/22 13:00:00
2020/01/24 01:00:00
2020/01/25 13:00:00
2020/01/27 01:00:00
2020/01/28 13:00:00
2020/01/30 01:00:00
2020/01/31 13:00:00
2020/02/02 01:00:00
2020/02/03 13:00:00
2020/02/05 01:00:00
2020/02/06 13:00:00
2020/02/08 01:00:00
2020/02/09 13:00:00
2020/02/11 01:00:00
2020/02/12 13:00:00
2020/02/14 01:00:00
2020/02/15 13:00:00
2020/02/17 01:00:00
2020/02/18 13:00:00
2020/02/20 01:00:00
2020/02/21 13:00:00
2020/02/23 01:00:00
2020/02/24 13:00:00
2020/02/26 01:00:00
2020/02/27 13:00:00
2020/02/29 01:00:00
2020/03/01 13:00:00
2020/03/03 01:00:00
2020/03/04 13:00:00
2020/03/06 01:00:00
2020/03/07 13:00:00
2020/03/09 01:00:00
2020/03/10 13:00:00
2020/03/12 01:00:00
2020/03/13 13:00:00
2020/03/15 01:00:00
2020/03/16 13:00:00
2020/03/18 01:00:00
2020/03/19 13:00:00
2020/03/21 01:00:00
2020/03/22 13:00:00
2020/03/24 01:00:00
2020/03/25 13:00:00
2020/03/27 01:00:00
2020/03/28 13:00:00
2020/03/30 01:00:00
2020/03/31 13:00:00
2020/04/02 01:00:00
2020/04/03 13:00:00
2020/04/05 01:00:00
2020/04/06 13:00:00
2020/04/08 01:00:00
2020/04/09 13:00:00
2020/04/11 01:00:00
2020/04/12 13:00:00
2020/04/14 01:00:00
2020/04/15 13:00:00
2020/04/17 01:00:00
2020/04/18 13:00:00
2020/04/20 01:00:00
2020/04/21 13:00:00
2020/04/23 01:00:00
2020/04/24 13:00:00
2020/04/26 01:00:00
2020/04/27 13:00:00
2020/04/29 01:00:00
2020/04/30 13:00:00
Water Level (in)
Ground
12
Precipitation



Temporary Water Table - PZ4
5.00
0.00
-5.00
-10.00
-15.00
-20.00
-25.00
-30.00
-35.00
2020/01/09 01:00:00
2020/01/10 13:00:00
2020/01/12 01:00:00
2020/01/13 13:00:00
2020/01/15 01:00:00
2020/01/16 13:00:00
2020/01/18 01:00:00
2020/01/19 13:00:00
2020/01/21 01:00:00
2020/01/22 13:00:00
2020/01/24 01:00:00
2020/01/25 13:00:00
2020/01/27 01:00:00
2020/01/28 13:00:00
2020/01/30 01:00:00
2020/01/31 13:00:00
2020/02/02 01:00:00
2020/02/03 13:00:00
2020/02/05 01:00:00
2020/02/06 13:00:00
2020/02/08 01:00:00
2020/02/09 13:00:00
2020/02/11 01:00:00
2020/02/12 13:00:00
2020/02/14 01:00:00
2020/02/15 13:00:00
2020/02/17 01:00:00
2020/02/18 13:00:00
2020/02/20 01:00:00
2020/02/21 13:00:00
2020/02/23 01:00:00
2020/02/24 13:00:00
2020/02/26 01:00:00
2020/02/27 13:00:00
2020/02/29 01:00:00
2020/03/01 13:00:00
2020/03/03 01:00:00
2020/03/04 13:00:00
2020/03/06 01:00:00
2020/03/07 13:00:00
2020/03/09 01:00:00
2020/03/10 13:00:00
2020/03/12 01:00:00
2020/03/13 13:00:00
2020/03/15 01:00:00
2020/03/16 13:00:00
2020/03/18 01:00:00
2020/03/19 13:00:00
2020/03/21 01:00:00
2020/03/22 13:00:00
2020/03/24 01:00:00
2020/03/25 13:00:00
2020/03/27 01:00:00
2020/03/28 13:00:00
2020/03/30 01:00:00
2020/03/31 13:00:00
2020/04/02 01:00:00
2020/04/03 13:00:00
2020/04/05 01:00:00
2020/04/06 13:00:00
2020/04/08 01:00:00
2020/04/09 13:00:00
2020/04/11 01:00:00
2020/04/12 13:00:00
2020/04/14 01:00:00
2020/04/15 13:00:00
2020/04/17 01:00:00
2020/04/18 13:00:00
2020/04/20 01:00:00
2020/04/21 13:00:00
2020/04/23 01:00:00
2020/04/24 13:00:00
2020/04/26 01:00:00
2020/04/27 13:00:00
2020/04/29 01:00:00
2020/04/30 13:00:00
Water Level (in)
Ground
12
Precipitation



Temporary Water Table - PZ5
5.00
0.00
-5.00
-10.00
-15.00
-20.00
-25.00
-30.00
-35.00
2020/01/09 01:00:00
2020/01/10 13:00:00
2020/01/12 01:00:00
2020/01/13 13:00:00
2020/01/15 01:00:00
2020/01/16 13:00:00
2020/01/18 01:00:00
2020/01/19 13:00:00
2020/01/21 01:00:00
2020/01/22 13:00:00
2020/01/24 01:00:00
2020/01/25 13:00:00
2020/01/27 01:00:00
2020/01/28 13:00:00
2020/01/30 01:00:00
2020/01/31 13:00:00
2020/02/02 01:00:00
2020/02/03 13:00:00
2020/02/05 01:00:00
2020/02/06 13:00:00
2020/02/08 01:00:00
2020/02/09 13:00:00
2020/02/11 01:00:00
2020/02/12 13:00:00
2020/02/14 01:00:00
2020/02/15 13:00:00
2020/02/17 01:00:00
2020/02/18 13:00:00
2020/02/20 01:00:00
2020/02/21 13:00:00
2020/02/23 01:00:00
2020/02/24 13:00:00
2020/02/26 01:00:00
2020/02/27 13:00:00
2020/02/29 01:00:00
2020/03/01 13:00:00
2020/03/03 01:00:00
2020/03/04 13:00:00
2020/03/06 01:00:00
2020/03/07 13:00:00
2020/03/09 01:00:00
2020/03/10 13:00:00
2020/03/12 01:00:00
2020/03/13 13:00:00
2020/03/15 01:00:00
2020/03/16 13:00:00
2020/03/18 01:00:00
2020/03/19 13:00:00
2020/03/21 01:00:00
2020/03/22 13:00:00
2020/03/24 01:00:00
2020/03/25 13:00:00
2020/03/27 01:00:00
2020/03/28 13:00:00
2020/03/30 01:00:00
2020/03/31 13:00:00
2020/04/02 01:00:00
2020/04/03 13:00:00
2020/04/05 01:00:00
2020/04/06 13:00:00
2020/04/08 01:00:00
2020/04/09 13:00:00
2020/04/11 01:00:00
2020/04/12 13:00:00
2020/04/14 01:00:00
2020/04/15 13:00:00
2020/04/17 01:00:00
2020/04/18 13:00:00
2020/04/20 01:00:00
2020/04/21 13:00:00
2020/04/23 01:00:00
2020/04/24 13:00:00
2020/04/26 01:00:00
2020/04/27 13:00:00
2020/04/29 01:00:00
2020/04/30 13:00:00
Water Level (in)
Ground
12
Precipitation



Temporary Water Table - PZ6
5.00
0.00
-5.00
-10.00
-15.00
-20.00
-25.00
-30.00
-35.00
2020/01/09 01:00:00
2020/01/10 13:00:00
2020/01/12 01:00:00
2020/01/13 13:00:00
2020/01/15 01:00:00
2020/01/16 13:00:00
2020/01/18 01:00:00
2020/01/19 13:00:00
2020/01/21 01:00:00
2020/01/22 13:00:00
2020/01/24 01:00:00
2020/01/25 13:00:00
2020/01/27 01:00:00
2020/01/28 13:00:00
2020/01/30 01:00:00
2020/01/31 13:00:00
2020/02/02 01:00:00
2020/02/03 13:00:00
2020/02/05 01:00:00
2020/02/06 13:00:00
2020/02/08 01:00:00
2020/02/09 13:00:00
2020/02/11 01:00:00
2020/02/12 13:00:00
2020/02/14 01:00:00
2020/02/15 13:00:00
2020/02/17 01:00:00
2020/02/18 13:00:00
2020/02/20 01:00:00
2020/02/21 13:00:00
2020/02/23 01:00:00
2020/02/24 13:00:00
2020/02/26 01:00:00
2020/02/27 13:00:00
2020/02/29 01:00:00
2020/03/01 13:00:00
2020/03/03 01:00:00
2020/03/04 13:00:00
2020/03/06 01:00:00
2020/03/07 13:00:00
2020/03/09 01:00:00
2020/03/10 13:00:00
2020/03/12 01:00:00
2020/03/13 13:00:00
2020/03/15 01:00:00
2020/03/16 13:00:00
2020/03/18 01:00:00
2020/03/19 13:00:00
2020/03/21 01:00:00
2020/03/22 13:00:00
2020/03/24 01:00:00
2020/03/25 13:00:00
2020/03/27 01:00:00
2020/03/28 13:00:00
2020/03/30 01:00:00
2020/03/31 13:00:00
2020/04/02 01:00:00
2020/04/03 13:00:00
2020/04/05 01:00:00
2020/04/06 13:00:00
2020/04/08 01:00:00
2020/04/09 13:00:00
2020/04/11 01:00:00
2020/04/12 13:00:00
2020/04/14 01:00:00
2020/04/15 13:00:00
2020/04/17 01:00:00
2020/04/18 13:00:00
2020/04/20 01:00:00
2020/04/21 13:00:00
2020/04/23 01:00:00
2020/04/24 13:00:00
2020/04/26 01:00:00
2020/04/27 13:00:00
2020/04/29 01:00:00
2020/04/30 13:00:00
Water Level (in)
Ground
12
Precipitation



Temporary Water Table - PZ7
5.00
0.00
-5.00
-10.00
-15.00
-20.00
-25.00
-30.00
-35.00
2020/01/09 01:00:00
2020/01/10 13:00:00
2020/01/12 01:00:00
2020/01/13 13:00:00
2020/01/15 01:00:00
2020/01/16 13:00:00
2020/01/18 01:00:00
2020/01/19 13:00:00
2020/01/21 01:00:00
2020/01/22 13:00:00
2020/01/24 01:00:00
2020/01/25 13:00:00
2020/01/27 01:00:00
2020/01/28 13:00:00
2020/01/30 01:00:00
2020/01/31 13:00:00
2020/02/02 01:00:00
2020/02/03 13:00:00
2020/02/05 01:00:00
2020/02/06 13:00:00
2020/02/08 01:00:00
2020/02/09 13:00:00
2020/02/11 01:00:00
2020/02/12 13:00:00
2020/02/14 01:00:00
2020/02/15 13:00:00
2020/02/17 01:00:00
2020/02/18 13:00:00
2020/02/20 01:00:00
2020/02/21 13:00:00
2020/02/23 01:00:00
2020/02/24 13:00:00
2020/02/26 01:00:00
2020/02/27 13:00:00
2020/02/29 01:00:00
2020/03/01 13:00:00
2020/03/03 01:00:00
2020/03/04 13:00:00
2020/03/06 01:00:00
2020/03/07 13:00:00
2020/03/09 01:00:00
2020/03/10 13:00:00
2020/03/12 01:00:00
2020/03/13 13:00:00
2020/03/15 01:00:00
2020/03/16 13:00:00
2020/03/18 01:00:00
2020/03/19 13:00:00
2020/03/21 01:00:00
2020/03/22 13:00:00
2020/03/24 01:00:00
2020/03/25 13:00:00
2020/03/27 01:00:00
2020/03/28 13:00:00
2020/03/30 01:00:00
2020/03/31 13:00:00
2020/04/02 01:00:00
2020/04/03 13:00:00
2020/04/05 01:00:00
2020/04/06 13:00:00
2020/04/08 01:00:00
2020/04/09 13:00:00
2020/04/11 01:00:00
2020/04/12 13:00:00
2020/04/14 01:00:00
2020/04/15 13:00:00
2020/04/17 01:00:00
2020/04/18 13:00:00
2020/04/20 01:00:00
2020/04/21 13:00:00
2020/04/23 01:00:00
2020/04/24 13:00:00
2020/04/26 01:00:00
2020/04/27 13:00:00
2020/04/29 01:00:00
2020/04/30 13:00:00
Water Level (in)
Ground
12
Precipitation


Temporary Water Table - PZ8
5.00
0.00
-5.00
-10.00
-15.00
-20.00
-25.00
-30.00
-35.00
2020/01/09 01:00:00
2020/01/10 13:00:00
2020/01/12 01:00:00
2020/01/13 13:00:00
2020/01/15 01:00:00
2020/01/16 13:00:00
2020/01/18 01:00:00
2020/01/19 13:00:00
2020/01/21 01:00:00
2020/01/22 13:00:00
2020/01/24 01:00:00
2020/01/25 13:00:00
2020/01/27 01:00:00
2020/01/28 13:00:00
2020/01/30 01:00:00
2020/01/31 13:00:00
2020/02/02 01:00:00
2020/02/03 13:00:00
2020/02/05 01:00:00
2020/02/06 13:00:00
2020/02/08 01:00:00
2020/02/09 13:00:00
2020/02/11 01:00:00
2020/02/12 13:00:00
2020/02/14 01:00:00
2020/02/15 13:00:00
2020/02/17 01:00:00
2020/02/18 13:00:00
2020/02/20 01:00:00
2020/02/21 13:00:00
2020/02/23 01:00:00
2020/02/24 13:00:00
2020/02/26 01:00:00
2020/02/27 13:00:00
2020/02/29 01:00:00
2020/03/01 13:00:00
2020/03/03 01:00:00
2020/03/04 13:00:00
2020/03/06 01:00:00
2020/03/07 13:00:00
2020/03/09 01:00:00
2020/03/10 13:00:00
2020/03/12 01:00:00
2020/03/13 13:00:00
2020/03/15 01:00:00
2020/03/16 13:00:00
2020/03/18 01:00:00
2020/03/19 13:00:00
2020/03/21 01:00:00
2020/03/22 13:00:00
2020/03/24 01:00:00
2020/03/25 13:00:00
2020/03/27 01:00:00
2020/03/28 13:00:00
2020/03/30 01:00:00
2020/03/31 13:00:00
2020/04/02 01:00:00
2020/04/03 13:00:00
2020/04/05 01:00:00
2020/04/06 13:00:00
2020/04/08 01:00:00
2020/04/09 13:00:00
2020/04/11 01:00:00
2020/04/12 13:00:00
2020/04/14 01:00:00
2020/04/15 13:00:00
2020/04/17 01:00:00
2020/04/18 13:00:00
2020/04/20 01:00:00
2020/04/21 13:00:00
2020/04/23 01:00:00
2020/04/24 13:00:00
2020/04/26 01:00:00
2020/04/27 13:00:00
2020/04/29 01:00:00
2020/04/30 13:00:00
Water Level (in)
Ground
12
Precipitation


Temporary Water Table - PZ9
5.00
0.00
-5.00
-10.00
-15.00
-20.00
-25.00
-30.00
-35.00
2020/01/09 01:00:00
2020/01/10 13:00:00
2020/01/12 01:00:00
2020/01/13 13:00:00
2020/01/15 01:00:00
2020/01/16 13:00:00
2020/01/18 01:00:00
2020/01/19 13:00:00
2020/01/21 01:00:00
2020/01/22 13:00:00
2020/01/24 01:00:00
2020/01/25 13:00:00
2020/01/27 01:00:00
2020/01/28 13:00:00
2020/01/30 01:00:00
2020/01/31 13:00:00
2020/02/02 01:00:00
2020/02/03 13:00:00
2020/02/05 01:00:00
2020/02/06 13:00:00
2020/02/08 01:00:00
2020/02/09 13:00:00
2020/02/11 01:00:00
2020/02/12 13:00:00
2020/02/14 01:00:00
2020/02/15 13:00:00
2020/02/17 01:00:00
2020/02/18 13:00:00
2020/02/20 01:00:00
2020/02/21 13:00:00
2020/02/23 01:00:00
2020/02/24 13:00:00
2020/02/26 01:00:00
2020/02/27 13:00:00
2020/02/29 01:00:00
2020/03/01 13:00:00
2020/03/03 01:00:00
2020/03/04 13:00:00
2020/03/06 01:00:00
2020/03/07 13:00:00
2020/03/09 01:00:00
2020/03/10 13:00:00
2020/03/12 01:00:00
2020/03/13 13:00:00
2020/03/15 01:00:00
2020/03/16 13:00:00
2020/03/18 01:00:00
2020/03/19 13:00:00
2020/03/21 01:00:00
2020/03/22 13:00:00
2020/03/24 01:00:00
2020/03/25 13:00:00
2020/03/27 01:00:00
2020/03/28 13:00:00
2020/03/30 01:00:00
2020/03/31 13:00:00
2020/04/02 01:00:00
2020/04/03 13:00:00
2020/04/05 01:00:00
2020/04/06 13:00:00
2020/04/08 01:00:00
2020/04/09 13:00:00
2020/04/11 01:00:00
2020/04/12 13:00:00
2020/04/14 01:00:00
2020/04/15 13:00:00
2020/04/17 01:00:00
2020/04/18 13:00:00
2020/04/20 01:00:00
2020/04/21 13:00:00
2020/04/23 01:00:00
2020/04/24 13:00:00
2020/04/26 01:00:00
2020/04/27 13:00:00
2020/04/29 01:00:00
2020/04/30 13:00:00
Water Level (in)
Ground
12
Precipitation


Temporary Water Table - PZ10
5.00
0.00
-5.00
-10.00
-15.00
-20.00
-25.00
-30.00
-35.00
2020/01/09 01:00:00
2020/01/10 13:00:00
2020/01/12 01:00:00
2020/01/13 13:00:00
2020/01/15 01:00:00
2020/01/16 13:00:00
2020/01/18 01:00:00
2020/01/19 13:00:00
2020/01/21 01:00:00
2020/01/22 13:00:00
2020/01/24 01:00:00
2020/01/25 13:00:00
2020/01/27 01:00:00
2020/01/28 13:00:00
2020/01/30 01:00:00
2020/01/31 13:00:00
2020/02/02 01:00:00
2020/02/03 13:00:00
2020/02/05 01:00:00
2020/02/06 13:00:00
2020/02/08 01:00:00
2020/02/09 13:00:00
2020/02/11 01:00:00
2020/02/12 13:00:00
2020/02/14 01:00:00
2020/02/15 13:00:00
2020/02/17 01:00:00
2020/02/18 13:00:00
2020/02/20 01:00:00
2020/02/21 13:00:00
2020/02/23 01:00:00
2020/02/24 13:00:00
2020/02/26 01:00:00
2020/02/27 13:00:00
2020/02/29 01:00:00
2020/03/01 13:00:00
2020/03/03 01:00:00
2020/03/04 13:00:00
2020/03/06 01:00:00
2020/03/07 13:00:00
2020/03/09 01:00:00
2020/03/10 13:00:00
2020/03/12 01:00:00
2020/03/13 13:00:00
2020/03/15 01:00:00
2020/03/16 13:00:00
2020/03/18 01:00:00
2020/03/19 13:00:00
2020/03/21 01:00:00
2020/03/22 13:00:00
2020/03/24 01:00:00
2020/03/25 13:00:00
2020/03/27 01:00:00
2020/03/28 13:00:00
2020/03/30 01:00:00
2020/03/31 13:00:00
2020/04/02 01:00:00
2020/04/03 13:00:00
2020/04/05 01:00:00
2020/04/06 13:00:00
2020/04/08 01:00:00
2020/04/09 13:00:00
2020/04/11 01:00:00
2020/04/12 13:00:00
2020/04/14 01:00:00
2020/04/15 13:00:00
2020/04/17 01:00:00
2020/04/18 13:00:00
2020/04/20 01:00:00
2020/04/21 13:00:00
2020/04/23 01:00:00
2020/04/24 13:00:00
2020/04/26 01:00:00
2020/04/27 13:00:00
2020/04/29 01:00:00
2020/04/30 13:00:00
Water Level (in)
Ground
12
Precipitation


Temporary Water Table - PZ11
5.00
0.00
-5.00
-10.00
-15.00
-20.00
-25.00
-30.00
-35.00
-40.00
2020/01/09 01:00:00
2020/01/10 13:00:00
2020/01/12 01:00:00
2020/01/13 13:00:00
2020/01/15 01:00:00
2020/01/16 13:00:00
2020/01/18 01:00:00
2020/01/19 13:00:00
2020/01/21 01:00:00
2020/01/22 13:00:00
2020/01/24 01:00:00
2020/01/25 13:00:00
2020/01/27 01:00:00
2020/01/28 13:00:00
2020/01/30 01:00:00
2020/01/31 13:00:00
2020/02/02 01:00:00
2020/02/03 13:00:00
2020/02/05 01:00:00
2020/02/06 13:00:00
2020/02/08 05:00:00
2020/02/09 17:00:00
2020/02/11 05:00:00
2020/02/12 17:00:00
2020/02/14 05:00:00
2020/02/15 17:00:00
2020/02/17 05:00:00
2020/02/18 17:00:00
2020/02/20 05:00:00
2020/02/21 17:00:00
2020/02/23 05:00:00
2020/02/24 17:00:00
2020/02/26 05:00:00
2020/02/27 17:00:00
2020/02/29 05:00:00
2020/03/01 17:00:00
2020/03/03 05:00:00
2020/03/04 17:00:00
2020/03/06 05:00:00
2020/03/07 17:00:00
2020/03/09 05:00:00
2020/03/10 17:00:00
2020/03/12 05:00:00
2020/03/13 17:00:00
2020/03/15 05:00:00
2020/03/16 17:00:00
2020/03/18 05:00:00
2020/03/19 17:00:00
2020/03/21 05:00:00
2020/03/22 17:00:00
2020/03/24 05:00:00
2020/03/25 17:00:00
2020/03/27 05:00:00
2020/03/28 17:00:00
2020/03/30 05:00:00
2020/03/31 17:00:00
2020/04/02 05:00:00
2020/04/03 17:00:00
2020/04/05 05:00:00
2020/04/06 17:00:00
2020/04/08 05:00:00
2020/04/09 17:00:00
2020/04/11 05:00:00
2020/04/12 17:00:00
2020/04/14 05:00:00
2020/04/15 17:00:00
2020/04/17 05:00:00
2020/04/18 17:00:00
2020/04/20 05:00:00
2020/04/21 17:00:00
2020/04/23 05:00:00
2020/04/24 17:00:00
2020/04/26 05:00:00
2020/04/27 17:00:00
2020/04/29 05:00:00
2020/04/30 17:00:00
Water Level (in)
Ground
12
Precipitation


Temporary Water Table - PZ12
5.00
0.00
-5.00
-10.00
-15.00
-20.00
-25.00
-30.00
-35.00
-40.00
2020/01/09 01:00:00
2020/01/10 13:00:00
2020/01/12 01:00:00
2020/01/13 13:00:00
2020/01/15 01:00:00
2020/01/16 13:00:00
2020/01/18 01:00:00
2020/01/19 13:00:00
2020/01/21 01:00:00
2020/01/22 13:00:00
2020/01/24 01:00:00
2020/01/25 13:00:00
2020/01/27 01:00:00
2020/01/28 13:00:00
2020/01/30 01:00:00
2020/01/31 13:00:00
2020/02/02 01:00:00
2020/02/03 13:00:00
2020/02/05 01:00:00
2020/02/06 13:00:00
2020/02/08 05:00:00
2020/02/09 17:00:00
2020/02/11 05:00:00
2020/02/12 17:00:00
2020/02/14 05:00:00
2020/02/15 17:00:00
2020/02/17 05:00:00
2020/02/18 17:00:00
2020/02/20 05:00:00
2020/02/21 17:00:00
2020/02/23 05:00:00
2020/02/24 17:00:00
2020/02/26 05:00:00
2020/02/27 17:00:00
2020/02/29 05:00:00
2020/03/01 17:00:00
2020/03/03 05:00:00
2020/03/04 17:00:00
2020/03/06 05:00:00
2020/03/07 17:00:00
2020/03/09 05:00:00
2020/03/10 17:00:00
2020/03/12 05:00:00
2020/03/13 17:00:00
2020/03/15 05:00:00
2020/03/16 17:00:00
2020/03/18 05:00:00
2020/03/19 17:00:00
2020/03/21 05:00:00
2020/03/22 17:00:00
2020/03/24 05:00:00
2020/03/25 17:00:00
2020/03/27 05:00:00
2020/03/28 17:00:00
2020/03/30 05:00:00
2020/03/31 17:00:00
2020/04/02 05:00:00
2020/04/03 17:00:00
2020/04/05 05:00:00
2020/04/06 17:00:00
2020/04/08 05:00:00
2020/04/09 17:00:00
2020/04/11 05:00:00
2020/04/12 17:00:00
2020/04/14 05:00:00
2020/04/15 17:00:00
2020/04/17 05:00:00
2020/04/18 17:00:00
2020/04/20 05:00:00
2020/04/21 17:00:00
2020/04/23 05:00:00
2020/04/24 17:00:00
2020/04/26 05:00:00
2020/04/27 17:00:00
2020/04/29 05:00:00
2020/04/30 17:00:00
Water Level (in)
Ground
12
Precipitation



Technology Sheet

Baro-Diver – DI800



Actual size

Technical Specifications

Length	4.33 in
Diameter	0.87 in
Weight	3.67 oz
Memory	72,000 measurements with backup; continuous and fixed length memory
Wetted parts	
housing	stainless steel (316L)
o-rings	Viton ®
pressure sensor	piezo resistive ceramic (Al_2O_3) with thermal compensation
cap	Nylon PA6 30% glass fiber
nose cone	ABS
Battery life	up to 10 years (dependent on usage)
Sample interval	½ second to 99 hours
Sample method	fixed interval
Communication	RS232

Pressure

Part number	**DI 800**	
Range	4.9	ftH_2O
Accuracy⁺	± 0.2	inH_2O
Resolution	0.01	inH_2O

Temperature

Range	-4 to 176 °F
Calibrated	14 to 122 °F
Accuracy⁺	± 0.18 °F
Resolution	0.018 °F

⁺ typical



M = membrane
Dimensions in mm

© January 2017 Van Essen Instruments. All rights reserved.

Climatological Data for AURORA STATE AP, OR - January 2020

Date	Max Temperature	Min Temperature	Avg Temperature	GDD Base 40	GDD Base 50	Precipitation	Snowfall	Snow Depth
2020-01-01	55	47	51.0	11	1	0.09	M	M
2020-01-02	51	43	47.0	7	0	0.00	M	M
2020-01-03	62	45	53.5	14	4	0.16	M	M
2020-01-04	50	40	45.0	5	0	0.29	M	M
2020-01-05	50	42	46.0	6	0	0.21	M	M
2020-01-06	52	45	48.5	9	0	0.44	M	M
2020-01-07	56	46	51.0	11	1	0.24	M	M
2020-01-08	47	38	42.5	3	0	0.15	M	M
2020-01-09	42	33	37.5	0	0	T	M	M
2020-01-10	47	37	42.0	2	0	0.55	M	M
2020-01-11	46	42	44.0	4	0	0.45	M	M
2020-01-12	46	38	42.0	2	0	0.80	M	M
2020-01-13	40	37	38.5	0	0	0.19	M	M
2020-01-14	42	32	37.0	0	0	T	M	M
2020-01-15	49	27	38.0	0	0	0.19	M	M
2020-01-16	43	29	36.0	0	0	0.14	M	M
2020-01-17	43	30	36.5	0	0	0.18	M	M
2020-01-18	51	40	45.5	6	0	0.09	M	M
2020-01-19	55	42	48.5	9	0	0.05	M	M
2020-01-20	48	39	43.5	4	0	0.00	M	M
2020-01-21	51	41	46.0	6	0	0.04	M	M
2020-01-22	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M
2020-01-23	56	51	53.5	14	4	0.77	M	M
2020-01-24	57	48	52.5	13	3	0.01	M	M
2020-01-25	58	47	52.5	13	3	0.24	M	M
2020-01-26	55	46	50.5	11	1	0.18	M	M
2020-01-27	53	41	47.0	7	0	0.49	M	M
2020-01-28	53	46	49.5	10	0	0.56	M	M
2020-01-29	49	46	47.5	8	0	0.47	M	M
2020-01-30	55	41	48.0	8	0	0.08	M	M
2020-01-31	62	54	58.0	18	8	0.00	M	M
Average|Sum	50.8	41.1	46.0	201	25	7.06	M	M

Climatological Data for AURORA STATE AP, OR - February 2020

Date	Max Temperature	Min Temperature	Avg Temperature	GDD Base 40	GDD Base 50	Precipitation	Snowfall	Snow Depth
2020-02-01	58	41	49.5	10	0	0.19	M	M
2020-02-02	46	31	38.5	0	0	0.03	M	M
2020-02-03	47	30	38.5	0	0	0.02	M	M
2020-02-04	42	27	34.5	0	0	0.00	M	M
2020-02-05	52	42	47.0	7	0	0.09	M	M
2020-02-06	57	49	53.0	13	3	0.01	M	M
2020-02-07	54	44	49.0	9	0	0.11	M	M
2020-02-08	51	38	44.5	5	0	0.03	M	M
2020-02-09	47	34	40.5	1	0	0.00	M	M
2020-02-10	51	34	42.5	3	0	0.00	M	M
2020-02-11	44	31	37.5	0	0	0.00	M	M
2020-02-12	53	33	43.0	3	0	0.00	M	M
2020-02-13	44	33	38.5	0	0	0.04	M	M
2020-02-14	50	39	44.5	5	0	0.01	M	M
2020-02-15	47	42	44.5	5	0	0.67	M	M
2020-02-16	51	37	44.0	4	0	T	M	M
2020-02-17	51	33	42.0	2	0	0.00	M	M
2020-02-18	54	33	43.5	4	0	0.00	M	M
2020-02-19	61	32	46.5	7	0	0.00	M	M
2020-02-20	56	28	42.0	2	0	0.00	M	M
2020-02-21	57	29	43.0	3	0	0.00	M	M
2020-02-22	58	31	44.5	5	0	0.00	M	M
2020-02-23	51	42	46.5	7	0	0.11	M	M
2020-02-24	49	34	41.5	2	0	0.00	M	M
2020-02-25	55	32	43.5	4	0	0.00	M	M
2020-02-26	58	40	49.0	9	0	0.00	M	M
2020-02-27	64	33	48.5	9	0	0.00	M	M
2020-02-28	56	32	44.0	4	0	0.12	M	M
2020-02-29	47	31	39.0	0	0	0.21	M	M
Average|Sum	52.1	35.0	43.6	123	3	1.64	M	M

Climatological Data for AURORA STATE AP, OR - March 2020

Date	Max Temperature	Min Temperature	Avg Temperature	GDD Base 40	GDD Base 50	Precipitation	Snowfall	Snow Depth
2020-03-01	49	32	40.5	1	0	T	M	M
2020-03-02	50	39	44.5	5	0	T	M	M
2020-03-03	60	47	53.5	14	4	T	M	M
2020-03-04	57	40	48.5	9	0	0.00	M	M
2020-03-05	59	34	46.5	7	0	0.00	M	M
2020-03-06	48	41	44.5	5	0	0.38	M	M
2020-03-07	49	36	42.5	3	0	0.02	M	M
2020-03-08	52	32	42.0	2	0	0.00	M	M
2020-03-09	57	29	43.0	3	0	0.00	M	M
2020-03-10	61	29	45.0	5	0	0.00	M	M
2020-03-11	57	36	46.5	7	0	0.00	M	M
2020-03-12	56	31	43.5	4	0	0.00	M	M
2020-03-13	41	34	37.5	0	0	0.10	M	M
2020-03-14	44	33	38.5	0	0	0.44	M	M
2020-03-15	48	33	40.5	1	0	0.00	M	M
2020-03-16	61	34	47.5	8	0	0.00	M	M
2020-03-17	59	36	47.5	8	0	0.00	M	M
2020-03-18	59	36	47.5	8	0	0.00	M	M
2020-03-19	63	34	48.5	9	0	0.00	M	M
2020-03-20	68	37	52.5	13	3	0.00	M	M
2020-03-21	60	37	48.5	9	0	0.00	M	M
2020-03-22	63	32	47.5	8	0	0.00	M	M
2020-03-23	51	43	47.0	7	0	0.22	M	M
2020-03-24	50	38	44.0	4	0	0.35	M	M
2020-03-25	53	37	45.0	5	0	T	M	M
2020-03-26	51	35	43.0	3	0	0.00	M	M
2020-03-27	51	38	44.5	5	0	0.15	M	M
2020-03-28	53	46	49.5	10	0	0.06	M	M
2020-03-29	59	48	53.5	14	4	0.18	M	M
2020-03-30	51	43	47.0	7	0	0.47	M	M
2020-03-31	52	40	46.0	6	0	0.16	M	M
Average|Sum	54.6	36.8	45.7	190	11	2.53	M	M

Climatological Data for AURORA STATE AP, OR - April 2020

Date	Max Temperature	Min Temperature	Avg Temperature	GDD Base 40	GDD Base 50	Precipitation	Snowfall	Snow Depth
2020-04-01	48	39	43.5	4	0	0.37	M	M
2020-04-02	52	36	44.0	4	0	0.09	M	M
2020-04-03	50	34	42.0	2	0	T	M	M
2020-04-04	52	37	44.5	5	0	0.07	M	M
2020-04-05	64	42	53.0	13	3	0.01	M	M
2020-04-06	62	41	51.5	12	2	0.00	M	M
2020-04-07	62	40	51.0	11	1	0.00	M	M
2020-04-08	74	36	55.0	15	5	0.00	M	M
2020-04-09	79	48	63.5	24	14	0.00	M	M
2020-04-10	71	41	56.0	16	6	0.00	M	M
2020-04-11	64	43	53.5	14	4	0.00	M	M
2020-04-12	66	36	51.0	11	1	0.00	M	M
2020-04-13	68	36	52.0	12	2	0.00	M	M
2020-04-14	69	37	53.0	13	3	0.00	M	M
2020-04-15	64	43	53.5	14	4	0.00	M	M
2020-04-16	71	43	57.0	17	7	0.00	M	M
2020-04-17	76	43	59.5	20	10	0.00	M	M
2020-04-18	53	45	49.0	9	0	0.10	M	M
2020-04-19	63	42	52.5	13	3	0.00	M	M
2020-04-20	72	40	56.0	16	6	0.00	M	M
2020-04-21	62	45	53.5	14	4	0.00	M	M
2020-04-22	60	47	53.5	14	4	0.31	M	M
2020-04-23	62	49	55.5	16	6	0.00	M	M
2020-04-24	63	50	56.5	17	7	0.03	M	M
2020-04-25	67	44	55.5	16	6	0.22	M	M
2020-04-26	68	39	53.5	14	4	0.09	M	M
2020-04-27	68	49	58.5	19	9	0.03	M	M
2020-04-28	72	50	61.0	21	11	0.00	M	M
2020-04-29	71	52	61.5	22	12	T	M	M
2020-04-30	65	46	55.5	16	6	0.00	M	M
Average|Sum	64.6	42.4	53.5	414	140	1.32	M	M

Climatological Data for AURORA STATE AP, OR - May 2020

Date	Max Temperature	Min Temperature	Avg Temperature	GDD Base 40	GDD Base 50	Precipitation	Snowfall	Snow Depth
2020-05-01	62	41	51.5	12	2	0.07	M	M
2020-05-02	57	43	50.0	10	0	0.49	M	M
2020-05-03	60	43	51.5	12	2	0.06	M	M
2020-05-04	70	39	54.5	15	5	0.01	M	M
2020-05-05	73	49	61.0	21	11	0.01	M	M
2020-05-06	64	46	55.0	15	5	0.13	M	M
2020-05-07	75	41	58.0	18	8	0.00	M	M
2020-05-08	85	57	71.0	31	21	0.00	M	M
2020-05-09	87	62	74.5	35	25	0.00	M	M
2020-05-10	88	54	71.0	31	21	0.00	M	M
2020-05-11	70	50	60.0	20	10	0.13	M	M
2020-05-12	63	49	56.0	16	6	0.25	M	M
2020-05-13	63	49	56.0	16	6	0.04	M	M
2020-05-14	57	50	53.5	14	4	0.68	M	M
2020-05-15	69	51	60.0	20	10	0.01	M	M
2020-05-16	69	54	61.5	22	12	0.16	M	M
2020-05-17	69	50	59.5	20	10	T	M	M
2020-05-18	60	52	56.0	16	6	0.39	M	M
2020-05-19	63	49	56.0	16	6	T	M	M
2020-05-20	61	51	56.0	16	6	0.02	M	M
2020-05-21	60	48	54.0	14	4	0.02	M	M
2020-05-22	62	45	53.5	14	4	0.03	M	M
2020-05-23	64	47	55.5	16	6	0.00	M	M
2020-05-24	74	48	61.0	21	11	0.00	M	M
2020-05-25	69	53	61.0	21	11	0.02	M	M
2020-05-26	75	56	65.5	26	16	0.00	M	M
2020-05-27	85	49	67.0	27	17	0.00	M	M
2020-05-28	92	55	73.5	34	24	0.00	M	M
2020-05-29	86	55	70.5	31	21	0.00	M	M
2020-05-30	62	53	57.5	18	8	0.30	M	M
2020-05-31	66	51	58.5	19	9	0.00	M	M
Average|Sum	69.7	49.7	59.7	617	307	2.82	M	M

Climatological Data for AURORA STATE AP, OR - June 2020

Date	Max Temperature	Min Temperature	Avg Temperature	GDD Base 40	GDD Base 50	Precipitation	Snowfall	Snow Depth
2020-06-01	73	44	58.5	19	9	0.00	M	M
2020-06-02	79	49	64.0	24	14	0.00	M	M
2020-06-03	76	51	63.5	24	14	0.00	M	M
2020-06-04	74	50	62.0	22	12	0.00	M	M
2020-06-05	70	52	61.0	21	11	0.00	M	M
2020-06-06	61	49	55.0	15	5	0.26	M	M
2020-06-07	62	48	55.0	15	5	0.21	M	M
2020-06-08	65	52	58.5	19	9	0.20	M	M
2020-06-09	66	51	58.5	19	9	0.42	M	M
2020-06-10	78	59	68.5	29	19	T	M	M
2020-06-11	76	58	67.0	27	17	0.04	M	M
2020-06-12	59	54	56.5	17	7	0.13	M	M
2020-06-13	60	51	55.5	16	6	0.58	M	M
2020-06-14	68	49	58.5	19	9	0.04	M	M
2020-06-15	64	52	58.0	18	8	0.84	M	M
2020-06-16	64	52	58.0	18	8	0.24	M	M
2020-06-17	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M
2020-06-18	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M
2020-06-19	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M
2020-06-20	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M
2020-06-21	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M
2020-06-22	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M
2020-06-23	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M
2020-06-24	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M
2020-06-25	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M
2020-06-26	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M
2020-06-27	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M
2020-06-28	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M
2020-06-29	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M
2020-06-30	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M
Average|Sum	68.4	51.3	59.9	322	162	2.96	M	M

AgACIS


Month	Total Precipitation Normal (inches)
January	5.87
February	4.75
March	4.23
April	3.13
May	2.36
June	2.02
July	0.68
August	0.66
September	1.73
October	3.23
November	6.63
December	6.58
Annual	41.87


Station Information

Station name:	AURORA STATE AP
State:	OR
County:	(FIPS 41047)
Station ids:	94281 (WBAN)UAO (FAA)3S2 (FAA)KUAO (ICAO)USW00094281 (GHCN)
Latitude:	45.2486 degrees
Longitude:	-122.7686 degrees
Elevation:	196 feet
Available date ranges:	Max Temperature 1997-06-01 - 2020-05-12 Min Temperature 1997-06-01 - 2020-05-12 Precipitation 1998-04-01 - 2020-05-12 Snowfall 2009-08-01 - 2018-12-12 Snow Depth 1998-07-16 - 2018-10-10


PRESTO GEOSYSTEMS

GEOWEB® LOAD SUPPORT SYSTEM TECHNICAL OVERVIEW





UNCONFINED GRANULAR PAVEMENT SYSTEM



THE GEOWEB GRANULAR PAVEMENT SYSTEM

PRESTO GEOSYSTEMS
670 N PERKINS STREET, APPLETON, WISCONSIN, USA 54914
Ph: 920-738-1707 or 800-548-3424 ■ Fax: 920-738-1222
e-mail: INFO@PRESTOGEO.COM WWW.PRESTOGEO.COM/
GWLSTO 15 FEB-08

Table of Contents

Introduction 1
Examples of Geoweb Load-Support System Applications 1
Figure 1 Typical Geoweb Sections 2
Features and Benefits of the Geoweb Cellular Confinement System 2
Identifying Load Support Problems and Geoweb Solutions 3
Soft Subgrades Problems 3
Surface Stability Problems 3
Aesthetic / Environmental Problems 3
Geoweb Load Support Systems - The Key Components 4
Textured Geoweb system 4
Perforated Geoweb system 4
Infill materials 4
Table 1 Total Thickness of Coarse Sand / Gravel Base Including Geoweb Section 5
Geotextile underlayer 5
Surface materials 6
Design Considerations and Methods 6
Flexible Pavements 6
Figure 2 Flexible Pavement Detail 6
Granular Pavements 7
Figure 3 Granular Pavement Detail 7
Spread Footings 7
Figure 4 Spread Footing Detail 7
Design Parameters - Granular Pavements 8
Wheel Load 8
Tire Pressure 8
Bearing Capacity Coefficient 8
Depth to Top of Geoweb section 8
Subgrade Strength 8
California Bearing Ratio (CBR) Test 9
Table 2 Unit Loads for Standard Crushed Stone Material 9
Standard Penetration Test 9
Shear Strength Tests 9
Angle of Internal Friction - Geoweb Infill Material 10

Figure 5 Angle of Internal Friction 10
Geoweb Cell Wall/Infill Friction Angle Ratio 10
Table 3 Recommended Peak Friction Angle Ratio 10
Design Calculations Granular Pavements 11
Variable Names 11
Calculations 11
Table 4 Correlation of Subgrade Soil Strength Parameters for Cohesive (Fine-Grained) Soils 12
Table 5 Total Thickness of Coarse Sand / Gravel Base Including Geoweb Section 14
Available Tools & Services 14
Design 14
Construction 14
Disclaimer 14
References 15

PRESTO GEOSYSTEMS

GEOWEB® LOAD SUPPORT SYSTEM TECHNICAL OVERVIEW

Introduction

Natural aggregate / soil construction materials for road base and other load support applications are inherently unstable compared to other construction materials such as steel and reinforced concrete. This is because they are comprised of discrete particles of varying sizes that can roll, or slide, over one another. They have relatively low shear resistance and will eventually fail as a result of single or multiple load applications. However, this *weak link* property also makes these natural construction materials easily workable relative to stockpiling, transporting and placing over large areas or long roadways.

Asphalt cement and Portland cement are commonly used to improve the stability of aggregate materials to make them suitable for the wearing course of load support structures. In addition, most load support structures also require a good base and/or subbase layer to distribute surface loads over the subgrade. Unbound aggregate materials are ideal for this purpose because they are easy to place, are flexible and improve the ride quality of the structure. However, because of their inherent weakness, road builders have long sought new ways to increase the long-term stability of unbound aggregate materials. Many products have been developed and tested to bind together or reinforce aggregate materials but often with limited success.

Fine and uniformly graded sands best exemplify the inherent weakness of granular materials. Desert sands and dry beach sands cannot support channelized traffic loading without significant rutting occurring due to localized shear failure of the near surface material. For this reason, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Waterways Experiment Station, began a research project in the mid 1970's to investigate methods for rapid construction of sand roads for beach landings and desert operations. In order to achieve surface stability without the requirement for chemical additives, mixing and curing time, three-dimensional cellular confinement of loose sands was determined to be the most practical alternative. Through field trials and experimentation, the optimum cell depth to diameter ratio was determined to be approximately 1.0 for heavy military and civilian wheel loads. In the late 1970's Presto Products Company developed the Geoweb cellular confinement system, based on the Corps of Engineers research, as a commercial product to stabilize unbound aggregate materials. The Geoweb system consists of an assembly of polyethylene sheet strips connected in a series of off-set, full-depth ultrasonic welded seams, aligned perpendicular to the longitudinal axis of the strips. When expanded, the interconnected strips form the walls of the cellular confinement structure into which granular fill materials can be placed. Various cell depths have been developed to satisfy load and subgrade strength design criteria based on optimum cell to diameter ratios. Recent improvements to the Geoweb system include surface texturization and cell wall perforations for improved frictional resistance and lateral drainage.

Examples of Geoweb Load-Support System Applications

- Granular Access Roads
- Grass Access Roads
- Porous Pavements
- Pavement Subbases
- Parking Lots
- Storage Yards
- Intermodal and Port Facilities
- Boat Ramps / Low Level Crossings
- Retaining Wall Spread Footings
- Foundation Mattresses
- Trench Invert Stabilization
- Stabilized Drainage Layer

COPYRIGHT 2008 – PRESTO PRODUCTS CO.




Figure 1 Typical Geoweb Sections

Features and Benefits of the Geoweb Cellular Confinement System

The Geoweb cellular confinement system improves the load-deformation performance of granular infill materials due to the hoop strength of individual cells, the passive resistance of infill material in adjacent cells and vertical stress transfer to adjoining cells. When compared to 2-dimensional sheet reinforcement materials, the stiffness of the 3-dimensional Geoweb system is significantly greater and does not require initial deformation to support the design load.

The Geoweb cellular confinement system dramatically increases the shear resistance of granular infill materials allowing the use of lower quality aggregates (e.g. sand, gravel) to carry concentrated loads that would otherwise require crushed stone or bituminous mixes to prevent localized, near-surface, shear failure. The cellular structure also distributes concentrated loads to surrounding cells thus reducing the stress on the subgrade directly beneath the load and the required total thickness of the structure.

The Geoweb load support system can offer several advantages over conventional solutions and alternative systems. When very soft soils and/or heavy loads are a factor, the system can reduce costs by reducing the required section thickness. Where aggregate materials are expensive or unavailable, the system can reduce costs by incorporating locally available materials. Since Geoweb sections are very compact for shipping and reduce total thickness requirements, a small quantity can be used to replace truckloads of imported aggregate that may have to be hauled over long distances. Finally, when extended pavement life and/or low maintenance requirements are desired, the Geoweb system can ensure that the integrity of granular infill materials will be maintained indefinitely.

COPYRIGHT 2008 PRESTO PRODUCTS CO.

Identifying Load Support Problems and Geoweb Solutions

Load support design problems most commonly arise when:

- soft subgrade soils are encountered,
- surface soils are unstable, (i.e. good quality aggregates are locally unavailable or uneconomical) or,
- there are aesthetic and/or environmental consideration.

To identify load support problems where Geoweb cellular confinement should be considered, the following questions should be asked.

Soft Subgrades Problems

Are there any constraints on undercutting or designing a thick structure? If yes, consider the Geoweb cellular confinement system to reduce the section thickness.

Is it impossible to build a stable foundation mattress below the load structure because of a very soft, unstable subgrade condition? If yes, consider the Geoweb cellular confinement system, with a geotextile underlayer, to bridge over the soft soil and support construction equipment while using a minimum thickness of cover material.

Conventional, non-Geoweb solutions to soft subgrades problems, may include:

- excavation of the soft soil and replacement with imported fill (usually granular),
- chemical stabilization of the subgrade soil, or
- design of a thick, multi-layered structure which may include high quality aggregate materials, asphaltic concrete and/or Portland cement concrete.

Thick pavement structures and/or deep excavation may not always be possible due to existing curbs and buried utilities in existing roads.

Surface Stability Problems

Do the locally available soils (e.g. sands and gravels) have adequate shear strength to be used as a wearing surface for a temporary or low-volume access road? If not, confinement of the local materials in the Geoweb system should be weighed against the cost of importing higher quality aggregate materials.

Will aggregate degradation and lateral spreading of the pavement base course result in rutting and premature failure of the pavement structure? If the subgrade is relatively competent, deformation and rutting of the base course is likely to be the cause of maintenance problems and reduce the potential life of the pavement structure. Using the Geoweb system to confine the base course will totally restrict lateral movement that causes rutting and will minimize abrasion and wear on the aggregate infill material.

Few, if any, conventional solutions exist for this problem.

Aesthetic / Environmental Problems

Would a grass surfaced, low volume access road for maintenance vehicles be more aesthetically pleasing than a gravel or asphalt concrete surfaced pavement? If yes, the Geoweb cellular confinement system infilled with an aggregate/topsoil mix and vegetated is an attractive solution.

Is a porous pavement required for groundwater regeneration? If yes, the Geoweb cellular confinement system infilled with porous stone should definitely be considered. However, without confinement, porous aggregates are inherently unstable as surface materials.

 COPYRIGHT 2008 – PRESTO PRODUCTS CO.

Geoweb Load Support Systems - The Key Components

Textured Geoweb system

Engineered surface-textured polyethylene strips used in manufacturing Geoweb sections improve the frictional interaction between the Geoweb cell walls and granular infill materials. The increase in cell-wall / infill-interface friction provides structural benefits in certain Geoweb applications.

In load support applications, the higher cell wall/infill interface friction increases the resistance to vertical deformation of the infill soil relative to the cellular structure. Therefore, a more efficient transfer of vertical stress is provided to the surrounding cells. The result is a further reduction in vertical stress on the subgrade compared to a smooth walled geocell. For certain combinations of wheel loads and infill material properties, the surface texture makes it possible to further reduce the total required thickness of granular pavement over smooth-walled geocells.

Results of small and large scale shear box tests on sand and stone materials with textured Geoweb materials have demonstrated that Peak Coefficient Ratios (i.e. peak interface friction coefficient of textured Geoweb sections divided by the peak interface friction coefficient of granular infill soil in-isolation) varied from 0.63 (crushed stone materials) to 0.81 (coarse sand materials) compared to 0.64 (crushed stone materials) and 0.61 (coarse sand materials) with smooth Geoweb materials. Note that texturization does not increase the interface friction with some crushed stone infills. The Peak Coefficient Ratio should not be confused with the Peak Friction Angle Ratio defined in the section titled Geoweb Cell Wall/Infill Friction Angle Ratio

Perforated Geoweb system

Similar tests using sand and stone materials with the perforated Geoweb material demonstrated that the interface frictional characteristics are similar, or in some cases better, than those with surface textured Geoweb cells. Specifically, the Peak Coefficient Ratios of perforated Geoweb materials with crushed stone and coarse sand infills were found to be 0.75 and 0.89 respectively.

The latter test results indicate that perforated cell walls can be as effective as textured cell walls in increasing the interface friction. Therefore, the structural capacity of the perforated Geoweb load support system with certain sand/gravel infills is more effective than the textured Geoweb system. Since perforations also offer the advantage of lateral drainage, which is particularly useful over impermeable subgrades, the perforated Geoweb system is the recommended choice for many pavement applications. Refer to Table 1 for an illustration of the significance of the performance advantage using textured and perforated cell wall type.

Infill materials

Infill materials for Geoweb load support applications should always be predominately granular with a maximum particle size of 50 mm (2 in). For best performance, the fines fraction (i.e. material passing the #200 sieve - 75 μm) should not be greater than 10%. Soils with greater than 10% fines have low permeability and lose strength dramatically when they become wet. Pure granular materials are not affected by moisture fluctuations but are not as stable as granular materials with 5% - 10% fines. A small fraction of fines will increase stability by reducing the voids ratio and binding the soil.

COPYRIGHT 2008 PRESTO PRODUCTS CO.

The Geoweb cellular confinement system is effective in increasing the stability of lower quality granular infill materials such as poorly graded sands and gravels. With cellular confinement, poor quality granular infills can be used as the surface or near-surface material of access roads where driving speeds are relatively slow and ride quality is not a major concern. Higher quality aggregates are recommended for granular surfaced pavements where traffic speeds are higher and a smoother riding surface is required. Good quality aggregates typically include well graded crushed stones or gravels with a maximum particle size of 40 mm (1.5 in) and less than 8%, by weight, passing the #200 sieve. For long-term durability, the coarse fraction of the aggregate should have a Los Angeles Abrasion test wear less than 50%. The fines fraction (i.e. passing the #200 sieve) should not be greater than two-thirds of the fraction passing the #40 sieve and the fraction passing the #40 sieve should have a liquid limit no greater than 25%. The plasticity index should be less than 6%.

Table 1 Total Thickness of Coarse Sand / Gravel Base Including Geoweb Section

Subgrade CBR	Wheel Load		Smooth Cell	Textured Cell	Perforated Cell	Unconfined Gravel
%	kN	(lbf)	Relative Total Thickness of Road Base			
0.2	27	(6,000)	32%	28%	27%	100%
	53	(12,000)	59%	25%	25%	100%
	111	(25,000)	72%	23%	23%	100%
	222	(50,000)	80%	22%	22%	100%
0.5	27	(6,000)	46%	40%	40%	100%
	53	(12,000)	43%	38%	37%	100%
	111	(25,000)	40%	35%	34%	100%
	222	(50,000)	38%	33%	32%	100%
1.0	27	(6,000)	58%	54%	54%	100%
	53	(12,000)	55%	49%	48%	100%
	111	(25,000)	52%	45%	44%	100%
	222	(50,000)	49%	43%	42%	100%
2.0	27	(6,000)	81%	81%	81%	100%
	53	(12,000)	65%	58%	58%	100%
	111	(25,000)	59%	52%	51%	100%
	222	(50,000)	60%	52%	51%	100%

NOTE: **This table is based on theoretical methodologies outlined herein. Values are for comparative purposes only and are not a substitute for project specific design.**

Geotextile underlayer

When the Geoweb section is to be placed directly above a fine-grained or cohesive soil subgrade, a nonwoven geotextile is typically recommended for separation of the native soil and the granular infill. Separation is important to prevent contamination and loss of shear strength of the granular infill and to prevent punching or migration of the infill material into the subgrade. With a geotextile underlayer, the infill material is totally confined on all sides and at the bottom of individual cells.

When specific designs require a granular subbase below the Geoweb section, a woven or nonwoven geotextile may be recommended for separation as well as temporary load support during placement of the subbase layer. If the subbase is a well-compacted granular material, a geotextile separator is not typically required between the subbase and Geoweb infill.

 COPYRIGHT 2008 – PRESTO PRODUCTS CO.

Surface materials

In order to prevent trafficking directly on top of the Geoweb cell walls, it is generally recommended to place a minimum 50 mm (2 in) of granular cover (i.e. overtopping) above the Geoweb cell walls. The surface material should be dense-graded crushed stone that is resistant to surface rutting. If traffic volumes are high, a bituminous surface treatment can increase the stability of the riding surface.

If an asphalt concrete base or surface layer is to be placed over the infilled Geoweb base, the depth of granular cover above the cell walls should be at least 25 mm (1 in) to allow for minor consolidation of the infill material and to insulate the polyethylene from direct contact with the hot mix asphalt concrete.

Design Considerations and Methods

There is no single design method that encompasses the full range of Geoweb load support applications. A theoretical design method, based on empirically derived design methods for unpaved roads over soft soils, has been developed for the Geoweb granular pavement system. Design methods for flexible pavements, spread footings, and granular pavements with unstable infill soils have yet to be developed. However, it was this latter function for which Geoweb was originally invented and developed and has proven effective, particularly with sand infill materials.

Recent results of large scale triaxial compression testing of the Geoweb cell infilled with granular materials demonstrate that the Geoweb system imparts an apparent cohesion of approximately 150 kPa (3000 psf) to the confined material. This effective cohesion is in addition to the natural frictional shear strength of the granular material. Presto Geosystems is currently using this information to develop bearing-capacity design procedures for Geoweb load support structures that takes into account the additional shear strength provided by the apparent cohesion. These design procedures will apply to large spread footing and granular pavement applications with poor-quality infill materials.

A discussion of currently available design procedures follows for Geoweb granular pavement systems and the design approaches used for other Geoweb load support applications.

Flexible Pavements

Conventional flexible pavement design methods (e.g. AASHTO, Asphalt Institute, Caltrans, etc.) are all based on empirical data collected from either full-scale road tests or ongoing testing and monitoring of pavement performance within various geographical areas. Structural values of conventional road construction materials (e.g. crushed stone, gravel, asphalt concrete, etc.) have been determined by federal and local agencies based on years of in-service performance history. While many new materials (e.g. stabilizers, geosynthetics, etc.) have been introduced in recent years to enhance the structural value of conventional construction materials, it is difficult and can take several years to obtain structural values for these components to use with existing design methods. For this reason, there are no agency-accepted structural values or equivalencies that can be used with current pavement design methods for the Geoweb system.




Figure 2 Flexible Pavement Detail

COPYRIGHT 2008 PRESTO PRODUCTS CO.

By combining conventional pavement design methods with a theoretical method for determining the structural equivalency of a confined pavement layer, it is possible to design pavement structures that incorporate the Geoweb system.

Granular Pavements

Design of Geoweb confined granular pavements (e.g. access roads) over soft soils is relatively straight forward and has been well documented for general design purposes. Refer to the Design Parameters – Granular Pavements and Design Calculations Granular Pavements sections of this document for specific details about the required design input data and the design calculations.




Figure 3 Granular Pavement Detail

Spread Footings

Geoweb spread footings may be considered for a wide range of load support applications such as building footings, buried pipes and segmental retaining walls. They may also be considered for a variety of soil problems such as low bearing capacity, settlement and inadequate shear resistance of near surface foundation soils. Footing loads may be relatively large or small with respect to individual cell or section size of Geoweb spread footings. Due to the versatility of the Geoweb cellular confinement system, the function and design method may change with varying combinations of application, problem and footing loads. In some cases the governing design factor may be:

- the overall shear resistance of the Geoweb spread footing,
- the redistribution of stresses within individual Geoweb cells or
- the increase in bearing area provided by a Geoweb spread footing.

The design approach used for granular pavement structures can also be used for design of Geoweb spread footings with relatively small rigid footing loads by modifying the design criteria for bearing capacity from local shear failure mode to general shear failure mode. For conventional bearing capacity and settlement calculations of larger footing loads, the recommended effective bearing area of a Geoweb mattress should extend no more than 500 mm (18 in) beyond the edges of the rigid footing. In most cases, this will provide a significant decrease in the calculated bearing pressure without compromising the basic assumption that the Geoweb mattress will be effectively rigid.




Figure 4 Spread Footing Detail

As stated above, development of a design method for Geoweb spread footings, which will take into account the effective cohesion of the cellular structure, is currently underway.

COPYRIGHT 2008 – PRESTO PRODUCTS CO.

Design Parameters - Granular Pavements

The following information and input parameters are required for design of the Geoweb load support system for granular pavements.

Wheel Load

The design wheel load is the heaviest single or dual wheel load that the granular pavement will be required to support over the proposed life of the structure.

Tire Pressure

The tire pressure is the tire inflation pressure of the design wheel load and is approximately equal to the ground contact pressure. An input value is required for determination of the effective contact radius of the design wheel load.

Bearing Capacity Coefficient

Bearing capacity coefficients are mathematically or empirically derived coefficients used within standard equations for determination of the bearing capacity of a soil. For unpaved roads over soft cohesive soils, the US Forest Service and others have developed bearing capacity coefficients for determination of the bearing capacity of soils subjected to dynamic loading wherein punching (local) shear failure is more prevalent than general shear failure. The US Forest Service developed the following bearing coefficients for unpaved haul roads for two broad ranges of traffic loading.

$N_c = 2.8$ High traffic with little rutting (i.e. > 1000, < 10000)

$N_c = 3.3$ Low traffic with significant rutting (i.e. < 1000)

Depth to Top of Geoweb section

The depth of placement of the Geoweb layer influences the distribution of stresses through the system and has a significant effect on the design. Since vertical stresses are higher near the surface, optimum performance and maximum thickness reduction are obtained by placing the Geoweb as close to the surface as possible. However, in order to protect the top of the Geoweb cell walls, a 25 mm - 50 mm (1 in - 2 in) aggregate wearing surface is typically recommended.

Subgrade Strength

There are several laboratory and field test methods available to determine the strength of subgrade soils for design purposes. The calculations require soil strength to be expressed in terms of shear strength or cohesion. Shear strength can be determined in the field by the vane shear test or in the laboratory by the shear box or triaxial compression tests. Soil strength is also commonly determined by the Standard Penetration Test and the California Bearing Ratio (CBR) test. For cohesive soils, shear strength of a soil can be estimated from the standard penetration resistance (N) or the California Bearing Ratio (CBR). In the absence of field or laboratory test data, the strength of the subgrade soil can be estimated by it's consistency (see the Field Identification section of Table 4). When estimating a soil's strength by it's consistency, the soil sample should be taken from a test pit which is deep enough to ensure it's properties have not been affected by changing surface conditions (e.g. rain water, hot dry weather, etc.).

Brief descriptions of the most common test methods for determining the strength of subgrade soils are given below.

 COPYRIGHT 2008 PRESTO PRODUCTS CO.

California Bearing Ratio (CBR) Test

The California Bearing Ratio test is an index test used to determine the relative strength of a soil compared to a standard high-quality crushed stone material. The test specimen is prepared by compacting a sample of the soil, in multiple lifts, into a 6 inch diameter cylinder, applying a surcharge in the form of circular plates to approximate the confining stress of the final pavement on the soil and soaking the entire sample for a period of 4 days. The test consists of loading the soil sample with a 3 square inch (1935 square mm) circular piston, through holes in the surcharge plates, at a rate of 0.10 inch (2.54 mm)/minute up to a maximum of 0.5 inches (13 mm). The CBR value is the ratio of the unit load at 0.10 inch (2.54 mm) or 0.20 inch (5.04 mm) to that of the standard crushed stone material at the same depth of penetration (whichever is higher). The unit loads are given in Table 2.

Table 2 Unit Loads for Standard Crushed Stone Material

0.1 inch penetration	1000 psi
0.2 inch penetration	1500 psi
0.3 inch penetration	1900 psi
0.4 inch penetration	2300 psi
0.5 inch penetration	2600 psi

Standard Penetration Test

The standard penetration test provides an indication of the density, and the angle of internal friction of cohesionless soils and the shear strength of cohesive soils. The tests consists of driving a split spoon sampler, equipped with a cutting shoe and attached to the end of a drill rod, into a soil by dropping a 140 lb (63.6 kg) hammer a distance of 30 inches (0.76 m). A split spoon sampler is a thick-walled steel tube, split lengthwise, used to obtain undisturbed samples of soil from drill holes. The number of blows required for each 6 inches (150 mm) of penetration of the split spoon sampler is recorded. The standard penetration resistance is the sum of the blows for the second and third increments of 6 inches (150 mm) and is termed N in blows/ft (blows/300 mm).

Shear Strength Tests

The shear strength of a soil is the stress at which the soil fails in shear. It can be calculated by dividing the shear force at which a soil fails by the cross-sectional area of shear or, if the cohesion and angle of internal friction are known, by the general Coulomb equation.

$$s = c + \sigma \tan \phi$$

where c is the soil's cohesion (i.e. interparticle attraction) expressed in terms of force per unit area

σ is the overburden or surcharge pressure in terms of force per unit area

ϕ is the soil's angle of internal friction (i.e. resistance to interparticle slip) in degrees

Granular soils do not have cohesion and therefore shear strength is governed by overburden pressure that explains why granular pavement surface materials are inherently unstable. Undrained cohesive soils (e.g. soft and saturated clays) do not have internal friction and therefore shear strength is governed by cohesion that can vary with moisture content. Drained cohesive soils can have both cohesion and internal friction.

The shear strength of granular soils can be measured in a laboratory by the shear box test. Cohesion and the angle of internal friction of cohesive soils can be measured in a laboratory for drained and undrained conditions by triaxial compression tests. In the field, shear strength can be measured by the field vane shear test. Refer to a textbook on soil mechanics or geotechnical engineering for more information about the shear strength of soils and test methods.

COPYRIGHT 2008 – PRESTO PRODUCTS CO.

Angle of Internal Friction - Geoweb Infill Material

The angle of internal friction of a cohesionless granular soil can be determined by measuring the maximum shear stress at failure over a range of normal stresses (i.e. confining pressures) and plotting the results on a graph. The angle formed by the best-fit straight line through the origin and the horizontal axis is a close approximation of the angle of internal friction. See Figure 5. For compacted granular materials, the angle of internal friction is typically within a range of 30° to 40°. The higher the quality of the granular material (e.g. angularity, gradation, hardness, etc.) the higher the angle of internal friction.




Figure 5 Angle of Internal Friction

Geoweb Cell Wall/Infill Friction Angle Ratio

The Geoweb cell wall/infill material friction angle ratio is the ratio of angle of shearing resistance between the infill material and the Geoweb cell wall over the peak friction angle of the infill soil in-isolation. It will vary depending upon the gradation and particle angularity of the infill material and the roughness of the cell wall or the size and spacing of perforations in the cell wall.

Shear box tests have been carried out to determine angles of shearing resistance between standard Geoweb cell wall treatments and typical granular materials. The results were expressed in terms of peak friction angle ratios (or Geoweb Cell Wall/Infill Friction Angle Ratio), where Peak Friction Angle Ratio is defined as the angle of shearing resistance between the granular infill and the Geoweb cell wall divided by the peak friction angle of the infill material in-isolation. Geoweb Cell Wall/Infill Friction Ratios for standard cell wall treatments and typical compacted granular materials are given in Table 3. The values presented in Table 3 are used to develop the relationships in Table 1 and base thickness in Table 5.

Table 3 Recommended Peak Friction Angle Ratio

Granular Infill Material	Cell Wall Type	$r = \delta/\phi$
Coarse Sand / Gravel	Smooth	0.71
	Textured	0.88
	Textured - Perforated	0.90
#40 Silica Sand	Smooth	0.78
	Textured	0.90
	Textured - Perforated	0.90
Crushed Stone	Smooth	0.72
	Textured	0.72
	Textured - Perforated	0.83

COPYRIGHT 2008 PRESTO PRODUCTS CO.

Design Calculations Granular Pavements

Illustrated here are the design procedures and calculations for determining aggregate thickness requirements for granular-surfaced pavements (e.g. access, utility and haul roads) both with and without the Geoweb cellular confinement system. Empirically derived bearing capacity coefficients are first used to determine the maximum allowable stress on a subgrade with either known or estimated shear strength. The maximum allowable stress is that stress which would cause local punching / shear failure of the subgrade under sustained loading conditions. Since granular pavement loads are transient, the effective strength of the soil is typically higher than it would be under static loading. Therefore, the maximum allowable stress is the limiting stress for design purposes. Boussinesq theory is then used to determine the required depth of granular cover beneath the design wheel load to ensure that the maximum allowable stress is not exceeded. The calculations outlined herein are intended for low volume roads where minor deformations are tolerable or for design of pavement subbase layers over soft soils. They are not intended for design of flexible pavement structures with paved surfaces. The calculations are only valid for granular pavement design over cohesive subgrade soils with CBR values less than 5.

Variable Names

c_u	Subgrade shear strength
N_c	Bearing capacity coefficient - based on design traffic - see below
P	Design wheel load
p	Contact pressure
r	Geoweb cell wall/Infill peak friction angle ratio
δ	Angle of shear resistance between the granular infill and Geoweb cell wall
ϕ	Angle of internal friction of the Geoweb infill material
z_t	Depth from surface to top of Geoweb cell walls
z_b	Depth from surface to bottom of Geoweb cell walls

Calculations

Determine the subgrade shear strength. Refer to Table 4 if the subgrade strength is reported in terms of Standard Penetration Resistance, CBR or by Field Identification.

Determine the maximum allowable stress on the subgrade, q_a $\quad q_a = N_c c_u$

where N_C = 2.8 (High Traffic, Low Rutting - from U.S. Forest Service guidelines)

N_C = 3.3 Low Traffic, High Rutting - from U.S. Forest Service guidelines)

Determine the required thickness of granular pavement, z_U, without the Geoweb cellular confinement system using the following equation (Boussinesq equation for estimating vertical stress at a given depth below a circular load re-written to calculate the depth of cover above a given vertical stress, q_a).

$$z_U = \frac{R}{\sqrt{\frac{1}{\left(1 - \frac{q_a}{p}\right)^{2/3}} - 1}}$$

where R = Radius of loaded area (i.e. effective radius of single or dual tires)

$$R = \sqrt{\frac{P}{p\pi}}$$

Determine the required thickness of granular pavement, z_G, with the Geoweb cellular confinement system.

 COPYRIGHT 2008 – PRESTO PRODUCTS CO.

Table 4 Correlation of Subgrade Soil Strength Parameters for Cohesive (Fine-Grained) Soils

California Bearing Ratio CBR (%)	Undrained Shear Strength c_u kPa (psi)	Standard Penetration Resistance SPT (blows/ft)	Field Identification
< 0.4	< 11.7 (1.7)	< 2	Very soft (extruded between fingers when squeezed)
0.4 - 0.8	11.7 - 24.1 (1.7) - (3.5)	2 - 4	Soft (molded by light finger pressure)
0.8 - 1.6	24.1 - 47.6 (3.5) - (6.9)	4 - 8	Medium (molded by strong finger pressure)
1.6 - 3.2	47.6 - 95.8 (6.9) - (13.9)	8 - 15	Stiff (readily indented by thumb but penetrated with great effort)
3.2 - 6.4	95.8 - 191 (13.9) - (27.7)	15 - 30	Very stiff (readily indented by thumbnail)
> 6.4	> 191 (27.7)	> 30	Hard (indented with difficulty by thumbnail)

The total required thickness of granular pavement with the Geoweb cellular confinement system is a function of the Geoweb cell depth, the depth of placement below the applied load, the wheel load and tire pressure and the infill material properties. Surface stress (i.e. wheel load contact pressure) is distributed both vertically and horizontally through the Geoweb cellular structure. Horizontal stresses, in turn, are converted into vertical resisting stresses along the cell walls thus reducing the total vertical stress directly beneath the center of the loaded area. The total resisting stress provided by the Geoweb cell structure is calculated and added to the maximum allowable stress on the subgrade for determination of the total required thickness of granular pavement with the Geoweb cellular confinement system.

The first step is to select the Geoweb section placement depth, z_t within the granular pavement structure. Since vertical stresses are higher near the surface, optimum performance and maximum thickness reduction are obtained by placing the Geoweb as close to the surface as possible. However, to protect the top of the Geoweb cell walls, a 25 mm to 50 mm (1 in to 2 in) aggregate wearing surface is typically recommended.

After selecting a trial depth of placement, calculate the vertical stress, σ_{vt}, at the top of the Geoweb section using the following equation.

$$\sigma_{vt} = p\left[1 - \left(\frac{1}{1 + \left(\frac{R}{z_t}\right)^2}\right)^{3/2}\right]$$

Next, calculate the vertical stress, σ_{vb}, at the bottom of the Geoweb section. The bottom depth, z_b, is the top depth, z_t, plus the thickness (or depth) of the Geoweb section.

$$\sigma_{vb} = p\left[1 - \left(\frac{1}{1 + \left(\frac{R}{z_b}\right)^2}\right)^{3/2}\right]$$

COPYRIGHT 2008 PRESTO PRODUCTS CO.

Calculate the horizontal stress at the top, σ_{ht}, and bottom, σ_{hb}, of the Geoweb section using the following equations.

$$\sigma_h = K_a \sigma_v$$

where K_a is the coefficient of active earth pressure.

$$K_a = \tan^2\left(45 - \phi/2\right)$$

Horizontal stress at the top of the Geoweb section, σ_{ht}

$$\sigma_{ht} = K_a \sigma_{vt}$$

Horizontal stress at the bottom of the Geoweb section, σ_{hb}.

$$\sigma_{hb} = K_a \sigma_{vb}$$

The average horizontal stress on the Geoweb cell walls is then determined as follows.

$$\sigma_{avge} = \frac{\left(\sigma_{ht} + \sigma_{hb}\right)}{2}$$

Next, calculate the reduction in stress, σ_r, directly beneath the center of the loaded area due to stress transfer to the Geoweb cell walls using the following equation.

$$\sigma_r = 2\left(\frac{H}{D}\right)\sigma_{avge}\ \tan\delta$$

where H = Geoweb cell depth in mm (in)

D = Effective Geoweb cell diameter = 190 mm (7.5 in)

δ = Angle of shearing resistance between granular infill material and Geoweb cell walls.

$\delta = r\phi$ (obtain test data or estimate r from Table 3)

Determine the design allowable stress, q_G, on the subgrade with the Geoweb cellular confinement system using the following equation.

$$q_G = q_a + \sigma_r$$

Determine the total required thickness of granular pavement, z_G, with the Geoweb cellular confinement system.

$$z_G = \frac{R}{\sqrt{\frac{1}{\left(1 - \frac{q_G}{p}\right)^{2/3}} - 1}}$$

If the total required thickness is greater than the surface thickness (i.e. depth to the top of the Geoweb section); in addition, the depth of the Geoweb section, a subbase layer is required. The thickness of the subbase layer must be equal to the total required thickness minus the surface thickness and the Geoweb section depth.

Using the equations presented herein, Table 5 gives base/subbase thickness requirements vs. cell wall type for the Geoweb load support system, under the following load condition:

- 203 mm (8 in) depth of Geoweb section,
- crushed stone infill,
- 38 degree friction angle,
- 690 kPa (100 psi) tire pressure,
- 25 mm (1 in) depth of cover over the Geoweb section,
- 2.8 bearing capacity coefficient.

COPYRIGHT 2008 – PRESTO PRODUCTS CO.

Table 5 Total Thickness of Coarse Sand / Gravel Base Including Geoweb Section

Subgrade CBR	Wheel Load		Smooth r = 0.71		Textured r = 0.88		Textured - Perforated r = 0.90		Unconfined Stone	
%	kN	(lbf)	mm	(in)	mm	(in)	mm	(in)	mm	(in)
0.2	**27**	**(6,000)**	277	(10.9)	241	(9.5)	236	(9.3)	876	(34.5)
	53	**(12,000)**	366	(14.4)	315	(12.4)	310	(12.2)	1240	(48.8)
	111	**(25,000)**	490	(19.3)	419	(16.5)	411	(16.2)	1788	(70.4)
	222	**(50,000)**	655	(25.8)	556	(21.9)	546	(21.5)	2527	(99.5)
0.5	**27**	**(6,000)**	251	(9.9)	221	(8.7)	218	(8.6)	546	(21.5)
	53	**(12,000)**	335	(13.2)	292	(11.5)	287	(11.3)	772	(30.4)
	111	**(25,000)**	450	(17.7)	389	(15.3)	384	(15.1)	1113	(43.8)
	222	**(50,000)**	605	(23.8)	518	(20.4)	511	(20.1)	1575	(62.0)
1.0	**27**	**(6,000)**	218	(8.6)	203	(8.0)	203	(8.0)	376	(14.8)
	53	**(12,000)**	292	(11.5)	257	(10.1)	254	(10.0)	531	(20.9)
	111	**(25,000)**	396	(15.6)	345	(13.6)	340	(13.4)	767	(30.2)
	222	**(50,000)**	536	(21.1)	465	(18.3)	457	(18.0)	1085	(42.7)
2.0	**27**	**(6,000)**	203	(8.0)	203	(8.0)	203	(8.0)	251	(9.9)
	53	**(12,000)**	231	(9.1)	206	(8.1)	203	(8.0)	353	(13.9)
	111	**(25,000)**	315	(12.4)	279	(11.0)	274	(10.8)	536	(21.1)
	222	**(50,000)**	429	(16.9)	376	(14.8)	368	(14.5)	721	(28.4)

NOTE: The above wheel load values are from either single or dual wheels. For axle loads multiply by 2. **This table is based on theoretical methodologies outlined herein. Values are for comparative purposes only and are not a substitute for project specific design.**

Available Tools & Services

Presto and Presto's authorized distributors and representatives offer assistance to anyone interested in evaluating, designing, building or purchasing a **Geoweb Load Support System**. You may access these services by calling 800-548-3424 or 920-738-1707. In addition to working directly with you, the following design and construction resources are available for your use with the **Geoweb Load Support System**.

Design	Material and CSI-format Specifications, System Components Guideline, Request for Project Evaluation, AutoCAD® Drawings, SPECMaker® Specification Development Tool, Technical Resources Library CD, videos
Construction	Installation Guidelines, SPECMaker® Specification Development Tool, Technical Resources Library CD, videos

Disclaimer

This document has been prepared for the benefit of customers interested in the **Geoweb Load Support System.** It was reviewed carefully prior to publication. Presto assumes no liability and makes no guarantee or warranty as to its accuracy or completeness. Final determination of the suitability of any information or material for the use contemplated, or for its manner of use, is the sole responsibility of the user. Geosystems®, Geoweb®, ATRA®, and SPECMaker® are registered trademarks of Presto Products Company. AutoCAD® is a registered trademark of AutoDesk. © 2007

References

1. Bathurst, Richard J. and Jarrett, Peter M., *Large-Scale Model Tests of Geocomposite Mattresses over Peat Subgrades*, Transportation Research Record 1188, 1988
2. Christopher, Barry R. and Holtz, Robert D., *Geotextile Engineering Manual*, Course Text, Prepared for Federal Highway Administration, National Highway Institute, Washington, D.C. under Contract DTFH61-80-C-00094
3. Guido, Vito A. and Sotirakis, N. Chirstou, *Bearing Capacity and Settlement Characteristics of Geoweb-Reinforced Earth Slabs*, "Special Topics in Foundations", ASCE 1988 Spring Meeting, Nashville, TN, May 9-11, 1988
4. Jamnejad, G, Kazerani, G., Harvey, R.C. and Clarke, J.D., *Polymer Grid Cell Reinforcement in Pavement Construction*. Proceedings, 2nd International Conference on Bearing Capacity of Roads and Airfields, Plymouth, U.K., Sept. 1986, pp. 537-546
5. Kazerani, G. and Jamnejad, G., *Polymer Grid Cell Reinforcement in Construction of Pavement Structures*, Proceedings, Geosynthetics '87 Conference, New Orleans, LA, Feb. 1987
6. Koerner, Robert M., Designing with Geosynthetics, Prentice-Hall, 1986
7. Mitchell, J. K., Kao, T. C. and Kavazanjian, E., *Analysis of Grid Cell Reinforced Pavement Bases*, Report GL-79-8. Geotechnical Laboratory, U.S. Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station, Vicksburg, MS, July 1979
8. Rea, C. and Mitchell, K., *Sand Reinforcement Using Paper Grid Cells*, Proceedings, Symposium on Earth Reinforcement, ASCE Annual Convention, Pittsburgh, PA, April 27, 1978, pp. 644-663
9. Steward, J. E., Williamson, R. and Mohney, J., *Guidelines for Use of Fabrics in Construction and Maintenance of Low Volume Roads*, U.S. Forest Service, Portland, OR, June 1977
10. Webster, S. L., *Investigation of Beach Sand Trafficability Enhancement Using Sand-Grid Confinement and Membrane Reinforcement Concepts*, Report GL-79-20 (1). U.S. Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station, Vicksburg, MS, Nov. 1979
11. Webster, S. L. and Alford, S. J., *Investigation of Construction Concepts for Pavements Across Soft Ground*, Report S-78-6. Geotechnical Laboratory, U.S. Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station, Vicksburg, MS, July 1978
12. Webster, S. L. and Watkins, J. E., *Investigation of Construction Techniques for Tactical Approach Roads Across Soft Ground*, Report S-77-1. Soils and Pavements Laboratory, U.S. Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station, Vicksburg, MS, Feb. 1977
13. Yoder, E.J. and Witczak, M.W, Principles of Pavement Design, Second Edition, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1975

 COPYRIGHT 2008 – PRESTO PRODUCTS CO.

Gulfstream FLIGHT OPS
Operations Briefing

Pavement Weight Bearing Capacity (ACN/PCN)

05202020
Scope: All Aircraft
Briefing Owner: Flight Operations

The information contained herein is advisory only in nature.

All Aircraft | Pavement Weight Bearing Capacity

Executive Summary

If you have a question regarding Airport Classification Number (ACN) and Pavement Classification Number (PCN), reference the following sources:

- **Mid Cabin Aircraft**: QRH: Supplemental Data
- **GIV & GV**: QRH : Performance -> Landing Planning
- **G450/G550/G650**: Performance Handbook -> Landing Planning
- **GVII-G500/G600** : Operating Manual >Supplemental Data

Once you have established your aircraft classification number, Gulfstream recommends you contact your flight plan provider as well as the appropriate airport authority/manager for an updated accurate advertised Pavement Classification Number as well as the latest assessment of permissible movement areas.

The PCN is calculated using the verbiage "unrestricted operations." While it has obviously a calculation of pavement strength, it also is derived to extend the life of the runway environment. While PCNs are published for repeated use, a one-time event (one takeoff/one landing) should be acceptable with the appropriate authorizations. *Caution must be given as PCN does not usually apply to taxiways or ramps and only within 50 feet of runway centerline*. When ACN/PCN is close, make sure to inquire from the airport manager about all movement areas, paying particular attention to the taxiways and ramp areas due to the runway PCN not always guaranteeing the taxiways.

All Aircraft | Pavement Weight Bearing Capacity

Executive Summary (continued)

Keep in mind that even when obtaining the airport manager's approval for an exemption for operation, stay alert to the fact that the real concern is the weight bearing capability of the ramp and taxiways, as it is undoubtedly lower than the runway surface itself. Even with an exemption, tight turns and prolonged duration on the ramp would not help the situation.

If the airport you are operating into has a small number PCN, it may be prudent to acquire a copy of the engineering runway analysis, as well as an explanation as to why the PCN is valued so low. While the average PCN may be acceptable in many cases, some airport movement areas may contain weaker pavement, and as such a smaller PCN is published.

Your flight plan provider and the airport authority will also be able to help you establish confirmed prior aircraft type operated into and out of that particular airfield and whether operators are using surrounding airports for tech stop purposes to add additional fuel for the departure enabling lighter weights at the lower PCN airfield. Heavier weight aircraft historical value and confirming known design value for the runway from the airport manager will assist in making the decision. If there is any doubt, conservatism should always trump and operation should be avoided.

If you still require assistance, please forward your question via the submit your question in the appropriate aircraft section and our team of pilot advocates will be happy to provide further guidance to your situation.

Gulfstream

All Aircraft | Pavement Weight Bearing Capacity

Background Briefing

This briefing addresses the two most common forms of pavement weight bearing capacity metrics. A brief, top-level overview of weight bearing capacity is discussed. Where to find such data and how to conduct a pavement analysis follows. Additional factors are discussed at the conclusion.


What are the two most common ways to determine pavement weight bearing capacity?

- **Wheel Weight Bearing Limits (commonly used in the United States).**
- **ACN/PCN (ICAO Standard)**

All Aircraft | Pavement Weight Bearing Capacity

WISE

LONESOME PINE (LNP)(KLNP) 3 NE UTC–5(–4DT) N36°59.25′ W82°31.80′ — CINCINNATI
2684 B **FUEL** 100LL, JET A NOTAM FILE LNP — H–9B, 12H, L–26H
RWY 06–24: H5280X100 (ASPH–GRVD) S–42, D–55, 2D–100 MIRL — IAP
0.3% up NE
RWY 06: REIL. PAPI(P2L)—GA 3.0° TCH 34′. Trees.
RWY 24: ODALS (NSTD) REIL. PAPI(P2R)—GA 3.0° TCH 36′. Trees.
AIRPORT REMARKS: Attended Mon–Sat 1400–2300Z‡, unattended Sun. $50 after hrs fee for fuel 276–328–9089. Wildlife on invof arpt. Rwy 06–24—three inch gradual dip starting 2000 ft from thld Rwy 24 continuing for 300 ft. Rwy 24 NSTD ODALS, 5 lgt configuration. ACTIVATE MIRL Rwy 06–24, ODALS Rwy 24 and REIL Rwy 06 and Rwy 24—CTAF.
AIRPORT MANAGER: 276-328-5300
WEATHER DATA SOURCES: AWOS–3 118.6 (276) 328–3727.
COMMUNICATIONS: CTAF/UNICOM 123.0
Ⓡ **INDIANAPOLIS CENTER APP/DEP CON** 126.57
RADIO AIDS TO NAVIGATION: NOTAM FILE DCA.
GLADE SPRING (L) VOR/DME 110.2 GZG Chan 39 N36°49.51′ W82°04.74′ 296° 23.8 NM to fld. 4200/2W. **HIWAS.**
VOR portion unusable:
351°–004° byd 15 NM blo 8,000′
ILS/DME 110.7 I–OWN Chan 44 Rwy 24. LOC/DME unmonitored when arpt unatndd.



CURRENT	NEW	NEW DESCRIPTION
S	S	Single wheel type landing gear (DC3), (C47), (F15), etc.
D	D	Dual wheel type landing gear (BE1900), (B737), (A319), etc.
T	D	Dual wheel type landing gear (P3, C9).
ST	2S	Two single wheels in tandem type landing gear (C130).
TRT	2T	Two triple wheels in tandem type landing gear (C17), etc.
DT	2D	Two dual wheels in tandem type landing gear (B707), etc.
TT	2D	Two dual wheels in tandem type landing gear (B757, KC135).
SBTT	2D/D1	Two dual wheels in tandem/dual wheel body gear type landing gear (KC10).
None	2D/2D1	Two dual wheels in tandem/two dual wheels in tandem body gear type landing gear (A340–600).
DDT	2D/2D2	Two dual wheels in tandem/two dual wheels in double tandem body gear type landing gear (B747, E4).
TTT	3D	Three dual wheels in tandem type landing gear (B777), etc.
TT	D2	Dual wheel gear two struts per side main gear type landing gear (B52).
TDT	C5	Complex dual wheel and quadruple wheel combination landing gear (C5).

FAA Airport/Facility Directory Front Matter


Wheel Weight Bearing Limits


- **FAA Wheel Weight Bearing Limits specify a maximum aircraft weight based on the number of wheels that the aircraft rests upon.**
- **This data is available in the Airport/Facility Directory.**
- **Add “000” to the numerical figure.**
- **It is imperative to emphasize that, per the FAA, this is based on total aircraft weight, *not weight per wheel.***

Gulfstream

All Aircraft | Pavement Weight Bearing Capacity

Graphical Wheel Description (Examples)





All Aircraft | Pavement Weight Bearing Capacity

EAST HAMPTON (HTO)(KHTO) 3 W UTC–5(–4DT) N40°57.57′ W72°15.10′ — NEW YORK COPTER L–33C, 34I IAP

55 B S4 **FUEL** 100LL, JET A TPA—See Remarks NOTAM FILE HTO

RWY 10–28: H4255X100 (ASPH–GRVD) S–60 MIRL 0.6% up W

RWY 10: REIL. PAPI(P2L)—GA 3.3° TCH 49′. Trees.


RWY 28: REIL. PAPI(P2R)—GA 3.0° TCH 54′. Pole.

RWY 16–34: H2060X75 (ASPH) S–8 0.6% up NW

RWY 16: Road.

RWY 34: Trees.

AIRPORT REMARKS: Attended continuously. Deer on and invof arpt. Rwy 16–34 cracked with vegetation growing through, standing water. NS ABTMT procedures in effect ctc arpt management for details at 631–537–1130. TPA—1000, jets—1500. Rwy 10 VGSI and RNAV glidepath not coincident. Ctl twr opr at arpt from May 23 thru Sept 14 (other times by NOTAM.) ACTIVATE MIRL Rwy 10–28, PAPI Rwy 10, PAPI Rwy 28, REIL Rwy 10, REIL Rwy 28—CTAF (PAPI and REIL 7 clicks CTAF). Ldg fee for all tran acft to include touch and go ops.



AIRPORT MANAGER: 631-537-1130

COMMUNICATIONS: CTAF 125.225

HAMPTON RCO 122.1R 113.6T 122.6 (NEW YORK RADIO)

Ⓡ **NEW YORK APP/DEP CON** 125.975 **CLNC DEL** 118.95

TOWER 125.225 (1200–0100Z‡) **GND CON** 121.9

AIRSPACE: CLASS D svc 1200–0100Z‡ other times CLASS G.

RADIO AIDS TO NAVIGATION: NOTAM FILE HTO.

HAMPTON (H) VORTAC 113.6 HTO Chan 83 N40°55.14′ W72°19.00′ 064° 3.8 NM to fld. 22/13W. **HIWAS.**

HIWAS OTS indef

DME portion unusable:

280°–325° byd 35 NM blo 1,700′

325°–355° byd 30 NM blo 2,000′

TACAN AZIMUTH unusable:

280°–325° byd 35 NM blo 1,700′

325°–355° byd 30 NM blo 2,000′

VOR unusable:

055°–100° byd 22 NM

221°–231° blo 6,000′

What if the A/FD only includes information pertaining to a single-wheel gear configuration?

- **Call the airport auhtority. They may have additional information.**
- **Most Gulfstream aircraft have a "Equivalent Single Wheel Loading (ESWL)" table. The G280 may have this information in the near future.**


Performance Handbook Gulfstream G450

G450 Equivalent Single Wheel Loading (ESWL)

OM 06-05-90


Gulfstream

All Aircraft | Pavement Weight Bearing Capacity



ITHACA TOMPKINS RGNL (ITH)(KITH) 3 NE UTC–5(–4DT) N42°29.48′ W76°27.52′
1099 B S4 **FUEL** 100LL, JET A Class I, ARFF Index B NOTAM FILE ITH
RWY 14–32: H6977X150 (ASPH–GRVD) S–100, D–192, 2S–114,
2D–574, 2D/2D2–1044 PCN 58 F/C/W/T HIRL 0.3% up SE
RWY 14: PAPI(P4L)—GA 3.0° TCH 50′.
RWY 32: MALSR. PAPI(P4L)—GA 3.2° TCH 53′. Trees.

FAA Airport/Facility Directory




Credit: Aviation Week

What is PCN?

- **Pavement Classification Number (PCN)**: Single unique number to express the load-carrying capacity of a pavement, without specifying a particular airplane or pavement structure.

- As shown in the graphic, tire pressure also affects the amount of force applied to a given portion of the pavement. This will be addressed later.

All Aircraft | Pavement Weight Bearing Capacity




Credit: Aviation Week

What is PCN (continued)?

- Subgrade strength can be translated into **California Bearing Ratio** (CBR), which is the ICAO-preferred unit.
- It can also be translated into a K-value.
- Many of these terms are present in Gulfstream performance guidance.

Subgrade Strength	CBR Value	K-Value
A	15	150
B	10	80
C	6	40
D	3	20

All Aircraft | Pavement Weight Bearing Capacity



	LB	53000	55000	60000	65000	70000	75000	80000	85000	90000	95000	100000
	KG	24040	24947	27215	29483	31751	34019	36287	38555	40823	43091	45359
Ultra Low (D)	CBR = 3	16.6	17.2	18.8	20.5	22.1	23.7	25.3	26.9	28.5	30.1	31.7
Low (C)	CBR = 6	14.5	15.2	16.8	18.4	20.0	21.7	23.3	24.9	26.5	28.2	29.8
Medium (B)	CBR = 10	13.3	13.9	15.4	16.9	18.4	19.9	21.4	22.9	24.4	25.9	27.4
High (A)	CBR = 15	12.7	13.2	14.6	16.0	17.3	18.7	20.1	21.4	22.8	24.1	25.5


Flexible Pavement, Tire Pressure = 216 PSI — Weight on Mains = 91% at 100,000 LB
Tire Size = H37.5x12.0R19 — Tire Spacing = 22" — Weight on Mains = 96.2% at 53,000 LB

What is ACN?


- **Aircraft Classification Number (ACN)**: Single unique number to express effect of an individual airplane on *different pavements*.

Generally, ACN must be less than or equal to PCN. Exceptions are discussed in the executive summary.

ACN Determination - ICAO 9157



All Aircraft | Pavement Weight Bearing Capacity




Tire Pressure

- **Tire pressure effects effects the amount of contact a wheel has with a surface, thereby affecting how much weight a given amount of pavement is exposed to. Maximum pressure limits are assigned to pavement to ensure that a minimum amount of contact is provided.**
- **The codes and numbers in the graphic to the left are updated to reflect new ICAO standards, whereas the codes/numbers in Gulfstream publications reflect older standards (including a "very low" rating).**
- ***Due to further aircraft weight restrictions when lowering tire pressures, lowering tire pressure is not a recommended method for normal operations to meet a desired PCN and will not be addressed in this briefing.***

Gulfstream

All Aircraft | Pavement Weight Bearing Capacity



Click image to access website

Where can I access PCN/Runway Weight Bearing information for US Airports?

- **The Airport/Facility Directory (A/FD) is a good source for this information.**

All Aircraft | Pavement Weight Bearing Capacity

JEPPESEN
A BOEING COMPANY

AC-U-KWIK®

Where can I find PCN/Runway Weight Bearing information for International Airports?

Examples include:

- **The Jeppesen Airport Directory, much like the FAA A/FD, contains PCN information.**
- **AC-U-KWIK also contains this data.**
- **NOTE: if wheel weight bearing capacity is listed in lieu of PCN for international airports, weights may be *per wheel*, not total aircraft weight (opposite of FAA numbers).**

Gulfstream

All Aircraft | Pavement Weight Bearing Capacity

MID CABIN (G280) EXAMPLE

Quick Reference Handbook — Gulfstream G280

G280 Aircraft Classification Number (ACN)

Aircraft Classification Number (ACN) is a number expressing the relative effect of an aircraft on a pavement for a specified subgrade category. ACN values are calculated for both flexible and rigid pavement. If the aircraft gross weight and runway subgrade strength are known, the ACN value can be determined from the charts on the following pages.

General Data:

Main Tire Size: 26 x 6.6R14
Main Tire Pressure: 203 psi (loaded), 195 psi (unloaded)
Main Gear Wheels Configuration: Dual Wheel
Main Wheel spacing: 375 mm
Percent Load on Gear Legs: See the attached tables. This input varies with the A/C weight, as the Aft C.G. is not constant. This is why the curves showing the ACN versus A/C weight are not linear.

Flexible Pavement - ACN

Aircraft Weight (lb) C.G. Location (%mac) % Reaction on MLG		Subgrade			
		High (CBR 15)	Medium (CBR 10)	Low (CBR 6)	Ultra Low (CBR 3)
Max Ramp Weight	39750 36.7%mac 90.0%	9.6	10.3	11.4	12.3
	38400 40.4% mac 92.0%	9.5	10.1	11.2	12.1
	37200 41.4%mac 92.4%	9.2	9.8	10.8	11.7
	28000 45.6%mac 94.0%	6.7	7.0	7.8	8.7
Min Operating Weight	20300 45.6%mac 94.2%	4.6	4.8	5.2	6.0

REVISION 7
Aug 17/14


SUPPLEMENTAL DATA
Page S- 21

FOR TRAINING PURPOSES ONLY

QRH TAB INDEX | BACK | FORWARD | PAGE UP | PAGE DOWN | CB | EVAC.

Example: Lake Placid, NY

- PCN: 24 F/B/X/T



Credit: Aviation Week

Note that the %MAC is at its rearward extreme, thereby placing the most weight possible on the main gear (92.4%). This is the most limiting condition. All Gulfstream ACNs are determined using this conservative methodology.

Entire weight band acceptable for PCN

Gulfstream

All Aircraft | Pavement Weight Bearing Capacity


LARGE CABIN (G650) EXAMPLE - PCN

CARLSBAD

MC CLELLAN–PALOMAR (CRQ)(KCRQ) 3 SE UTC–8(–7DT) N33°07.70′ W117°16.81′ LOS ANGELES L–4H IAP, AD
331 B S4 **FUEL** 100LL, JET A OX 3, 4 TPA—See Remarks Class I, ARFF Index A
NOTAM FILE CRQ

RWY 06–24: H4897X150 (ASPH–GRVD) S–60, D–80, 2S–102, 2D–110
PCN 33 F/D/X/T HIRL
RWY 06: PAPI(P4L)—GA 3.0° TCH 35′. Thld dsplcd 297′.
RWY 24: MALSR. REIL. PAPI(P4L)—GA 3.2° TCH 54′. Rgt tfc.


RUNWAY DECLARED DISTANCE INFORMATION
RWY 06: TORA–4897 TODA–4897 ASDA–4897 LDA–4600
RWY 24: TORA–4897 TODA–4897 ASDA–4897 LDA–4897



AIRPORT REMARKS: Attended 1500–0600Z‡. Rwy 24 hard to see two hrs prior to SS. Do not mistake S twy as rwy. Extensive bird activity in vicinity especially in spring. P–lines 2 miles W & SW. CLOSED to air carrier ops with more than 9 passenger seats from 0630Z‡ to 1400Z‡ except by PPR call arpt manager 760–431–4646. PPR for all military acft call arpt manager 760–431–4646. TPA—1003(672) helicopters, 1503(1172) small acft, 2003(1672) large acft. Rwy 06–24 south VFR tfc pattern clsd 0600–1500Z‡. No jet acft training due to noise abatement and traffic congestion. Multiple apchs by large acft (including large helicopters) not authorized. All acft multiple practice apch and ldgs discourage 0600–1500Z‡. Voluntary curfew, jets 0600–1500Z‡, props 0800–1400Z‡, emerg, lifeguard and law enforcement excepted. RVR touchdown Rwy 24 avbl. Rwy 24 is calm wind rwy. Arpt has noise abatement procedures ctc arpt manager 760–431–4646. Request jets fly the ILS apch. North side ramp limited to 12,500 lbs. Limited transient tie down space on public ramp. When twr clsd ACTIVATE HIRL Rwy 06–24, PAPI Rwy 06 and Rwy 24, REIL Rwy 24, MALSR Rwy 24—CTAF. U.S. Customs User Fee Arpt, ctc 877–848–7766.
AIRPORT MANAGER: 760-966-3272
WEATHER DATA SOURCES: ASOS (760) 930–0864 LAWRS.
COMMUNICATIONS: CTAF 118.6 **ATIS** 120.15 (760–438–2117)
OCEANSIDE RCO 115.3 T 122.1R (SAN DIEGO RADIO)
Ⓡ **SOCAL APP/DEP CON** 127.3
TOWER 118.6 (1500–0600Z‡) **GND CON** 121.8
CLNC DEL 134.85 For clnc del when ATCT clsd call SOCAL APP (800) 448–3724.
AIRSPACE: CLASS D svc 1500–0600Z‡ other times CLASS G.
RADIO AIDS TO NAVIGATION: NOTAM FILE CRQ.
OCEANSIDE (H) VORTAC 115.3 OCN Chan 100 N33°14.44′ W117°25.06′ 119° 9.7 NM to fld. 52/15E.
VOR portion unusable:
227°–265° byd 20 NM
ILS/DME 108.7 I–CRQ Chan 24 Rwy 24. Unmonitored when ATCT clsd. Autopilot coupled approaches na below 960′ MSL.

Example: Carlsbad, CA

- PCN: 33 F/D/X/T



Credit: Aviation Week

Subgrade Strength	CBR Value	K-Value
D	3	20

Gulfstream


Rev 0.0 | For Reference Only - Not FAA Approved/Use in Conjunction with AFM

All Aircraft | Pavement Weight Bearing Capacity

LARGE CABIN (G650) EXAMPLE - PCN

	LB	53000	55000	60000	65000	70000	75000	80000	85000	90000	95000	100000
	KG	24040	24947	27215	29483	31751	34019	36287	38555	40823	43091	45359
Ultra Low (D)	CBR = 3	16.6	17.2	18.8	20.5	22.1	23.7	25.3	26.9	28.5	30.1	31.7
Low (C)	CBR = 6	14.5	15.2	16.8	18.4	20.0	21.7	23.3	24.9	26.5	28.2	29.8
Medium (B)	CBR = 10	13.3	13.9	15.4	16.9	18.4	19.9	21.4	22.9	24.4	25.9	27.4
High (A)	CBR = 15	12.7	13.2	14.6	16.0	17.3	18.7	20.1	21.4	22.8	24.1	25.5


Flexible Pavement, Tire Pressure = 216 PSI — Weight on Mains = 91% at 100,000 LB
Tire Size = H37.5x12.0R19 — Tire Spacing = 22" — Weight on Mains = 96.2% at 53,000 LB



Entire weight band acceptable for PCN

All Aircraft | Pavement Weight Bearing Capacity

LARGE CABIN (G650) EXAMPLE - PCN



Gulfstream G650 **Performance Handbook**

Aircraft Classification Number (ACN) Charts, ctd... GAC

	LB	53000	55000	60000	65000	70000	75000	80000	85000	90000	95000	100000
	KG	24040	24947	27215	29483	31751	34019	36287	38555	40823	43091	45359
Ultra Low (D)	CBR = 3	16.6	17.2	18.8	20.5	22.1	23.7	25.3	26.9	28.5	30.1	31.7
Low (C)	CBR = 6	14.5	15.2	16.8	18.4	20.0	21.7	23.3	24.9	26.5	28.2	29.8
Medium (B)	CBR = 10	13.3	13.9	15.4	16.9	18.4	19.9	21.4	22.9	24.4	25.9	27.4
High (A)	CBR = 15	12.7	13.2	14.6	16.0	17.3	18.7	20.1	21.4	22.8	24.1	25.5

Flexible Pavement, Tire Pressure = 216 PSI — Weight on Mains = 91% at 100,000 LB
Tire Size = H37.5x12.0R19 — Tire Spacing = 22" — Weight on Mains = 96.2% at 53,000 LB

PERFORMANCE
PC - 12

REVISION 9 (RE-ISSUE)
Oct 22/14

	LB	53000	55000	60000	65000	70000	75000	80000	85000	90000	95000	100000
	KG	24040	24947	27215	29483	31751	34019	36287	38555	40823	43091	45359
Ultra Low (D)	CBR = 3	16.6	17.2	18.8	20.5	22.1	23.7	25.3	26.9	28.5	30.1	31.7
Low (C)	CBR = 6	14.5	15.2	16.8	18.4	20.0	21.7	23.3	24.9	26.5	28.2	29.8
Medium (B)	CBR = 10	13.3	13.9	15.4	16.9	18.4	19.9	21.4	22.9	24.4	25.9	27.4
High (A)	CBR = 15	12.7	13.2	14.6	16.0	17.3	18.7	20.1	21.4	22.8	24.1	25.5

Flexible Pavement, Tire Pressure = 216 PSI — Weight on Mains = 91% at 100,000 LB
Tire Size = H37.5x12.0R19 — Tire Spacing = 22" — Weight on Mains = 96.2% at 53,000 LB


PERFORMANCE
PC - 12

REVISION 9 (RE-ISSUE)
Oct 22/14

- As an alternative to consulting the line graph, the tables provided at the bottom of the page can be used to interpolate and find more accurate values.

All Aircraft | Pavement Weight Bearing Capacity

LARGE CABIN (G550) EXAMPLE - ESWL



VIRGINIA 345

MARION/WYTHEVILLE

MOUNTAIN EMPIRE (MKJ)(KMKJ) 9 NE UTC–5(–4DT) N36°53.69′ W81°21.00′ CINCINNATI
2558 B S4 **FUEL** 100LL, JET A NOTAM FILE MKJ H–9B, 12H, L–26I IAP
RWY 08–26: H5252X75 (ASPH) S-20 MIRL 1.1% up W
RWY 08: REIL. PAPI(P2L)—GA 3.0° TCH 40′. Trees.
RWY 26: REIL. PAPI(P2L)—GA 3.75° TCH 47′. Road.
AIRPORT REMARKS: Attended Apr–Oct Sun 1800–2300Z‡, Nov–May Mon–Sat 1300–2200Z‡, Nov–May Sun 1800–2300z‡, April–Oct Mon–Sat 1300–2300Z‡. After hrs ctc 276–685–1122. Rwy 26 previous markings showing through. Located 9 NM northeast Marion. MIRL Rwy 08–26 preset low ints, ACTIVATE higher ints—CTAF.
AIRPORT MANAGER: 276-783-8805
WEATHER DATA SOURCES: AWOS–3 123.875 (276) 686–6420. AWOS dp unrel.
COMMUNICATIONS: CTAF/UNICOM 122.7
Ⓡ **ATLANTA CENTER APP/DEP CON** 127.85
RADIO AIDS TO NAVIGATION: NOTAM FILE PSK.
PULASKI (H) VORTAC 116.8 PSK Chan 115 N37°05.26′ W80°42.77′ 256° 32.7 NM to fld. 2120/6W. **HIWAS.**
TACAN AZIMUTH & DME unusable:
034°–038° byd 25 NM
135°–175° byd 25 NM blo 10,000′
200°–225° byd 10 NM
284°–286° byd 10 NM blo 10,000′
287°–316° byd 25 NM blo 10,000′
315°–335° byd 10 NM blo 10,000′
334°–039° byd 25 NM blo 10,000′
DME unusable:
250°–350° byd 25 NM blo 10,000′
TACAN AZIMUTH unusable:
052°–100°
234°–283°
SUZZE NDB (MHW/LOM) 335 MK N36°55.21′ W81°14.60′ 260° 5.4 NM to fld. NOTAM FILE MKJ. NDB unmonitored when arpt unatndd.
LOC 110.5 I–MKJ Rwy 26. LOM SUZZE NDB. LOC unmonitored when arpt unatndd. LOC unusable byd 15° left of course.
COMM/NAV/WEATHER REMARKS: AWOS dewpoint unreliable.

(55,000lbs) x (0.9)x(0.5)/(1.25) =

19,800lbs Equivalent Single Wheel Loading

Example: Mountain Empire, VA

- FAA Wheel Weight Bearing Limit: S-20
- Landing weight: 55,000lbs.

Performance Handbook Gulfstream G550

Equivalent Single Wheel Loading (ESWL) GV-GER-1212

1. **Introduction:**

   One consideration in operating Gulfstream aircraft is the strength of runway and taxiway pavements in relation to aircraft operating weight. This can limit operational weights in some airports. One common method of evaluating an aircraft for a given runway is the Equivalent Single Wheel Loading (ESWL). ESWL accounts for the extra tire flotation for multi-wheel landing gear struts such as the dual wheel struts used on the Gulfstream aircraft. This section provides information on how to compute ESWL for the G550 and G500 airplanes.

2. **G550 and G500 Main Landing Gear Parameters:**

Max Ramp Weight (pounds)	MLG Tire Size (inches)	Tire Spacing (inches)	Max Tire Pressure (psi)	Reduction Factor -	Maximum ESWL (pounds)
91,400	35 X 11.0	18.5	198	1.25	32,904

   The reduction factor in the table above assumes a rigid pavement with a radius of equivalent stiffness of 40 inches, roughly equivalent to a 13.5 inch thick concrete slab. Thinner pavements would give higher reduction factors, so the factors presented are conservative.

3. **ESWL Computation for Lower Operating Weights:**

   ESWL can be computed for lower operating weights as follows:
   ESWL = (Gross Weight) x (0.9) x (0.5) / (Reduction Factor)

Gulfstream

Gulfstream FLIGHT OPS

Operations Briefing

GRI
9750 SW Nimbus Avenue
Beaverton, OR 97008-7172
p | 503-641-3478 f | 503-644-8034

September 16, 2019

Century West Engineering Corporation
5331 SW Macadam Avenue, Suite 287
Portland, OR 97239

Attention: James Kirby, PE
Senior Project Manager

SUBJECT: Pavement Classification Number (PCN) Evaluation of Runway 17-35
Aurora State Airport (UAO)
Aurora, Oregon

As requested, GRI conducted a pavement evaluation at Aurora State Airport (UAO) in support of the Oregon Department of Aviation (ODA) to develop a pavement classification number (PCN) for Runway 17-35.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Our work included review of relevant ODA records for Runway 17-35, falling weight deflectometer (FWD) testing, core explorations, and engineering analyses in accordance with Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Advisory Circular 150/5335-5C, *Standardized Method of Reporting Airport Pavement Strength – PCN*. According to the FAA, the PCN is a number that expresses the load-carrying capacity of a pavement for unrestricted operations. We determined the PCN using the Technical Evaluation Method specified in Advisory Circular 150/5335-5C.

BACKGROUND

Based on information provided in the ODA pavement evaluation/maintenance management program report prepared by Pavement Consultant Inc. in 2018, a 4,100-ft-long segment on the north end of the runway was first constructed in 1943 and in 1993, a 900-ft-long extension was built to the south. The last major rehabilitation on the runway was conducted in 2005 and generally consisted of a 2- to 3-in. overlay.

The current Airport Master Record, FAA Form 5010, lists the gross weight limit for a single-wheel, main-gear aircraft and a dual-wheel, main-gear aircraft at 30,000 and 45,000 lbs, respectively. UAO currently does not have an established PCN.

FIELD WORK

Site Reconnaissance

A visual pavement reconnaissance was performed by GRI engineers on August 12, 2019, to assess the general surface condition of the pavements within the project and to identify core exploration locations.

Falling Weight Deflectometer Tests

GRI conducted FWD testing on August 20, 2019, along the full length of the runway. The testing was conducted in accordance with FAA Advisory Circular 150/5370-11b, *Use of Nondestructive Testing in the Evaluation of Airport Pavements,* using our KUAB 2m Model 150 FWD device.

FWD testing was completed along test lines located at 7 ft west and 12 ft east of the runway centerline. The tests were spaced at approximately 200-ft intervals within the runway keel section. The approximate locations of the test lines are shown on Figure 1.

The FWD test procedures are described in Appendix A. The data were normalized to a 30,000-lb load basis and the FWD deflection data are shown in Table 1A.

We also reviewed the load-response data measured by the FWD to provide a preliminary understanding of the overall stiffness of the pavement structure. Although this information does not provide information about the stiffness of individual soil and pavement layers, it does provide a quick assessment of the overall stiffness of the pavement system to gauge the variability of pavement stiffness within a particular pavement facility. Impact stiffness modulus (ISM) is inversely proportional to deflection and is therefore a direct measurement of the combined stiffness, or resistance to deflection induced by FWD loading, of the pavement and subgrade soils. As such, it is usually a relative measure of the pavement's ability to support loads, i.e., high ISM modulus values usually correspond to high pavement strength and vice versa. The profile of relative pavement strength along the two FWD test lines, as measured by resistance to deflection under FWD loading, is plotted for each FWD test location on Figure 4A. Additional discussion regarding ISM is provided in Appendix A.

Coring Explorations

General. On August 20, 2019, GRI conducted three core explorations, all of which were located over cracks. The approximate locations of the explorations are shown on the Site Plan, Figure 1. Details of our field investigations are further discussed in Appendix A of this report and the core explorations are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1: SUMMARY OF CORING EXPLORATION RESULTS

Core No.	FWD Test No.	Test Line	Station	Asphalt Concrete Thickness, in.	Aggregate Base Thickness, in.	Drilled Over a Crack?	Depth of Crack, in.
B-1	26	7 ft west	56+81	8.75	15.00	Yes	2.50
B-2	16	7 ft west	39+51	9.00	15.00	Yes	3.25
B-3	32	12 ft east	19+41	9.00	15.00	Yes	2.50

Existing Pavement Conditions

Overall, the pavement surface of Runway 17-35 appears to be in good condition. The primary distresses observed on the runway are low- to medium-severity longitudinal cracking, primarily at paving-panel joints or along the centerline; low-severity weathering; and isolated low-severity alligator cracking within the gear paths.

Since the alligator cracking within the gear paths (noted above) is a load-associated distress, in our opinion, it warranted further investigation and we therefore conducted the three core explorations in areas of alligator cracking on the runway. As shown in Table 1 and the photo logs on Figures 1A through 3A in Appendix A, the cracking is top down and extends to a depth of 2.5 in. in cores B-1 and B-3 and to a depth of 3.25 in. in B-2. These types of cracks may be induced by excessive shear stresses imposed by aircraft wheel loads at the runway surface and can typically be repaired by milling to the depth of cracking and overlaying. In our opinion, pavement exhibiting this type of distress should be rehabilitated when the cracking progresses to the point that spalling begins to occur and therefore represents a significant Foreign Object Damage (FOD) potential. The core samples also exhibit delamination (separation of asphalt concrete [AC] layers) at a depth of 2.5 and 3.25 in. in cores B-2 and B-3, respectively. The depth of delamination generally agrees with the thickness of the 2005 overlay.

DESIGN PROCEDURES AND ANALYSIS

Traffic Loading

Century West Engineering Corporation (CWE) provided an estimate of the aircraft traffic-volume data consisting of the number of operations (i.e., either an arrival or departure) for Runway 17-35 in 2018 from the FAA Traffic Flow Management System Counts (TFMSC). Our traffic-loading estimate is based on an annual growth rate of 1.58% per year, which is based on the aviation forecasts provided in the current master plan for UAO (WHPacific, 2012).

The COMFAA 3.0 software used to compute the PCN has inputs for each aircraft type (in the mix), which include the type of aircraft, gross weight, and number of annual departures over a 20-year period. The program does not take into account the annual growth rate, so we calculated the total departures from 2020 to 2040 to determine the equivalent annual number of departures for the analysis. The aircraft mix and annual number of departures we input into COMFAA are provided in Table 2.

Table 2: RUNWAY 17-35: AIRCRAFT TYPES AND DEPARTURE VOLUMES

Aircraft Type	Maximum Takeoff Weight, lbs	Design Aircraft for COMFAA	2018 Annual Operations	2040 Annual Operations	Values Entered into COMFAA	
					Equivalent Airplane	Annual # of Departures
Bombardier Global Express	92,500	Gulfstream G-V	50	61	Gulfstream G-V	64
Gulfstream G600	91,600	Gulfstream G-V	2	3		
Gulfstream V	76,850	Gulfstream G-IV	2	3	Gulfstream G-IV	7
Gulfstream IV	73,200	Gulfstream G-IV	2	3		
Dassault Falcon 900	45,503	Falcon-900	68	83	Falcon-900	83
Bombardier Challenger 600	45,100	Challenger CL-604	58	70	Challenger CL-604	176
Bombardier Challenger 300	38,850	Challenger CL-604	88	106		
Dassault Falcon 2000	41,000	Falcon-2000	34	42	Falcon-2000	42
Dassault Falcon 50	37,480	Falcon-50	276	332	Falcon-50	424
Dassault Falcon 20	28,650	Falcon-50	76	92		
Cessna Citation 750	36,600	Citation X	104	126	Citation X	292

Aircraft Type	Maximum Takeoff Weight, lbs	Design Aircraft for COMFAA	2018 Annual Operations	2040 Annual Operations	Values Entered into COMFAA	
					Equivalent Airplane	Annual # of Departures
Cessna Citation 680	30,775	Citation X	138	167		
Hawker 800	28,000	Hawker-800	34	42	Hawker-800	42
Gulfstream G150	26,100	D-35	80	97	D-35	97
Astra 1125	24,650	D-30	96	117	D-30	117
Cessna Citation 650	22,000	Citation VI/VII	98	119	Citation VI/VII	119
Learjet 60	23,500	Learjet-55	30	36		
Learjet 55	21,500	Learjet-55	4	6	Learjet-55	57
Learjet 75	21,500	Learjet-55	12	15		
Learjet 45	20,500	Learjet-35A/65A	110	133		
Learjet 35	18,000	Learjet-35A/65A	8	10	Learjet-35A/65A	254
Learjet 31	15,500	Learjet-35A/65A	92	111		
Cessna Citation 560	20,000	Citation 550B	704	847	Citation 550B	1,102
Cessna Citation 550	13,300	Citation 550B	212	255		
Phenom 300/ Embraer 300	17,968	D-25	56	68	D-25	68
		Total Operations:	**2,434**			**2,944**

Backcalculation Analysis of FWD Test Data

The elastic moduli of the subgrade soil at the boring locations were backcalculated from the FWD test data. The average minus-one standard deviation subgrade moduli for each analysis unit (design modulus) are shown at the bottom of the backcalculation analysis results in Table 2A in Appendix A.


PAVEMENT CLASSIFICATION NUMBER (PCN) CALCULATIONS

As requested by the ODA, we calculated the PCN for Runway 17-35 for each aircraft in the fleet mix based on the critical pavement-layer thickness and subgrade-support characteristics developed herein. The California bearing ratio (CBR) used in the PCN analysis is based on the backcalculated design modulus from Analysis Unit 2 in Table 2A in Appendix A and was calculated using the typical correlation between CBR and Resilient Modulus (M_r) and the correlation adopted by the FAA in Advisory Circular 150/5320-6F, *Airport Pavement Design and Evaluation*, which is represented by the following:

$$CBR = M_r / 1{,}500$$

The analysis was conducted using the FAA's Support Spreadsheet, COMFAA 3.0. The pavement-layer thicknesses were converted into an equivalent pavement section using the appropriate subgrade-support code and the default values for the conversion factors given in Advisory Circular 150/5335-5C. Based on our analysis, the equivalent pavement section is also shown on the following figure.

EQUIVALENT PAVEMENT SECTION FOR RUNWAY 17-35



Results of the PCN computations summarized in Table 3 are based on the departure traffic provided by CWE. For Runway 17-35, we recommend publishing the PCN value shown in Table 3. The corresponding PCN elements of the runway are summarized in Form 5010 (Table 1B) in Appendix B.

Table 3: RECOMMENDED UPDATES TO FAA FORM 5010 FOR UAO RUNWAY 17-35

		Aircraft Gross Weight, thousands lbs	
Runway	**PCN**	**Single Wheel Main Gear**	**Dual Wheel Main Gear**
17-35	40/F/C/X/T	102	145

Our recommended single-wheel, main-gear and dual-wheel, main-gear aircraft gross weights are 102,000 and 143,000 lbs, respectively. The increase in wheel-load capacity (as compared to the current Airport Master Record, FAA Form 5010) is likely due to the increased structural capacity related to the 2005 overlay. Additional discussion regarding the PCN methodology and reporting is provided in Appendix B.

LIMITATIONS

This pavement report has been prepared for use by the Oregon Department of Aviation and Century West Engineering Corporation and should not be relied upon by any other entity without the written permission of an authorized representative. The scope is limited to the specific project and location described herein, and our description of the project represents our understanding of the significant aspects of the project relevant to the analysis of the pavements at the time of publication.

PCN system is only intended as a method that airport operators can use to evaluate acceptable operations of aircraft. It is not intended as a pavement design or pavement evaluation procedure, nor does it restrict or replace the methodology used to design or evaluate a pavement structure.


Our work has been performed in a manner consistent with the level of care and skill ordinarily exercised by members of the profession currently practicing under similar conditions in the locale. The results and conclusions submitted in this report are based on the data obtained from our sources of information discussed in this report. No other warranty, expressed or implied, is made.

Please contact the undersigned if you have any questions regarding this report or any other pavement considerations associated with this project.

Submitted for GRI,



Renews 12/2020



Michael J. Maloney, PE
Principal


Lindsi A. Hammond, PE
Associate

This document has been submitted electronically.

References

WHPacific, Inc., 2012, Aurora State Airport, Airport Master Plan Update.

Pavement Consultants Inc., 2018, 2018 Pavement Evaluation / Maintenance Management Program: Aurora State Airport.



PAVEMENT CORE COMPLETED BY GRI
(AUGUST 20, 2019)

FWD TESTING COMPLETED BY GRI
(AUGUST 20, 2019)

SITE PLAN FROM GOOGLE EARTH (IMAGE DATE JULY 2018)

North

0 600 1,200 FT

GRI

CENTURY WEST ENGINEERING CORPORATION
AURORA STATE AIRPORT – RUNWAY 17-35 PCN EVALUATION

SITE PLAN

SEP. 2019 JOB NO. 6289 FIG. 1

APPENDIX A

Field Explorations and FWD Data

APPENDIX A

FIELD EXPLORATIONS AND FWD DATA

FIELD EXPLORATIONS

Existing pavement and subsurface conditions on Runway 17-35 were investigated by GRI on August 20, 2019, with three core explorations, designated B-1 through B-3. The approximate locations of the explorations are shown on the Site Plan, Figure 1. The field exploration and laboratory programs completed for this project are described below.

Pavement Core Explorations

The pavement was cored at each exploration location to assist in evaluation of the type of cracking and/or the thickness and condition of the asphalt concrete (AC). The pavement was cored using an electric drill owned and operated by GRI. Photographs of the core locations and core samples are shown on Figures 1A through 3A. Below the AC, we excavated to a maximum total depth of 24 in. below ground surface to observe the condition of the aggregate base (AB) and subgrade, if encountered. The subgrade was not encountered during our explorations and the AB was classified as silty sandy gravel ranging from angular to rounded and up to 1 to 1.5 in. in diameter.

FWD DATA

Falling weight deflectometer (FWD) tests were conducted by GRI on August 20, 2019, using our KUAB Model 150 FWD. The annual reference calibration for the FWD was accomplished in October 2019 at the KUAB manufacturing facility in Savoy, Illinois.

The FWD testing on Runway 17-35 was accomplished along test lines located at 7 ft west and 12 ft east of the runway centerline. The tests were completed at approximately 200-ft intervals within the keel section of the runway.

General

Geodetic coordinates of all test locations were measured from GPS signal using a submeter-capable Trimble™ GPS receiver with the antenna mounted on the FWD above the load plate.

The FWD load is generated by a two-mass/two-buffer, falling-weight system that produces a nearly haversine-shaped load-pulse waveform. The buffer and weight combination used for these tests produces a load rise time of approximately 14 milliseconds with an equivalent haversine frequency of approximately 32 Hz. The load pulse was applied to the pavement surface through a 450-mm-diameter (8.86-in.-radius), four-part, segmented plate designed to apply uniform surface pressure distribution despite irregularities in the pavement surface. Air temperature and pavement surface temperature (the latter measured by infrared thermometer) were recorded for each test.

Test Data

The average deflections from the two nominal 32,000-lb impact loads were linearly normalized to a 30-kip (30,000-lb) load basis and are tabulated in Table 1A of this appendix. The measurement units for the test

data are distance in feet, deflections in mil units (1 mil = 0.001 in.), load in pounds, sensor distance in inches, load plate radius in inches, and temperature in degrees Fahrenheit.

Impact Stiffness Modulus (ISM)

The Impact Stiffness Modulus (ISM) shown in units of kips per square inch (ksi) is the composite stiffness, or dynamic plate bearing modulus, of all the materials beneath the pavement/roadway surface. It is computed using the Boussinesq formula for surface deflection beneath the center of a uniformly loaded circular area on a linear-elastic half space, with a Poisson's ratio of 0.50. The surface deflection measured at the center of the FWD load plate (D0) was used to compute the surface modulus. The magnitude of the ISM is inversely proportional to deflection and comparable to the elastic modulus. The difference between the pavement ISM and elastic modulus is that the elastic modulus represents the elastic load-deformation response of an individual pavement layer or the subgrade soil, whereas the pavement ISM represents the composite elastic load-deformation response of all materials (pavement layers and subgrade soil) below the pavement surface. Therefore, the ISM (as computed from the deflection measured beneath the FWD load plate) cannot be taken as representative of the elastic modulus of any single pavement layer or the subgrade soil. However, since it is a measurement of the combined stiffness of the pavement structure and subgrade soil, it is often useful for evaluation of variation in pavement stiffness and for assessment of relative pavement strength. Plots of the ISMs are shown on Figure 4A.

Table 1A - FWD NORMALIZED DEFLECTION TEST DATA
RUNWAY 17-35: AURORA STATE AIRPORT (UAO)

Test Section: RW 17-35
Start Point: North edge of runway, 10+00
Test Date: 8/20/2019
Test File: 6289-Aurora Airport.fwd
Load Plate Radius, in: 8.86
Sensor Distance, in: 0 12 18 24 36 48 60 72

Deflections Normalized to 30000 lbf Basis

Test No.	Test Station	Test Line	Core	D 1, mils	D 2, mils	D 3, mils	D 4, mils	D 5, mils	D 6, mils	D 7, mils	D 8, mils	Surface Temp., °F	Time	Surface Modulus, Ksi	ISM, kips/in	Comments
1	10+50	7' w		28.54	24.85	21.17	18.56	13.73	10.05	7.37	5.54	68	1:24:59	57	1,051	7' west
2	12+50	7' w		25.28	20.28	16.82	14.62	10.56	7.81	5.80	4.50	71	1:26:36	64	1,187	
3	14+49	7' w		30.42	25.52	21.55	18.73	13.50	9.84	7.24	5.55	71	1:27:52	53	986	
4	16+51	7' w		29.35	24.82	20.94	18.25	13.29	9.74	7.15	5.47	71	1:29:09	55	1,022	
5	18+50	7' w		24.65	20.46	17.12	14.81	10.62	7.71	5.71	4.47	71	1:30:14	66	1,217	
6	20+56	7' w		27.93	22.60	18.54	15.81	11.05	7.98	5.87	4.66	71	1:31:20	58	1,074	
7	22+50	7' w		25.72	21.22	17.71	15.34	11.10	8.13	6.06	4.70	71	1:32:26	63	1,166	
8	24+51	7' w		26.54	21.58	17.98	15.18	10.67	7.71	5.71	4.47	71	1:33:33	61	1,130	
9	26+53	7' w		26.28	20.74	17.15	14.64	10.47	7.67	5.83	4.64	70	1:34:39	62	1,142	
10	28+55	7' w		26.82	22.10	18.49	15.98	11.58	8.49	6.34	4.95	71	1:35:42	60	1,119	
11	30+54	7' w		26.27	21.60	18.22	15.84	11.70	8.66	6.45	4.96	71	1:37:01	62	1,142	
12	32+54	7' w		30.95	25.88	21.81	19.07	13.97	10.26	7.67	5.78	71	1:38:07	52	969	
13	34+52	7' w		36.96	27.64	22.18	18.81	13.26	9.67	7.12	5.56	71	1:39:22	44	812	
14	36+57	7' w		32.41	26.67	22.42	19.26	13.87	10.02	7.26	5.44	70	1:40:28	50	926	
15	38+52	7' w		28.76	23.55	19.60	16.84	12.06	8.67	6.34	4.88	70	1:41:38	56	1,043	
16	39+51	7' w	B-2	34.09	27.13	22.55	19.48	14.13	10.46	7.65	5.72	70	1:43:21	47	880	B-2
17	40+51	7' w		27.27	22.43	18.67	16.13	11.60	8.44	6.11	4.75	70	1:44:29	59	1,100	
18	42+51	7' w		31.58	25.74	21.56	18.44	13.11	9.35	6.80	5.10	70	1:45:38	51	950	
19	44+51	7' w		29.21	23.02	18.77	15.98	11.24	7.90	5.76	4.52	70	1:46:46	55	1,027	
20	46+50	7' w		29.41	23.54	19.35	16.44	11.40	7.92	5.78	4.50	70	1:47:53	55	1,020	
21	48+52	7' w		28.25	23.01	19.08	16.26	11.38	8.17	6.06	4.66	70	1:49:02	57	1,062	
22	50+52	7' w		39.77	29.04	22.94	19.04	12.53	8.69	6.21	4.86	70	1:50:10	41	754	
23	52+50	7' w		34.37	27.28	22.48	18.86	12.83	8.94	6.47	5.08	70	1:51:20	47	873	
24	54+51	7' w		44.23	34.59	27.53	22.75	14.74	9.70	6.77	5.20	69	1:52:33	37	678	
25	56+40	7' w		37.32	28.83	22.75	18.62	11.88	7.81	5.61	4.42	67	1:53:49	43	804	
26	56+81	7' w	B-1	35.88	28.79	23.20	19.31	12.57	8.38	5.79	4.55	70	1:55:03	45	836	B-1
27	58+50	7' w		35.45	27.78	22.05	18.05	11.74	7.82	5.60	4.34	65	1:56:22	46	846	5875=s end end 7' west
28	11+50	12' e		25.22	21.35	18.22	15.93	11.88	8.90	6.66	5.09	68	2:05:27	64	1,190	12' east
29	13+50	12' e		30.01	25.29	21.29	18.67	13.66	10.11	7.43	5.70	70	2:07:03	54	1,000	
30	15+51	12' e		30.03	25.22	21.26	18.42	13.46	9.89	7.28	5.64	70	2:08:15	54	999	
31	17+53	12' e		28.42	22.94	19.00	16.27	11.53	8.38	6.20	4.83	70	2:09:28	57	1,056	
32	19+41	12' e	B-3	34.02	25.85	20.87	17.26	11.79	8.33	6.13	4.74	70	2:13:56	48	882	B-3
33	21+50	12' e		21.06	17.31	14.42	12.49	9.07	6.79	5.19	4.17	70	2:16:05	77	1,425	
34	23+52	12' e		25.55	21.01	17.53	15.14	11.13	8.27	6.23	4.95	70	2:17:18	63	1,174	
35	25+52	12' e		21.98	17.91	15.02	13.04	9.69	7.31	5.60	4.43	69	2:18:26	74	1,365	
36	27+51	12' e		26.27	20.79	16.87	14.33	10.21	7.48	5.62	4.44	69	2:19:33	62	1,142	
37	29+50	12' e		34.66	28.16	23.24	19.76	13.95	10.10	7.48	5.79	69	2:20:42	47	866	

Table 1A - FWD NORMALIZED DEFLECTION TEST DATA
RUNWAY 17-35: AURORA STATE AIRPORT (UAO)

Deflections Normalized to 30000 lbf Basis

Test No.	Test Station	Test Line	Core	D 1, mils	D 2, mils	D 3, mils	D 4, mils	D 5, mils	D 6, mils	D 7, mils	D 8, mils	Surface Temp., °F	Time	Surface Modulus, Ksi	ISM, kips/in	Comments
38	31+52	12' e		27.24	22.35	18.84	16.39	12.19	9.20	6.99	5.47	69	2:21:52	59	1,101	
39	33+49	12' e		26.34	21.87	18.38	15.90	11.64	8.78	6.71	5.25	69	2:23:00	61	1,139	
40	35+53	12' e		24.64	20.22	16.91	14.67	10.73	8.01	6.08	4.83	69	2:24:09	66	1,218	
41	37+51	12' e		29.65	24.86	20.96	18.32	13.45	9.99	7.38	5.60	69	2:25:16	55	1,012	
42	39+50	12' e		25.27	21.38	17.99	15.86	11.68	8.77	6.56	5.13	69	2:26:26	64	1,187	
43	41+51	12' e		25.80	21.67	18.35	15.90	11.67	8.62	6.43	4.94	69	2:27:34	63	1,163	
44	43+50	12' e		27.58	23.19	19.57	17.18	12.51	9.22	6.76	5.14	69	2:28:38	59	1,088	
45	45+51	12' e		26.22	21.41	17.71	15.13	10.72	7.77	5.72	4.51	69	2:29:48	62	1,144	
46	47+54	12' e		28.02	22.49	18.48	15.60	10.83	7.75	5.68	4.46	69	2:30:56	58	1,071	
47	49+51	12' e		27.34	22.44	18.36	15.67	11.04	7.94	5.90	4.62	69	2:32:04	59	1,097	
48	51+53	12' e		30.35	24.69	20.12	17.00	11.60	8.11	5.96	4.66	69	2:33:11	53	988	
49	53+55	12' e		31.95	26.02	21.17	17.69	11.99	8.46	6.17	4.85	69	2:34:18	51	939	
50	55+50	12' e		36.26	28.03	22.28	18.48	12.16	8.34	6.04	4.75	69	2:35:31	45	827	
51	57+51	12' e		32.67	26.40	21.38	17.62	11.50	7.75	5.50	4.31	67	2:36:47	49	918	5878=s end end 12' east

Table 2A - BACKCALCULATION ANALYSIS SUMMARY
RUNWAY 17-35: AURORA STATE AIRPORT (UAO)

Runway 17-35: Aurora State Airport (UAO)
Based on FWD Testing Conducted: 8/20/2019
Start Station: North edge of runway, 10+00

FWD Test #	Test Station	Test Line	Core Exploration	Analysis Unit	D0, mils	AC Thickness, inches	AB Thickness, inches	Subgrade Modulus, psi
1	10+50	7' w		1	28.54	9.00	15.00	10,402
2	12+50	7' w		1	25.28	9.00	15.00	15,441
3	14+49	7' w		1	30.42	9.00	15.00	11,553
4	16+51	7' w		1	29.35	9.00	15.00	11,570
5	18+50	7' w		1	24.65	9.00	15.00	12,902
6	20+56	7' w		1	27.93	9.00	15.00	11,768
7	22+50	7' w		1	25.72	9.00	15.00	14,630
8	24+51	7' w		1	26.54	9.00	15.00	12,567
9	26+53	7' w		1	26.28	9.00	15.00	15,004
10	28+55	7' w		1	26.82	9.00	15.00	14,486
11	30+54	7' w		1	26.27	9.00	15.00	13,228
12	32+54	7' w		1	30.95	9.00	15.00	10,155
13	34+52	7' w		1	36.96	9.00	15.00	9,847
14	36+57	7' w		1	32.41	9.00	15.00	10,365
15	38+52	7' w		1	28.76	9.00	15.00	10,556
16	39+51	7' w	B-2	1	34.09	9.00	15.00	9,726
17	40+51	7' w		1	27.27	9.00	15.00	10,489
18	42+51	7' w		1	31.58	9.00	15.00	11,108
19	44+51	7' w		1	29.21	9.00	15.00	11,314
20	46+50	7' w		1	29.41	9.00	15.00	11,087
21	48+52	7' w		1	28.25	9.00	15.00	14,129
22	50+52	7' w		2	39.77	8.75	15.00	8,814
23	52+50	7' w		2	34.37	8.75	15.00	9,367
24	54+51	7' w		2	44.23	8.75	15.00	6,713
25	56+40	7' w		2	37.32	8.75	15.00	9,796
26	56+81	7' w	B-1	2	35.88	8.75	15.00	7,615
27	58+50	7' w		2	35.45	8.75	15.00	9,512
28	11+50	12' e		1	25.22	9.00	15.00	12,541
29	13+50	12' e		1	30.01	9.00	15.00	11,399
30	15+51	12' e		1	30.03	9.00	15.00	9,781
31	17+53	12' e		1	28.42	9.00	15.00	11,645
32	19+41	12' e	B-3	1	34.02	9.00	15.00	10,977
33	21+50	12' e		1	21.06	9.00	15.00	17,720
34	23+52	12' e		1	25.55	9.00	15.00	13,364
35	25+52	12' e		1	21.98	9.00	15.00	14,811
36	27+51	12' e		1	26.27	9.00	15.00	14,236
37	29+50	12' e		1	34.66	9.00	15.00	11,837
38	31+52	12' e		1	27.24	9.00	15.00	10,942
39	33+49	12' e		1	26.34	9.00	15.00	11,421
40	35+53	12' e		1	24.64	9.00	15.00	14,477
41	37+51	12' e		1	29.65	9.00	15.00	10,835
42	39+50	12' e		1	25.27	9.00	15.00	11,501
43	41+51	12' e		1	25.80	9.00	15.00	13,236
44	43+50	12' e		1	27.58	9.00	15.00	11,913

Table 2A - BACKCALCULATION ANALYSIS SUMMARY
RUNWAY 17-35: AURORA STATE AIRPORT (UAO)

FWD Test #	Test Station	Test Line	Core Exploration	Analysis Unit	D0, mils	AC Thickness, inches	AB Thickness, inches	Subgrade Modulus, psi
45	45+51	12' e		1	26.22	9.00	15.00	12,250
46	47+54	12' e		1	28.02	9.00	15.00	11,825
47	49+51	12' e		1	27.34	9.00	15.00	12,606
48	51+53	12' e		2	30.35	8.75	15.00	11,238
49	53+55	12' e		2	31.95	8.75	15.00	10,326
50	55+50	12' e		2	36.26	8.75	15.00	9,761
51	57+51	12' e		2	32.67	8.75	15.00	9,341

Statistical Summary

Structural Unit#	From Sta	To Sta	PAVER PMP Unit	Average D0, mils	Average AC Thickness, in.	Average AB Thickness, in.	Average Subgrade Modulus, psi
1	0+00	49+51	R17AU-01	28.10	9.00	15.00	12,235
2	0+00	58+50	R17AU-02	35.83	8.75	15.00	9,248

Design Subgrade Resilient Modulus

Structural Unit #	From	To	PAVER PMP Unit	Average Subgrade Modulus, psi	Standard Deviation, psi	Average Subgrade – Standard Deviation, psi	CBR, Mr (psi)/1500
1	10+50	49+51	R17AU-01	12,235	1,800	10,435	7
2	50+52	58+50	R17AU-02	9,248	1,294	7,955	5



Core B-1 (RW 17-35 8′ West of Centerline, Station 56+81, FWD 26)




B-1 (Pavement Core Sample, 8.75 in.)

GRI

PAVEMENT CORE PHOTOGRAPHS



Core B-2 (RW 17-35 8′ West of Centerline, Station 39+51, FWD 16)



B-2 (Pavement Core Sample, 9.0 in.)

GRI

PAVEMENT CORE PHOTOGRAPHS

SEP. 2019 JOB NO. 6289 FIG. 2A



Core B-3 (RW 17-35 12′ East of Centerline, Station 19+41, FWD 32)




B-3 (Pavement Core Sample, 9.0 in.)

GRI

PAVEMENT CORE PHOTOGRAPHS

SEP. 2019 JOB NO. 6289 FIG. 3A



GRI

IMPULSE STIFFNESS MODULUS

SEP. 2019 JOB NO. 6289 FIG. 4A

APPENDIX B

Pavement Classification Number Analysis

APPENDIX B

PAVEMENT CLASSIFICATION NUMBER ANALYSIS

BACKGROUND

In 2014, the FAA instituted a requirement that Part 139-certified airports be assigned pavement classification number (PCN) data. The PCN is required because the United States is a member state of the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO), the international regulatory body for air traffic. ICAO adopted the Aircraft Classification Number (ACN)-Pavement Classification Number (ACN-PCN) method to allow any airport a standardized method for reporting the effect of aircraft that use the facility, as well as the load-carrying capacity of the pavement (ICAO, 1999).

The ACN is a number that expresses the relative effect of an aircraft at a given configuration on a pavement structure for a specified standard subgrade strength. Conversely, the PCN is defined as a number that expresses the load-carrying capacity of a pavement for unrestricted operations. Therefore, the ACN-PCN system is structured so that a pavement with a particular PCN value can support unlimited repetitions of an aircraft that has an ACN equal to or less than the pavement's PCN value.

In the ACN/PCN method, the PCN, pavement type, subgrade strength category, tire pressure category, and evaluation method are all reported together. A code system has been implemented to allow an abbreviated presentation of the necessary information. The pavement type is abbreviated "R" for rigid (portland cement concrete [PCC]) and "F" for flexible (AC) pavements. Four subgrade categories, A, B, C, and D, indicate high, medium, low, and ultra-low subgrade strengths, respectively. The four tire-pressure categories, W, X, Y, and Z, indicate high, medium, low, and very low tire pressures, respectively. The evaluation methods are T for a technical evaluation and U for an evaluation based on the type and weight of the aircraft that commonly use the airfield. For example, the PCN code 90/F/C/W/T indicates that the PCN number is 90, that the pavement is flexible, that there is a low-strength subgrade, that high-pressure tires are allowed, and that a technical evaluation was performed to determine the PCN rating.

METHODOLOGY

As noted above, the pavement strength evaluation was accomplished in accordance with the Technical Method described in Advisory Circular 150/5335-5C. To complete the analysis, the following information was used for Runway 17-35:

> **Aircraft Traffic Volume:** The traffic volume estimate was provided by Century West Engineering Corporation in terms of operations for Runway 17-35. The COMFAA 3.0 program includes a library of standard aircraft types, and we used the default gear weight for each aircraft in the aircraft fleet mix.
>
> **Pavement Structure:** As noted earlier herein, the pavement thickness and subgrade support characteristics were estimated based on the FWD backcalculation results and core explorations.

The results of our PCN analysis are summarized in Form 5010 – Airport Master Record (Table 1B) and presented on Figure 1B of this appendix.

Reference

ICAO, 1999, Aerodrome standards – aerodrome design and operations, Annex 14, Third Edition.

Table 1B - FORM 5010 AIRPORT MASTER RECORD

- ○ A Flexible Category (CBR 15)
- ○ B Flexible Category (CBR 10)
- ◉ C Flexible Category (CBR 6)
- ○ D Flexible Category (CBR 3)

TIRE PRESSURE

- ○ W Unlimited
- ◉ X 254 psi
- ○ Y 145 psi
- ○ Z 73 psi

METHOD USED

- ○ Using Aircraft
- ◉ Technical

Project info

Aurora State Airport

- ○ A Rigid Category (k 552 pci)
- ○ B Rigid Category (k 295 pci)
- ○ C Rigid Category (k 147 pci)
- ○ D Rigid Category (k 74 pci)

AIRCRAFT GEAR TYPE IN TRAFFIC MIX

- ☑ S (single wheel gear)
- ☑ D (dual wheel gear)
- ☐ 2D (dual tandem wheel gear)
- ☐ 3D (triple tandem wheel gear) e.g B-777
- ☐ DDT or W/B (tandem gear under wing AND tandem gear under body) e.g. B-747, A-340-600, A-380

Airport LOC-ID	UAO
Pavement ID	RW 17-35

Enter PCN 40


IF 3D or W/B Gear Checked, #38 = PCN
Please Add Data Element #38 Remark

Form 5010 Data Element	Gross Weight and PCN
#35 S gear	102
#36 D gear	143
#37 DT gear	
#38 DDT gear	
#39 PCN	40/F/C/X/T

3D	
2D/2D2	
2D/3D2W	
2D/3D2B	

Report Minimum Gross Weight

Airport LOC-ID	Pavement ID	#35 S GW	#36 D GW	#37 DT GW	#38 DDT GW	#39 PCN
UAO	17-35	102	143			40/F/C/X/T



	Citation-X	Learjet-35A/65A	Learjet-55	Citation-VI/VII	Gulfstream-G-IV	Gulfstream-G-V
1. Aircraft ACN at traffic mix GW	11.5	5.2	7.0	7.4	24.6	30.9
2. Calculated PCN at CDF max. GW	15.4	15.4	15.5	15.8	29.1	40.4
3. Annual Departures from traffic mix	2,920	2,540	570	1,190	70	610

GRI

PAVEMENT CLASSIFICATION CHART

SEP. 2019 JOB NO. 6289 FIG. 1B

HD AVIATION & SOUTHEND AIRPARK

T.4S, R.1W, SEC. 2D & 11A, T.L. 200, 203, 400, 401, 1600
14401 KEIL ROAD N.E.
AURORA, OREGON 97002

PLAN APPROVED

Date 6/22/05 Signed
* with changes noted herein

REGISTERED ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH SPECIALIST
STATE OF OREGON
Robert F. Sweeney
#0206202513
Expires 30Sep05

INSTALLER: TBA

LICENSE #: TBA

Table of Contents

Page 1 Cover Sheet
Page 2 Construction Specifications
Page 3 Design Data Table
Page 4 Soil Evaluations
Page 5 System Schematic
Page 6 Site Plan – Overall
Page 7 Site Plan- Collect & Treatment Sys
Page 8 Site Plan – Treatment System Area
Page 9 Tank Details – S4, S9, S11
Page 10 Tank Details – S5 & D2
Page 11 Tank Details – S6 & D3
Page 12 Tank Details – S10 & D4
Page 13 Tank Details – S12 & D5
Page 14 Tank Details – S13 & D6
Page 15 Tank Details – S1, S2, S3
Page 16 Tank Details – C1 & D1
Page 17 Tank Details – C2 & R1
Page 18 Tank Details – R3 & D7
Page 19 Tank Details – S12, S13, S14
Page 20 Tank Anti-Buoyancy Details
Page 21 Recirculating Textile Filter
Page 22 Recirculating Textile Filter Details
Page 23 Drainfield Details – 1
Page 24 Drainfield Details – 2
Page 25 Pump Curves – S1, S2, S3
Page 26 Pump Curves –S4, S7, S9, S11
Page 27 Pump Curves – D1, D2, D3, D4
Page 28 Pump Curve – D5, D6, D7
Page 29 Preliminary Parts List
Page 30 Maintenance Matrix – 1
Page 31 Maintenance Matrix – 2

Project Description

Proposed expansion of existing wastewater treatment facility for a regional airport.
System design = 10,000 GPD.
Residential strength waste flows to eight new Septic Tanks and three new 2-compartment Septic/Dosing Tanks. Effluent flows by gravity from the Septic Tanks to five new Dosing Tanks. Three existing Dosing Septic Tanks will be converted to Sewage Lift Stations, pumping to a new 3000-gallon Co-mingle Tank with effluent filter and then to a 3000-gallon Dosing Tank. Accumulated sludges to be removed by a licensed Sewage Disposal Service.

Effluent is pumped from the Dosing Tanks and Septic/Dosing Tanks to a new 3000-gallon Co-mingle Tank and new 3000-gallon Recirculation Tank that is to be intertied to existing 2x3000-gallon Recirculation Tanks. The Recirculation Tanks will dose two AX-100 Recirculating Textile Filters.


Final disposal via an existing Dosing Tank will be retrofitted with new pumping systems. The existing drainfield size to be doubled to 3000 lft by using the previously identified reserve area. Existing drainfield laterals to be removed and replaced. New Distribution System is detailed in this design. New reserve area will be located west of present drainfield.

Existing Recirculating Gravel Filter to be disassembled and removed. Used gravel media will be deposited in empty NW corner of Tax Lot 400.
Site is served by a private water well.

Site and Soils (Profile Details, Pg. 4)

Amity Silt Loam
Slope 0 – 2%
Reference: Existing File / Permit No.: DEQ110707

VICINITY MAP



PAGE 1
11 JAN 2005
SCALE: NONE

H.D. AVIATION & SOUTHEND AIRPARK
T.4S, R.1W, SEC. 2D & 11A, T.L. 200, 203, 400, 401, 1600
COVER SHEET

CHECKED BY:
DRAWN BY:

Environmental Management Systems Inc.
4080 SE International Way, Ste.B112
Milwaukie, OREGON 97222
OR (503)353-9691 WA (360)735-1109
FAX (503)353-9695

CHECK OFF	
	GENERAL STANDARDS
	All w ork and material shall conform w ith OAR 340 Div. 71 & 73 approved design permit, and appropriate law s. Permits relating (but not limited) to plumbing, electrical, and grading must be coordinated w ith the on-site system installer and designer.
	Minor modifications to accommodate stumps, boulders or other unforeseen obstacles may be needed. Major modification cannot be performed w ithout re-design and regulatory approval.
	If the installation contractor (installer) notes any conflicts w ith applicable State and/or local law s, rules or requirements, he shall request a clarification before ordering or installing affected materials or w ork. This may include and is not limited to such factors as: land-use regulations, grading ordinances, erosion control districts, hauling limits, typographical errors, etc.
	Installer is to obtain copies of all necessary permits, authorizations, licenses etc. prior to initiating construction, including that specialty w ork designated to a subcontractor w hich is directly or indirectly related to the system construction.
	Installer shall request and obtain utility locates by a qualified service for all potential underground utilities before excavation w ork commences.
	Installer shall maintain any and all survey monuments, w hich are affected by w ork and activities, related to the projects. Monuments, if damaged by the installer, shall be reset by a licensed surveyor at the installer's expense.
	All materials and equipment shall be of the type, model and brand listed for the manufacturers specified, unless otherw ise authorized by the system designer. Substitution of materials and equipment shall receive pre-authorization and the contractor/installer w ill be responsible for providing performance and operating data.
	Installer shall prepare, maintain and provide, at completion of the project, draw ings detailing the construction "as-built" and shall provide the ow ner & designer w ith the manufacturer's current specification and operating data on all equipment installed prior to final payment to the installer.
	TANK (S)
	Grout: Grout w atertight using hydraulic-adhesive type cement or grout material. Grout interior and exterior.
	Seal all joints and seams w ith manufacturer-approved sealants.
	Odor proof: Seal riser lid to contact w ith closed cell plastic foam sheet, or single-side adhesive neoprene foam tape.
	All tanks must be Traffic Rated.
	Tanks must be fitted w ith manhole covers in steel rings set in pavement minimum 2" above the tank risers.
	Riser: Tank must be equipped w ith a w atertight riser, w ith minimum 18" inside diameter, w ith tank access brought to or above finish grade. Riser seams must be grouted interior and exterior.
	Knockouts: Perforations and unused knockouts must be grouted.
	Watertight: Tank must be subject to overnight test for w atertightness prior to calling for inspection. Fill to a maximum 2" into riser. Mark w ater level, initials, time and date.
	PUMP (S)
	Air-lock hole: Install a 5/32" diameter hole in discharge pipe below off level and below check level.
	Disconnect: Provide a quick disconnect of non-corrosive material w ithin 12" of riser top. Position to allow for removal of pump and pump screen for annual maintenance.
	Isolate valve: Provide a gate or ball valve w ithin 12" of riser top, on discharge side of disconnect. Position to allow for removal of pump and pump screen for annual maintenance.
	Flush transport pipe and check for equal distribution from splitters, valves, and/or distribution box.
	Float control assembly: Float controls must be connected to a separate stand pipe, not discharge line, w hich is serviceable and accessible.
	Pump screen: Provide a corrosion-resistant screen w ith minimum tw elve sq. ft. surface area, w ith maximum 1/8" openings, surrounding pump extending above maximum effluent level.
	Trace w ire: Provide an electrically continuous 18 gauge, green-jacketed copper w ire in trench for the full length of all transport lines, accessible at the source end.
	ELECTRICAL COMPONENTS
	Wiring of pumps and controls shall be performed by a licensed electrician under the auspices of a permit secured from the local jurisdiction. For details of electrical system, pump controls, floats, and the level of the float settings see the manufacturer's instructions and approved design.
	Splicing of w ires at the splice box inside the tank risers shall be done using the heat shrink connectors provided by the manufacturer or w ith an approved w atertight electrical connector nut.
	Wiring from the splice box to the source or the control panel shall be protected in UL approved PVC conduit, constructed w atertight. Pump line voltage shall have w ater proof insulation such as THW, THWN, or HHW. Wire for all connections shall be 14 gauge w ire or larger.
	"Seal offs" shall be installed betw een the splice box and the pow er source or control panel, either in the horizontal just outside the riser or in the vertical just below the control panel or per connection. "Seal offs" shall be installed to manufacturer's specifications and shall be equal to or better than the follow ing: Appleton EYF seal off box, PVC terminal adapters (threaded), Killark sealing compound, Killark packing fiber.
	Wiring shall be color coded or numbered and the schedule w ritten inside the control panel or on the w iring diagram.
	Upon completion, the apparatus shall be tested for operation and correctness. Available voltage, pump run voltage and pump run amperage shall be measured and recorded inside the control panel.
	The w iring diagram shall be retained on site (preferably in control panel enclosure) and any as-built notes or comments entered, initialed, and dated.
	CONTROL PANEL (S)
	The electrician shall label the control panel or electrical panel w ith his business name and the permit number and date of installation.
	Control panel shall be installed per manufacturer's instructions; alarm shall be audible from the living/w orking space. Pump and alarm must be on separate circuits. Location of panels to be based on electrical access.
	The control panel for all pumps must have the capability to record the number of alarms, pump events and override events, if applicable.
	Use a padlock or other locking device to prevent unauthorized access to the control panel. Panel to be installed on 4" X 4" post, NOT on w all.
	Panel shall be in accordance w ith NEMA 4X rating. Panel enclosure shall meet NEMA 4X requirements.
	OTHER
	Setbacks: Maintain required setbacks.
	COLLECTION SYSTEM
	Plumbing permit required
	DISTRIBUTION AND TRANSPORT LINES
	Pressure piping: Must meet or exceed Class 200 PVC, (ASTM 2241), or class 160 for pipes greater than an inch in diameter.
	Road crossing: Sleeve transport pipe in Sch. 40 PVC, installed a minimum of 18" below grade, and bedded in ¾ minus to the surface.
	All w ork and materials shall conform w ith Chapter 246-272 WAC, approved design permit, and appropriate law s. Permits relating (but not limited) to plumbing, electrical, and grading must be coordinated w ith the on-site system installer and designer.

REGISTERED ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH SPECIALIST
STATE OF OREGON
Robert F. Sweeney
#02062025 13
Expires 2005

PAGE 2

11 JAN 2005

SCALE: NONE

H.D. AVIATION & SOUTHEND AIRPARK

T.4S, R.1W, SEC. 2D & 11A, T.L. 200, 203, 400, 401, 1600

CONSTRUCTION SPECIFICATIONS

CHECKED BY:

DRAWN BY:

Environmental Management Systems Inc.
4080 SE International Way, Ste.B112
Milwaukie, OREGON 97222
OR (503)353-9691 WA (360)735-1109
FAX (503)353-9695

Table 1: Maximum Daily Design Flow

	Source					Gallons Per Day
HD AVIATION	Existing Building 1	55	occupants @	15	gpd	825
	Existing Building 2	63	occupants @	15	gpd	945
	Existing Building 3	25	occupants @	15	gpd	375
	Future Building 4	6	occupants @	15	gpd	90
	Future Building 5	5	occupants @	15	gpd	75
	Future Building 6	7	occupants @	15	gpd	105
	Future Building 7	11	occupants @	15	gpd	165
	Future Building 8	10	occupants @	15	gpd	150
	Future Building 9	6	occupants @	15	gpd	90
SOUTHEND AIRPARK	Future Building A	32	occupants @	15	gpd	480
		7	occupants @	75	gpd	525
	Existing Building B	3	occupants @	15	gpd	45
	Existing Building C	15	occupants @	15	gpd	225
	Existing Building D	9	occupants @	15	gpd	135
		6	occupants @	75	gpd	450
	Future Building E	3	occupants @	15	gpd	45
	Existing Building F	3	occupants @	15	gpd	45
	Future Building G	12	occupants @	15	gpd	180
	Future Building H	12	occupants @	15	gpd	180
	Existing Building I	21	occupants @	15	gpd	315
	Existing Building J	13	occupants @	15	gpd	195
	Future Building K	33	occupants @	15	gpd	495
	Future Building L	34	occupants @	15	gpd	510
		7	occupants @	75	gpd	525
	Future Building M	7	occupants @	15	gpd	105
	Future Building N	15	occupants @	15	gpd	225
	Projected Peak Flow					**7500**
	Design Flow Max					**10000**

Table 2: Capacity for Existing Drainfield

Effluent Quality	Gallons Per Day	Loading Rate
Advantex Effluent	5000	45 lft / 150 gpd

Table 3: Capacity for New Drainfield

Effluent Quality	Gallons Per Day	Loading Rate
Advantex Effluent	5000	45 lft / 150 gpd

Table 4: Effluent Quality Expectations

Parameter	Not to Exceed
BOD	20 mg/L
TSS	20 mg/L
TN	30 mg/L

System Components-HD Aviation

	Tank #	Volume (gal)	Dose Schedule	Pump Type	# of Pumps	Pump Model	Pump Size	Gal/min
Pump Stations	S1	3000	Timed	Solids Handling	2	PSE4011	4/10 hp	10
	S2	3000	Timed	Solids Handling	2	PSE4011	4/10 hp	10
	S3	1500	Demand	Solids Handling	2	PSE4011	4/10 hp	10
Septic Tanks	S5	1000	na	na	na	na	na	na
	S6	3000	na	na	na	na	na	na
	S10	3000	na	na	na	na	na	na
	S12	1500	na	na	na	na	na	na
	S13	1500	na	na	na	na	na	na
	S14	1000	na	na	na	na	na	na
	S15	1000	na	na	na	na	na	na
	S16	1000	na	na	na	na	na	na
Septic/Dosing Tanks	S4	1500	Demand	Turbine	2	P100511	1/2 hp	10
	S7	1500	Demand	Turbine	2	P100511	1/2 hp	10
	S8	1500	Demand	Submersible	1	Myers	1/2 hp	10
	S9	1500	Demand	Turbine	2	P100511	1/2 hp	10
	S11	1500	Demand	Turbine	2	P100511	1/2 hp	10
Dosing Tanks	D1	2000	Timed	Turbine	2	P100511	1/2 hp	10
	D2	1000	Timed	Turbine	2	P100511	1/2 hp	10
	D3	1500	Timed	Turbine	2	P100511	1/2 hp	10
	D4	1000	Timed	Turbine	2	P100511	1/2 hp	10
	D5	1000	Timed	Turbine	2	P100511	1/2 hp	10
	D6	1000	Timed	Turbine	2	P100511	1/2 hp	10
	D7	3000	Timed	Turbine	2	P501512	1-1/2 hp	50
Recirculation Tanks	R3	3000	Timed	Turbine	2	P500712	3/4 hp **	50

Primary Septic Tankage Volume = 25,500 gallons

Total Tankage Volume = 47,500 gallons

*** Pumps to be upgraded to size and model determined and verified by RTF Manufacturer (Orenco).*

Recirculating Textile Filter	Max. Design Capacity =	10,000gpd
	Projected Peak Flow =	7500 gpd
	Projected Average Daily Flow =	3750 gpd
	Pod Surface Area =	100 sqft.
	Number of pods =	2
	Recirculation Rate =	4 to 1
	Acutal Flow (w/ Recirc.) =	15000 gpd
	Design Hydraulic Loading =	50 gal/sqft/day
	Design Recirculation Loading =	250 gal/sqft/day

Distribution Components

Quantity	Component
1	OSI-Hydrotek V6602 Automatic Distribution Valve (RTF Pod Distribution)
1	OSI-Hydrotek V6606 Automatic Distribution Valve (Drainfield Distribution)

Pressure Distribution Drainfield	Max. Design Capacity =	10,000gpd
	Projected Peak Flow =	7500 gpd
	Projected Average flow =	3750 gpd
	Design Hydraulic Loading Rate =	45 Lft./ 150gpd

REGISTERED ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH SPECIALIST
STATE OF OREGON
Robert F. Sweeney
#0206202513
Expires 30 Sept 05

PAGE 3

11 JAN 2005

SCALE: NONE

H.D. AVIATION & SOUTHEND AIRPARK

T.4S, R.1W, SEC. 2D & 11A, T.L. 200, 203, 400, 401, 1600

DESIGN DATA TABLE

CHECKED BY:

DRAWN BY:

Environmental Management Systems Inc.
4080 SE International Way, Ste.B112
Milwaukie, OREGON 97222
OR (503)353-9691 WA (360)735-1109
FAX (503)353-9695

ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS Inc. - ON-SITE SEWAGE TREATMENT SITE EVALUATION DATA

4080 SE International Way, Suite #B-112, Milwaukie, OR 97222-8867 (503) 353-9691 fax: (503) 353-9695 (Vancouver, WA 360-735-1109)

APPLICANT: HD AVIATION — PREVIOUS EVALUATIONS: Y / N | ID# :

ADDRESS OF SITE: 1400 KEIL RD, AURORA, OR 97002 — Sub Division:

LEGAL DESCRIPTION: TOWNSHIP: 2S RANGE: 1W SECTION: 2, 11 PARCEL/TAX LOT: 800 — other:

SOIL PROFILES: DRAINFIELD AREA - EAST SET OF HOLES

TEST HOLE	DEPTH (IN)	TEXTURE	Redoximorphic Features: MATRIX COLOR	Oxidized COLOR	Reduced Color	Coarse Fragments	ROOTS	STRUCTURE & Other Comments:	APPL. RATE w/ Pretreatment
#1 NE	0" - 8"	gSiL	7.5YR 3/3	--	--	--	mf	sbk	45 LPf/150g
	8" - 16"	SiCL	7.5YR 3/2	--	--	--	cf	Faint Mottles / sbk	45 LPf/150g
	16" - 36"	SiCL	7.5YR 4/2	7.5YR 4/6	7.5YR 3/2	--	ff	Distinct Mottles / abk	50 LPf/150g
Slope= 2% E	36" - 64"	SiCL	7.5YR 2.5/2	7.5YR 4/6	7.5YR 3/2	--	vff	Somew hat Massive	50 LPf/150g
#2 NW	0" - 13"	gSiL	7.5YR 3/3	--	--	--	mf	sbk	45 LPf/150g
	13" - 18"	SiCL	7.5YR 3/2	--	--	--	cf	Faint Mottles / sbk	45 LPf/150g
	18" - 40"	gSiCL	7.5YR 4/2	7.5YR 4/6	7.5YR 3/2	--	ff	Distinct Mottles / abk	50 LPf/150g
Slope= 2% E	40" - 76"	SiCL	7.5YR 2.5/2	7.5YR 4/6	7.5YR 3/2	--	vff	Somew hat Massive	50 LPf/150g
#3 SE	0" - 10"	gSiL	7.5YR 3/3	--	--	--	mf	sbk	45 LPf/150g
	10" - 30"	gSiCL	7.5YR 3/2	7.5YR 4/6	7.5YR 3/2	--	ff	Distinct Mottles / abk	50 LPf/150g
	30" - 62"	SiCL	7.5YR 2.5/1	7.5YR 4/6	7.5YR 3/2	--	vff	Somew hat Massive	50 LPf/150g
Slope= 2% E	62" - 66"	SiCL	7.5YR 3/2	--	--	--	--	Massive	75 LPf/150g
#4 SW	0" - 14"	gSiL	7.5YR 3/3	--	--	--	mf	sbk	45 LPf/150g
	14" - 30"	gSiCL	7.5YR 3/2	7.5YR 4/6	7.5YR 3/2	--	ff	Distinct Mottles / abk	50 LPf/150g
	30" - 48"	SiCL	7.5YR 4/2	7.5YR 4/6	7.5YR 3/2	--	vff	Somew hat Massive	50 LPf/150g
Slope= 2% E	48" - 66"	SiCL	7.5YR 3/2	--	--	--	--	Massive	75 LPf/150g

WEATHER CONDITIONS: (X) CLEAR ( ) CLOUDY ( ) PRECIPITATION ( ) EXTREME DRYNESS ( ) OTHER:

LANDFORMS: ( ) FLOODPLAIN (X) TERRACE (X) UPLAND ( ) SIDESLOPE ( ) OPEN ( ) OTHER:

VEGETATION: (X) PASTURED ( ) FORESTED (X) CLEARED ( ) WETLAND ( ) OTHER:

MAJOR LIMITING FACTOR(S): (X) WATER TABLE / (X) SOIL SUITABILITY / ( ) SET BACKS / ( ) LOT SIZE

SOIL TYPE: SiL / SiCL PROPOSED SYSTEM: RGF to Pressure Drainfield

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS: Soil Pits Observed with Randy Trox, RS of DEQ-Western Region.

EFFECTIVE SOIL DEPTH ~ 30-48" OTHER: SURFACE LAYERS INCLUDE OLD FILL FROM AIRSTRIP CONSTRUCTION.

Soil Survey Mapping: Marion County Sheet #6= Amity Silt Loam

EVALUATOR'S NAME: ROBERT F. SWEENEY, RS — EVALUATORS SIGNATURE: R Sweeney — DATE: 14 July 1999

ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS Inc. - ON-SITE SEWAGE TREATMENT SITE EVALUATION DATA

4080 SE International Way, Suite #B-112, Milwaukie, OR 97222-8867 (503) 353-9691 fax: (503) 353-9695 (Vancouver, WA 360-735-1109)

APPLICANT: HD AVIATION — PREVIOUS EVALUATIONS: Y / N | ID# :

ADDRESS OF SITE: 1400 KEIL RD, AURORA, OR 97002 — Sub Division:

LEGAL DESCRIPTION: TOWNSHIP: 2S RANGE: 1W SECTION: 2, 11 PARCEL/TAX LOT: 800 — other:

SOIL PROFILES: DRAINFIELD AREA - WEST SET OF HOLES

TEST HOLE	DEPTH (IN)	TEXTURE	Redoximorphic Features: MATRIX COLOR	Oxidized COLOR	Reduced Color	Coarse Fragments	ROOTS	STRUCTURE & Other Comments:	APPL. RATE w/ Pretreatment
#1 SW	0" - 10"	SiL	7.5YR 3/3	--	--	--	mf	sbk	45 LPf/150g
	10" - 21"	SiL	7.5YR 3/2	--	--	--	cf	abk	45 LPf/150g
	21" - 25"	gSiL	7.5YR 3/2	7.5YR 4/6	7.5YR 3/2	--	ff	Distinct Mottles	50 LPf/150g
Slope= 1% W	25" - 60"	SiCL	7.5YR 4/2	7.5YR 4/6	7.5YR 3/2	--	vff	Somew hat Massive	50 LPf/150g
#2 SE	0" - 15"	SiL	7.5YR 3/3	--	--	--	mf	sbk	45 LPf/150g
	15" - 19"	gSiL	7.5YR 3/2	--	--	--	cf	sbk	45 LPf/150g
	19" - 28"	SiCL	7.5YR 3/2	7.5YR 4/6	7.5YR 3/2	--	ff	Distinct Mottles	50 LPf/150g
Slope= 1% W	28" - 60"	SiCL	7.5YR 4/2	7.5YR 4/6	7.5YR 3/2	--	vff	Somew hat Massive	50 LPf/150g
#3 NE	0" - 15"	SiL	7.5YR 3/3	--	--	--	mf	sbk	45 LPf/150g
	15" - 20"	gSiL	7.5YR 3/2	7.5YR 4/6	7.5YR 3/2	--	ff	Distinct Mottles / abk	50 LPf/150g
	20" - 60"	SiCL	7.5YR 4/2	7.5YR 4/6	7.5YR 3/2	--	vff	Somew hat Massive	50 LPf/150g
Slope= 1% W									
#4 NW	0" - 16"	SiL	7.5YR 3/3	--	--	--	mf	abk	45 LPf/150g
	16" - 22"	gSiL	7.5YR 3/2	7.5YR 4/6	7.5YR 3/2	--	ff	Distinct Mottles / abk	50 LPf/150g
	22" - 60"	SiCL	7.5YR 4/2	7.5YR 4/6	7.5YR 3/2	--	vff	Somew hat Massive	50 LPf/150g
Slope= 1% W									

WEATHER CONDITIONS: (X) CLEAR ( ) CLOUDY ( ) PRECIPITATION ( ) EXTREME DRYNESS ( ) OTHER:

LANDFORMS: ( ) FLOODPLAIN (X) TERRACE (X) UPLAND ( ) SIDESLOPE ( ) OPEN ( ) OTHER:

VEGETATION: (X) PASTURED ( ) FORESTED (X) CLEARED ( ) WETLAND ( ) OTHER:

MAJOR LIMITING FACTOR(S): (X) WATER TABLE / (X) SOIL SUITABILITY / ( ) SET BACKS / ( ) LOT SIZE

SOIL TYPE: SiL / SiCL PROPOSED SYSTEM: RGF to Pressure Drainfield


ADDITIONAL COMMENTS: Soil Pits Observed with Randy Trox, RS of DEQ-Western Region.

EFFECTIVE SOIL DEPTH ~ 20-25" OTHER: SURFACE LAYERS INCLUDE OLD FILL FROM AIRSTRIP CONSTRUCTION.

Soil Survey Mapping: Marion County Sheet #6= Amity Silt Loam

Center Test Pits Similar to Corners w / Redox Features starting at >15 inches below ground surface

EVALUATOR'S NAME: ROBERT F. SWEENEY, RS — EVALUATORS SIGNATURE: R Sweeney — DATE: 14 July 1999



REGISTERED ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH SPECIALIST
STATE OF OREGON
Robert F. Sweeney
#020620513
Expires 30 Sep 05

PAGE 4

11 JAN 2005

SCALE: NONE

H.D. AVIATION & SOUTHEND AIRPARK


T.4S, R.1W, SEC. 2D & 11A, T.L. 200, 203, 400, 401, 1600


SOIL EVALUATIONS


CHECKED BY:

DRAWN BY:


Environmental Management Systems Inc.
4080 SE International Way, Ste.B112
Milwaukie, OREGON 97222
OR (503)353-9691 WA (360)735-1109
FAX (503)353-9695








V6606 DISTRIBUTING VALVE



DRAINFIELD CELL



MONITORING PORT @ END OF EACH LINE

REGISTERED ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH SPECIALIST
STATE OF OREGON
Robert F. Sweeney
#0206202513
Expires 30Sep05

H.D. AVIATION & SOUTHEND AIRPARK
T.4S, R.1W, SEC. 2D & 11A, T.L. 200, 203, 400, 401, 1600
DRAINFIELD DETAILS-1
PAGE 23
11 JAN 2005
SCALE: NONE
CHECKED BY:
DRAWN BY:

Environmental Management Systems Inc.
4080 SE International Way, Ste.B112
Milwaukie, OREGON 97222
OR (503)353-9691 WA (360)735-1109
FAX (503)353-9695

KEIL ROAD

EXISTING RIP RAP

EXISTING GWI OUTFALL TO BE DISCONNECTED

18" CONCRETE CULVERT

NEW RIP RAP

EXISTING 2"øPVC TRANSPORT LINE

#1 NE TEST PIT

#3 SE TEST PIT

Solid pipe starts here

EXISTING 1'x3' GWI

#4 SW TEST PIT

#2 NW TEST PIT

NEW V6606

CONNECT NEW 1'X3' GWI TO EXISTING GWI. DISCONNECT CURRENT SOUTH OUTFALL AND REROUTE SOUTH OF NEW DRAINFIELD CELLS

RESERVE DRAINFIELD AREA

APPROACH LIGHTS

FENCE

KEIL ROAD

#3 NE TEST PIT


#4 NW TEST PIT

#2 SE TEST PIT


#1 SW TEST PIT

STATE HIGHWAY 164

REGISTERED ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH SPECIALIST
STATE OF OREGON
Robert F. Sweeney
#0206202513
Expires 30Sep05



RIP RAP DETAIL



GWI DETAIL

PAGE 24

11 JAN 2005

SCALE: NONE

H.D. AVIATION & SOUTHEND AIRPARK

T.4S, R.1W, SEC. 2D & 11A, T.L. 200, 203, 400, 401, 1600

DRAINFIELD DETAILS-2

CHECKED BY:

DRAWN BY:

Environmental Management Systems Inc.
4080 SE International Way, Ste.B112
Milwaukie, OREGON 97222
OR (503)353-9691 WA (360)735-1109
FAX (503)353-9695

Aron,

Here is our response to the questions from the airport's geotechnical consultant along with all of the attachments.

Brett

==========

- Field Data Collection
    - Date of soil sampling
      We conducted 2 site visits: September 9, 2021 and October 11, 2021. The samples for proctor testing were collected on October 11, 2021.

    - Were any logs prepared to describe the bulk sampling results?
      Logs were not prepared for bulk samples. A bulk sample was collected from each area. Each bulk sample was not collected from a discrete test location. Soil collected from the testing locations were combined to form the bulk sample that was tested in the laboratory. Separate bulk samples from the existing and proposed drain field were prepared and tested in the laboratory.

    - Was a sieve analysis and/or Atterberg Limits test performed to validate the Silt visual classification?
      Sieve tests and/or Atterberg Limits tests were not conducted. The samples were visually classified in the field and in the laboratory. Other geotechnical studies at Aurora State Airport confirm our classification. Laboratory tests from these studies were used in conjunction with our visual classification to classify the soil. We have attached a copy of pertinent information from these studies (Attachment 1 - Lab Data).

    - Was infiltration testing performed? If not, why?
      Drain field design will be conducted by others and therefore we did not conduct infiltration testing as part of scope of services. A drain field feasibility study was conducted by Environmental Management Systems, Inc. A November 5, 2020 report that documents their study is attached (Attachment 2 - EMS drainfield feasibility report.pdf).

- As-builts or other construction documents pertaining to the existing drain field

To be provided by others. [Note: Attachment 6 added by Aron Faegre to this memo for providing this information to Tony Beach.]

- Report references
  - Geoweb design procedure
    The Geoweb design procedure is attached: "GeoWeb Load Support System, Technical Overview" (Attachment 3 - Geoweb Technical Overview.pdf)

  - Provide addition discussion on how the 6-inch geoweb, with 2/3 aggregate and 1/3 topsoil, replaces 12 inches of compacted soil.
    According to the FAA Airport Construction Standards (AC150/5370-10) Item P-152, the specified method of stabilizing the subgrade outside of paved areas is to compact the upper 12-inches to at least 95 percent of the maximum dry density, as determined by ASTM D698. It is further specified that the upper 4 inches must be scarified and be in a loose state. The intent of this is to provide a subgrade that can support snow removal equipment, aircraft rescue and firefighting equipment, and an occasional aircraft without causing damage to the aircraft. The intent of the geoweb is to provide a subgrade that will provide a subgrade that will support such traffic. It does so by confining the infill soil with the cells which gives the infill soil added shear strength when it is loaded from the top. It reduces the stress directly below the loaded area by transferring stress to the cell walls. Our calculation shows that the Geoweb provides a subgrade with an adequate factor of safety.

  - Equivalent Single Wheel Load source
    AASHTO H20: AASHTO HB-17 Standard Specifications for Highway Bridges, 17th Edition standard

    Gulfstream 550: Gulfstream Flight Ops, Operations Briefing, Pavement Weight Bearing Capacity (CAN/PCN) a copy is attached (Attachment 4 - Gulfstream Flight Ops.pdf)

  - Source identifying the critical aircraft type
    A Gulfstream G-V aircraft was selected based on a report prepared by Geotechnical Resources, Inc., dated September 16, 2019, that documents a pavement evaluation of Runway 17-35 at Aurora State Airport. We have attached a copy of that report (Attachment 5 – GRI Report)

- Report figures
  - Figure A-1: graphic does not show up in the provided pdf
  - Figure A-2: graphic does not show up in the provided pdf

We have attached another copy of our report that a shows Figures A-1 and A-2 when opened with Bluebeam Revu X64 Version 2016.5.1 and with Google Chrome Version 96.0.4664.110

- "Such stringent compaction is not permitted in the soil cover of drain fields"
    - Where does this statement come from?
      This statement was written by NV5 based on the requirement from drain filed designer that the drain field cover material must allow evapotranspiration and oxygen exchange to function efficiently. Compacted soil will inhibit both of these processes.

In addition to the list above, we will also need specifics on the proposed Geoweb reinforced drain field construction.

- Materials/Construction Proposed
    - What materials specification is to be used (ODOT, proprietary, etc.) for the aggregate?
      Per the GeoWeb Manufacturer the infill material should consist of one third pulverized topsoil and two thirds crushed aggregate. The aggregate portion should be crushed rock that has a particle size range from 0.375 to 1.0 inches with a D50 of 0.5 inches and a 30 percent void space. The engineered fill should lightly be compacted to allow vegetation growth.

    - What compaction specifications and test methods are proposed to achieve the proposed Geoweb strengths?
      After the cells have been filled the prepared ground surface should be proofrolled with a fully loaded dump truck. Some rutting and deflection is acceptable considering that the FAA specifies the upper 4-inches of subgrade consist loose uncompacted soil over 12-inches of compacted subgrade.

    - What compaction specifications and test methods are proposed for soil layers to be placed along with the Geoweb?
      The only other soil that will be placed is the washed gravel or drain rock in the drainage trenches. We recommend only light compaction of this material until it is well keyed. Even at this level of compaction we believe its load bearing characteristics will be superior to the soil that exists in the RSA. Over compacting this material will inhibit its drainage characteristics

- What subgrade compaction specifications and test methods are proposed for the expanded drain field areas?
  See our response to the two prior questions.

- What materials are proposed for use in the rest of the elements of the drain field system (pipes, manifolds, perf spec., etc.)?
  To be addressed by others. [[Note: Attachment 6 added by Aron Faegre to this memo for providing this information to Tony Beach.]

Attachments:

Attachment 1 – Lab Data
Attachment 2 – EMS drainfield feasibility report
Attachment 3 – Geoweb Technical Overview
Attachment 4 – Gulfstream Flight Ops
Attachment 5 – GRI Report
Attachment 6 – Construction Documents for HDSE Drainfield

PAC Meeting #9 – February 11, 2025

NOTICE OF A MEETING
FOR THE AURORA STATE AIRPORT
Airport Master Plan Project

Notice is hereby given that the Oregon Department of Aviation (ODAV) will hold an online (via Zoom) Public Planning Advisory Committee (PAC) meeting.

When: Tuesday, February 11, 2025
5:00 p.m. - 8:00 p.m.

Where: Join by phone or virtually (via Zoom)
Please join the virtual **PAC meeting** by visiting:
https://us02web.zoom.us/j/88245329218

This meeting will provide an opportunity for the PAC and project stakeholders to review the refined preferred alternative, the Airport Layout Plan (ALP), and Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) for the Airport Master Plan project. For copies of the meeting materials and other information related to the project, please visit: https://publicproject.net/AuroraAirport

Accessible Meeting Information
Special accommodations are available upon advanced request. Please contact Alex Thomas at least 48 hours prior to the event to discuss specific needs.

For airport questions or project information, please contact Alex Thomas, ODAV Planning & Programs Manager, through the following means: Email: Alex.R.Thomas@odav.oregon.gov

AURORA STATE AIRPORT

AIRPORT MASTER PLAN

PAC MEETING #9 AGENDA

Date/Time: February 11, 2025, from 5:00-8:00 pm

Location: Zoom Webinar: https://us02web.zoom.us/j/88245329218

Meeting Goals: Review the refined preferred alternative, the Airport Layout Plan (ALP), and Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) for the Airport Master Plan project.

Time	Topic	Person
5:00-5:10 pm	**Introductions**	Brandy Steffen
5:10-5:30 pm	**Review:** • Refined Preferred Alternative • Feedback received on the refinements	David Miller
5:30-6:00 pm	**PAC questions and comments on Refined Preferred Alternative**	Brandy Steffen
6:00-6:30 pm	**Review:** • Airport Layout Plan (ALP) • Capital Improvement Plan (CIP)	David Miller
6:30-7:15 pm	**PAC questions and comments on ALP & CIP**	Brandy Steffen
7:15-7:45 pm	**Public Comments** • Comments may be emailed before the meeting through the website: https://publicproject.net/AuroraAirport# • Commenters may have up to 2 minute to speak. We ask that only one representative from each organization speaks. We may not be able to hear from everyone. • *Reminder:* public comments typed into Zoom may not be answered during the meeting, but answers will be included in the written meeting summary.	Brandy Steffen
7:45-8:00 pm	**Next Steps**	Brandy Steffen

A meeting summary with all PAC and public comments will be posted to the project website.

We always will take comments via the website, which will be included in the meeting notes and shared with the PAC members: https://publicproject.net/AuroraAirport#

AURORA STATE AIRPORT

PLANNING ADVISORY COMMITTEE (PAC)
MEETING #9 SUMMARY

Date: Tuesday, February 11, 2024
Time: 5:00-8:00 pm
Location: Zoom Webinar

In Attendance

PAC Members Present

Aron Faegre, *alternate*, *Helicopter Transport Service; AABC/TLM Holdings*
Austin Barnes, *Marion County Planning Dept. Planning Organization*
Ben Williams, *Friends of French Prairie*
Bill Graupp, *Aurora CTE, Inc*
Bruce Bennett, *Positive Aurora Airport Management*
Brian Asher, *City of Aurora*
Cathryn Stephens, *ODAV Board*
Councilor Anne Shevlin, *alternate*, *City of Wilsonville*
David Waggoner, *Willamette Aviation*
Dave Mauk, *Charbonneau Country Club*
Jamie Stickel, *City of Canby*
Jon Bickford, *Atlantic Aviation*
Naomi Zwerdling, *Oregon Dept of Transportation*
Melissa Ahrens*, Oregon Dept of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD)*
Pam Barlow Lind, *Confederated Tribes of the Siletz Indians*
Patrick Donaldson, *Wilsonville Chamber of Commerce*
Ted Millar, *AABC/TLM Holdings*
Tony Helbling, *Aurora Airport Improvement Association*
Whitney Stewart, *Oregon Office of Emergency Management*

PAC Members Absent

Alvin Klausen, *Marion County*
Beth Wytoski, *Regional Solutions*
Cheryl Pouley, *Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde Community of Oregon*
Chris Neamtzu, *City of Wilsonville (Attended part of the meeting as member of Public; see below)*
Commissioner Danielle Bethel, *Marion County*
Commissioner Tootie Smith, *Clackamas County*
Dave Tibbetts, *Columbia Helicopters*
Don Hardy, *alternate, City of Canby*
Greg Hughes, *alternate*, *Vans Aircraft*
Ken Ivey, *Aurora Butteville Barlow Community*
Matt Crall, *alternate, Oregon Dept of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD)*
Matt Williams, *Deer Creek Estates HOA*
Matt Lawyer, *alternate, Marion County*
Micheal Weimer, *Life Flight Network*
Raul Suarez, *Aurora Air Traffic Control*
Rian Johnson, *Vans Aircraft*
Matt Nash, *alternate*, *Columbia Helicopters*
Robert Fournier, *Helicopter Transport Service*
Roger Kaye, *1000 Friends of Oregon*

Agency Representatives Present
Kenji Sugahara, *ODAV*
Alex Thomas, *ODAV*
Tony Beach, *ODAV*
Stacy Posegate, *DOJ*

Staff and Consultants
Matt Rogers, *Century West*
David Miller, *Century West*
Samantha Peterson, *Century West*
Mark Steele, *Century West*
James Kirby*, Century West*
Brandy Steffen*, JLA Public Involvement*
Jen Winslow*, JLA Public Involvement*
Ashley Balsom*, JLA Public Involvement*

Audience / Members of the Public
Betsy Johnson
Bill Poehler
Bobby Meyer
Brett Pondrocker
Bruce Bergman
Chris Gage
Chris Neamtzu *(Wilsonville primary PAC member, stated he was unable to attend; alternate attended instead. Chris attended part of the meeting as a member of public.)*

Audience / Members of the Public, continued
George Buley
George Van Hoomissen
Greg Leo
Jake Farrens
Jason Paolo
Joseph Schaefer
Kaelyn Cahill
Kevin O'Malley
Larry Shadle
Luiza H
Lukas Nickerson
Mark Ottenad
Peter Rempp
Richard Langsen
Rick Olmsted
Rod
Shannon Colebank
Shawn O'Neil
Toni Whitler
Wendie Kellington

Overview

Planning Advisory Committee (PAC) members reviewed the refined preferred alternative, the Airport Layout Plan (ALP), and Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) for the Airport Master Plan (AMP) project. *The presentation; meeting recording, chat, and transcript; and other materials are posted on the website (publicproject.net/AuroraAirport). Comments collected during the meeting have been added to this meeting summary.*

Welcome and Introductions

Brandy Steffen, JLA Public Involvement, welcomed everyone to the meeting and reviewed the project team and PAC membership list. She reviewed the agenda and Zoom meeting tips and etiquette. The meeting was extended by an hour to ensure time to discuss and ask questions about the refined preferred alternative, ALP, and CIP. **Tony Beach and Kenji Sugahara, ODAV**, reviewed the Airport Master Plan (AMP) process and

explained that it took longer for the public comments and meeting summaries to be posted to the project website because ODAV wanted to ensure all comments had responses and the meetings were accurately summarized. The technical team reviewed and incorporated PAC feedback as it was received.

Presentation - Refined Preferred Alternative

David Miller, Century West, said that the refined preferred alternative, published on January 6th, would be explained and reviewed, but no changes were made since then. Questions on other topics should be submitted in writing for reference.

David explained that the refined alternative resulted from feedback from previous PAC meetings. Key concerns included considering a no-build alternative, eliminating options impacting hangars, and reassessing the need for a parallel taxi lane and vehicle service road. Significant changes to the refined preferred alternative included removing the parallel taxi lane and vehicle service road and eliminating the need for certain property acquisitions. Other refinements involved reconfiguring helicopter parking and aircraft tie-down positions.

Elements that remained unchanged from prior versions of the preferred alternative included the proposed north runway extension, removal of drain fields from the runway safety area, shifting the Hubbard Highway while maintaining ODOT's right-of-way, and clearing the object-free area. The refined preferred alternative image included priority property acquisitions along Hubbard Highway and the east side of the runway, with a willingness-based acquisition approach for additional areas.

Comments and responses are provided in the table below.

Capital Improvement Plan

David reviewed the Capital Improvement Program (CIP), outlining the breakdown of projects tied to meeting FAA standards. He noted that the overall costs initially were around $185 million, with significant property acquisition on the east side. Key projects which are expected to be completed within the next five years include runway rehabilitation, obstruction removal, and easement acquisitions.

Long-term projects (beyond five years) include reconstruction of the parallel taxiway, drainage ditch mitigation, and the Hubbard Highway project, which involves property acquisition and right-of-way considerations. Further runway extensions and parallel taxiway improvements were also listed. The total long-term costs are just under $100 million, with major expenses related to shifting right-of-way and road construction.

David stated that while routine maintenance costs like pavement sealing are not included, those tasks are considered essential and would fall under the maintenance category. While property acquisition is not fully costed out, it remains a possibility if the airport needs to purchase land for future projects.

FAA funding for these projects is typically up to 90%, though this can vary depending on congressional authorizations. Such large-scale projects may require a regional evaluation from the FAA, as they represent a rare scale of upgrades needed to meet standards.

Airport Layout Plan

David reviewed the Airport Layout Plan (ALP), outlining the details of the plan and how they would be included in the final Airport Master Plan. The airport layout plan includes the previously presented improvements. Key

elements include runway and parallel taxiway upgrades, Keil Road alignment, road extensions, and property acquisitions (marked in yellow).

The ODAV terminal area, control tower, and circulation roads connecting off-airport access were also shown. Additional details cover future apron improvements, reconfigurations of tie-downs and taxi lanes, and hangar development. The north end of the runway and parallel taxiway require property acquisition to control the object-free area.

Please see the presentation under the PAC 9 meeting on the project website for the ALP.

PAC Questions and Comments

Brandy began the PAC discussion. *Comments and responses are provided in the table below; responses provided during the meeting include the speakers name. Some PAC members didn't have questions or comments but were asked specifically if they wanted to add anything. Their names are listed in the table below.*

Public Comment

Brandy opened the public comment section of the meeting. There were two public comments. After all spoke, there was time for additional public comments and Brandy asked if the commenters would like to speak again, which they did. Additionally, public in attendance were able to provide written comments throughout the meeting in the Q&A section. *Written and verbal comments, as well as responses, are provided in the tables below.*

Next Steps

David stated that the chapters and forecast will be updated and packaged into a full final report. The next steps for the project include:

- Finalizing the ALP, which will include additional content (airspace and approach surface drawings).
- ODAV will submit the ALP draft to the FAA for their review, which typically takes about 90 days, although this may extend depending on their workload. While the FAA doesn't formally approve the master plan, they do approve the ALP. Once the FAA is satisfied, the plan will be signed off, and the project will be closed out.
- The public review period will be open throughout this process, and the public participation details will be included in the report. The draft final report will be submitted by May, and assuming the FAA review goes smoothly, the project will close out by the end of May.
    - The local adoption process will follow after that.

Brandy, Tony, and Kenji thanked the PAC and public attendees for their time and input throughout the project, then ended the meeting.

PAC Member Questions/Comments and Responses[1]

ID	Name	Affiliation	Question/Comment	Response
9.1	**Ben Williams**	*Friends of French Prairie*	What are the plans or proposals for the relocation of the drain field?	**David Miller, CWE:** Our plan recommends relocating the drain field outside the runway safety area, as we discussed in the last meeting and presented to the board last week. The FAA has weighed in and supports this relocation due to two key issues: the grade at the end of the runway and the drain field's inability to support the weight of an aircraft or emergency vehicle. The final decision on where to relocate the drain field will be up to its owner. Currently, it sits on leased airport land but services buildings off the airport. Since our plan is limited to ODF property, it does not propose alternative locations off airport grounds, and so far, no proposals have been made to relocate it elsewhere on the airport.
9.2	**Tony Helbling**	*Aurora Airport Improvement Association*	I kind of disagree with the on airport vs. off airport because it strikes me as odd that the master plan can consider off airport items like the relocation of the highway, but cannot consider the internal circulation road since it's only on airport. Portions of the internal circulation road would off the airport just as the highway is. Why can we consider one but not the other?	**David Miller, CWE:** The main focus of the master plan is to evaluate facility needs within the boundaries controlled by ODAV, both now and in the future. Anything beyond the official airport boundary, such as addressing off-airport infrastructure like the through-the-fence area or vehicle service roads, falls outside the scope recognized by the FAA. Property acquisition and related improvements are considered because those areas would become part of the airport itself. For example, shifting the Hubbard Highway requires adjusting its right-of-way to meet FAA standards, particularly for the runway's object-free area. As it stands, the plan recommends relocating the drain field out of the runway safety area to satisfy FAA requirements. However, the final decision on its new location will ultimately be up to the responsible parties.

[1] Live responses are included, along with additional information/clarification, as needed.

			Good. The drain field issue has to do with taking (them) because there is an easement in perpetuity on the south drain field. If the state pursues the taking of that easement, then it becomes incumbent on the state to find a new location for the drain field. And as we've suggested, the acquired area to the east of the current Keil Road would be a logical place to put it. I'm not sure why we're not depicting that.	**David Miller, CWE:** Any future decisions about relocation will need to be addressed outside the master plan. The primary focus of the master plan is to clear the runway safety area to meet FAA standards. While there will likely be ongoing discussions during implementation, those details are beyond the scope of the plan itself. ODAV is fully aware of the input received throughout the process, including from recent meetings, and has taken it into account in their final decisions.
9.3	**Aron Faegre**	*Helicopter Transport Service; AABC/TLM Holdings*	We hear a lot of interpretations about what the FAA rules are, but I think we need to pay close attention to what other airports are allowed under those rules. To my knowledge, I've never seen any ruling stating that a drain field isn't allowed in a runway safety area. The key issue is whether it can support an aircraft. We've already submitted a detailed study from NV5 showing how modern materials could make the site capable of supporting even a Gulfstream 550. So my question to David is, why wouldn't the master plan at least explore potential solutions? If not in the plan itself, then at least in the narrative. The FAA circular on master planning explicitly states that options should be presented, including modifications of standards. You should be discussing them. I've spoken with FAA headquarters, and the modification of standards program exists precisely for situations like this. They've even removed the five-year resubmission requirement. It's designed for multi-phase projects and the process is meant to be applied for before seeking grants, so airports know what's possible before applying. I feel like Oregon is getting the short end of the stick here. We've provided two FAA-approved methodologies for keeping the drain fields in place. Even if ODAV isn't in favor, they should at least present an alternative solution. Some argue it can't be placed in EFU	**David Miller, CWE:** Thanks, Aron. I won't go through all the details again, but as I mentioned earlier, discussions about the drain field have involved ODAV staff, FAA staff, and the Seattle ADO. Century West's role hasn't been so much in the master planning process but rather in evaluating the engineering side of things. From the information provided to our team so far, we haven't seen evidence that the proposed options are feasible. Others may disagree, but based on the available data, the FAA made its decision on the refined preferred alternative accordingly. There are gradient issues, as James Kirby has pointed out in past discussions—portions of the drain field rise above the runway safety grade, creating a non-standard condition. Additionally, the inability to taxi an aircraft or drive an emergency vehicle over it is another non-standard issue. While modification of standards may be an option in some cases, runway safety areas are not considered modifiable, even under the FAA's more project-specific approach. Their standards for these areas are stricter than for other protected areas.

			land, which makes it even more critical for the ALP or the plan to clearly define the airport boundary from a land use standpoint. The courts have ruled that without this, EFU land conversion isn't possible. So my main question is: why can't the master plan at least acknowledge and discuss the alternative solutions that have already been submitted? It seems short-sighted, and I don't see why Oregon should have fewer rights than other states, where these things are routinely allowed I agree that modification of standards doesn't apply to a runway safety area. However, we submitted a highly detailed geotechnical report, and to our knowledge, the state's Geotech firm, GRI, was never even given a chance to review it or provide specific comments. That was before Kenji's time, but it's frustrating that there wasn't a real discussion. NV5 is one of the largest geotechnical firms in Oregon and operates nationally—why would we question their findings? They analyzed the issue in depth, yet their work never seemed to get a fair review. It felt like the discussion was cut off before it could be seriously considered. More recently, we submitted the EMAS option, which is a standard FAA approach for a C-II airport. It's strange that it wasn't even acknowledged, especially since other C-II airports have used it successfully. I would say to Tony that I really wish there was an opportunity to meet on this issue and have our Geotech team and your Geotech team work together. It feels like the issue is being intentionally avoided without giving the specialists, who are most knowledgeable, a chance to talk. Our request to have our Geotech team speak with yours was refused, and it feels like a negative approach to solving the problem. I would still ask that we reconsider this and allow NV5 and GRI to be in the room together	**Tony Beach, ODAV:** What David said is correct: we are focused on making the runway safety area standard by removing the drain field, which does not comply with FAA regulations. Currently, the master plan does not propose a new location for the drain field on state property, and we have not evaluated future accommodations for it. Regarding Aron's comments, we have thoroughly reviewed the report he mentioned with our engineers and even made related correspondence available on our project website. However, we remain unconvinced that the drain field can be modified to meet FAA standards, which is why we continue to recommend its removal from the runway safety area. Aron, I really appreciate your comments, and I assure you we have taken a very close look at this. We have gone thoroughly over the report that you've submitted and we had questions that as far as we're aware have not been answered. Again, the drain field has not been proven to meet FAA standards and function at its current location. We need to remove it from the primary safety area.

			with everyone involved to discuss it creatively. Modern materials are being used successfully for fire engine access, and I believe this approach could work here as well, but it would require looking at the situation as an opportunity, rather than closing the door on it quickly.	
9.4	**Bruce Bennett**	*Positive Aurora Airport Management*	I had recommended the acre of land that's available midfield that would connect the taxiway to the state ramp be put on the priority purchase status and I was wondering if I am ahead of myself, or has that change been made to the preferred alternative?	**David Miller, CWE:** The basic change regarding the circulation road is that the proposal presented in PAC meetings 7 and 8 to add a vehicle service road on the airport was removed from the preferred alternative. The connections between the existing off-airport circulation road and the airport remain unchanged in the preferred alternative. The modification involves adjusting the alternative to create connections to the existing off-airport roads.
			I'm confused by this situation. The last plan proposed spending hundreds of millions on a parallel taxiway and vehicle roadway, which I thought was outrageous and absurd because it would involve destroying all the major hangars at the airport. It seemed totally unrealistic. That plan claimed there was a need for both vehicle and aircraft circulation, but really, by adding just 1.07 acres to the state's ramp, the south end of the airport could be connected, which is currently cut off. Right now, only the north half of the airport is accessible from the main state ramp, and I just don't understand why this hasn't been addressed.	**Tony Beach, ODAV:** The way that the preferred alternative shows potential for property acquisition on all of the property and aeronautical use. We believe that it currently reflects the comments about acquiring the property that I believe you're commenting on.
			I did make it an option, which is a step forward. However, part of it is marked with yellow hashes, indicating it's a priority purchase, and I think this is important because it could make a significant difference, like reducing a thousand feet of restricted taxiway. I had recommended multiple times that this be placed on the priority purchase list, not just as a "someday" possibility. It may seem small, but it's a significant	**David Miller, CWE:** The identification of the property in light yellow on the various alternatives which has been identified as reserve, doesn't preclude a more timely acquisition. If the owner of the property approaches ODAV proposing that ODAV acquire it for a specific purpose, there's nothing about reserve designation that would prevent that. I think identifying it is a good example of why identifying aeronautical use lands in the reserve

			improvement for runway access and aircraft flow. I agree that a full-length parallel taxiway would be ideal, but due to space constraints, it's impossible. This compromise would cost far less and is much more achievable in the near future. I also agree with the need to address the septic systems as efficiently and cost-effectively as possible, and I appreciate the steps taken in the refined preferred alternative. It's a significant improvement that avoids removing all the hangars, which is great progress. We need to remember that we are not aiming to be like PDX. It's important to make safety improvements while keeping our operations reasonable and manageable. The goal is to ensure safety without unnecessary growth, focusing on making the airport safer for current aircraft operations, which have been happening since 1976. There's no intent to drastically change or grow, just to improve what we have.	sense is good because it leaves options available and that is part of that evaluation.
9.5	**Tony Helbling**	*Aurora Airport Improvement Association*	Tony, you mentioned earlier, and I do agree with you, that we do need to bring the RSA into conformity. I don't disagree with that. I think we've suggested two ways to do it. One is the email, and one is the Geotech system that we've suggested. What I've heard you say is that "we" looked at the proposed alternative for the Geotech fabric and decided that it was unacceptable.	**Tony Beach, ODAV:** We've reviewed the information submitted about the drain field, but we haven't received sufficient responses to our questions to feel confident that the proposed improvements will meet standards. We've had many discussions on the issue, and our consultants and engineers, along with the FAA, have agreed that the drain fields need to be removed from the runway safety area. **Brandy Steffen, JLA:** It sounds like there's some clarification needed, and we'll circle back and get you an answer. The details you're asking about might be available in the materials posted on the project website. **David Miller, CWE:** Aurora State Airport is owned and managed by ODAV, a Department of the State of Oregon. Decisions and determinations made regarding the

			For the record, I need you to define who "we" are and what their qualifications were to make that determination. I understand your position, but I'm asking who made the decision to reject the geotextile fabric solution. We submitted the report recently, and we haven't received any questions from ODAV. I'd like to know who made the subjective decision about the fabric's acceptability, because I'm not hearing who exactly determined it was unacceptable.	Airport are made by the Agency. The individuals with specific management responsibilities, including the Director and agency managers, represent the decisions made on behalf of the agency. These individuals are also tasked with coordination with the ODAV board. **Tony Beach, ODAV:** I just wanted to make sure we're clear about the drain field topic. The information on the drain field improvements and the GeoWeb technical overview is available on the public project website, specifically under PAC meeting number eight. This includes the attachments and email correspondence regarding the issues, including where the conversation left off in February 2022 with the lessee and their engineer, as well as discussions between ODAV staff and Century West engineers. I also want to point out that the correspondence details the questions that were asked and not answered, so it's clear we have been actively seeking answers, but some were still left unresolved.
9.6	**Patrick Donaldson**	*Wilsonville Chamber of Commerce*	Since the beginning, we've been under the impression that the airport master plan would include an assessment of the economic impacts, including the displacement of businesses and employees, whether temporarily or permanently. This would be in line with the financial and economic considerations mentioned in the original documents. Despite our repeated requests and a letter sent on January 21st, we haven't seen this analysis. We've been told these discussions would happen, but they haven't, and we haven't been included in any talks about it. Because of this, the Wilsonville Area Chamber of Commerce cannot endorse the final report in its current form, as it lacks credible analysis on the economic impact to our regional businesses and communities.	**David Miller, CWE:** Economic impact analysis is not typically included in FAA master plan scopes of work, and it wasn't part of our FAA-approved scope for this project. As for the impact of things like the Hubbard highway shift, we've evaluated property acquisition at a conceptual level, which is appropriate for a master plan. The more detailed analysis, such as environmental evaluations and right-of-way assessments, will happen during the ODOT highway design process. The master plan simply outlines a path forward to meet FAA standards, but the specifics of design adjustments are yet to be determined. Regarding the drain field, until an alternative location is identified, we can't fully evaluate or quantify the potential impacts on tenants or users. If the drain field is relocated off ODAV property, it's difficult to assess

			I feel like this is a simple question: why haven't we received an economic impact analysis? We were promised it would happen, but it hasn't. I'm concerned that something isn't as transparent as it should be, and as we were promised, and that this process is repeating the mistakes of previous efforts, where too many questions went unanswered. So, I just want to know: will we receive that analysis or not?	any economic impact on adjacent property owners or tenants, and it's not part of the master plan to evaluate this. That being said, for FAA-funded projects, each element is subject to environmental review, which does include some economic impact analysis. Once the concepts are further developed, more detailed analyses will come, but they will be part of the implementation process, not the current phase. So, while we understand the concern, the detailed economic impact analysis will come later. I would say it's not a misrepresentation. In any master plan, there are practical limitations defined by the FAA-approved scope. Economic analysis and business plans typically aren't funded by the FAA as part of the master plan. Does this mean the analysis won't be needed later for project design? No, it just means that the level of analysis required will be determined by decision-makers like the FAA for NEPA assessments or ODOT for highway impacts. The purpose of the master plan is to identify key issues for the future, and many require action in later phases. As for the economic impact analysis, the final alternative did consider business and employee impacts, but not in the level of detail you're asking. It's common for master planning to not have this level of detail upfront, it's something that becomes clearer during the design and implementation phases.
			Just to clarify, I believe you're saying that the details and impacts will be forthcoming, but we're not at a point where we can identify them yet. I understand that, but I want to confirm: if we get to the end of this process and those impacts and costs haven't been addressed, would that be a misrepresentation of what was initially communicated in the original covenant	Thank you. One last thing is that perhaps you've been involved with environmental assessments or environmental impact statement documents. It's important to point out that when a project that's proposed from a master plan is being implemented, the first stage of implementation might be

			between this project and the participants, public and panelists? Well, when things become more real, I would respectfully request that we all return back to the original commitment that was made at the process about what is an airport master plan, what was represented and whether or not we have met that test. At this point, I would suggest that the chamber does not believe that covenant has been fulfilled. So, I'll leave it at that.	environmental evaluation. That process is entirely separate from an airport master planning process and the evaluation is specific to the contemplated design for that project. The FAA is not bound by the recommendation of the master plan. They must reach an independent finding that the project will not create significant impacts on communities or areas so that level of analysis is not typically found in the airport master plan. When projects are going forward with the environmental process, the FAA will be involved and we'll cover some of those same issues.
9.7	**Bruce Bennett** (in the chat)	*Positive Aurora Airport Management*	It sounds like something very technical is being decided anecdotally, regarding the drain fields?	Thank you for your comment
9.8	**Tony Helbling** (in the chat)	*Aurora Airport Improvement Association*	Where in the previous meeting notes are questions from ODAV to anyone regarding of the geo tech fabric information submitted into testimony in the last few months? And why would ODAV only tell us tonight they've not received answers to questions they've asked so they are moving forward with a plan to remove the drain fields?	Comment continued below. See response to Comment 9.9.
9.9	**Tony Helbling** (in the chat)	*Aurora Airport Improvement Association*	For the record - I now understand you are referring to questions discussed in 2021. That entire discussion was tabled by Betty Stansbury on phone call with me because she asked for help gathering data for a Century West survey to ALL the airport users. Now using that thread and the unanswered questions that were tabled to make a based decision on a submittal in the last two months... that is a weak argument and I don't accept it. the submitted study needs to be considered in this master plan process.	The documentation submitted has been evaluated and found to be missing pertinent details which have been requested but not received. Until the time when the requested information is provided, ODAV is reserving judgment in order to evaluate a complete proposal.
9.10	**Ben Williams**	*Friends of French Prairie*	What is the normal planning horizon for an FAA approved master plan? Once it is reviewed by the FAA and approved, how long does it take to go into effect and become adopted?	**David Miller, CWE:** FAA master plans have a 20-year planning horizon. Since this process has taken longer, the forecast was based on an earlier year. The plan's timeline extends 20 years from the approval of the forecast, placing it into the

				early 2040s (e.g., 2021–2041 or 2024–2044). Most airports, especially one the size of Aurora State Airport, typically update their master plans more frequently than every 20 years as conditions and standards change. This new master plan will replace the previous one adopted in 2012.
			Your last statement was incorrect. The 2012 master plan was never officially adopted, according to the Oregon Court of Appeals. Given the typical 20-year planning horizon for a master plan, why does the capital improvement plan include another master plan listed for funding beyond 2023?	The expectation is that within the next 20 years, another master plan update will be required, likely beyond 10 years. The exact timing depends on priorities and project progress. It is just a reflection of the fact that that an airport like Aurora needs master planning to be done on a fairly regular basis, so funding is allocated accordingly. While the plan covers 20 years, FAA and ODAV will need to set aside funds for updates before then.
			Are you saying that, based on your mention of 10 years, you expect all the long-term projects listed in the table to be completed within that timeframe?	No, there's no assumption that all long-term projects will be completed within 10 years. Master plans outline a broad list of projects, but due to funding constraints and implementation challenges, many long-term projects often get pushed beyond the 20-year horizon. This is common in airport planning, as priorities shift and funding availability affects timelines. The current master plan identifies projects based on forecasted demand and updated standards, but when the next update happens will depend on evolving conditions and coordination with the FAA.
9.11	**Brian Asher**	*Mayor, City of Aurora*	Thanks for all the work over the 4 years.	Thank you for your participation in the PAC.
9.12	**Ted Millar**	*AABC/TLM Holdings*	It's my understanding that ODAV needs to expand the airport boundary on the ALP to include improvements like Keil Road. However, I don't see the airport use boundary shown on the new master plan. Does the boundary for through-the-fence access and future purchases	**David Miller, CWE:** The FAA requires the airport layout plan (ALP) to show the existing airport property line based on ownership, not use. ODAV's grant obligations extend to this boundary. When property acquisitions are planned, a future airport property line is also shown, as

			include the entire area between the roadway boundary and the newly indicated acquisition areas? It's my understanding that those have to be included in the airport boundary to be able to be eligible. Is that correct? All buildings on the airport, which are under private ownership through the "through the fence" agreement, are not shown within the airport use boundary. These areas should be included in the airport use boundary, as they make up 56% of the airport land and are essential for airport operations, even though they are privately owned. To be able to purchase areas like the Keil Road and aeronautical reserve in the future, they must be shown within the airport use boundary on the master plan to meet the requirements and avoid legal issues. It should be more clearly labeled to reflect future airport boundaries or airport use. Showing it as potential acquisition is insufficient without clearly identifying it as part of the airport boundary for eligibility.	seen in the yellow areas. The aeronautical use areas to the east are noted in the drawing and data sheet, but the FAA prioritizes the official property line. The future property acquisitions will be identified in a reserve capacity but not as part of the current airport boundary. These acquisitions depend on willing sellers and do not require identifying specific parcels in advance. The plan acknowledges these areas as potential future acquisitions. The area (on the ALP) is marked by a magenta line. This line borders the parcels in question, and a note on the plan acknowledges that these parcels are captured within the airport layout plan, meeting the necessary requirements. **Tony Beach, ODAV:** The airport boundary Ted is referring to is a state-level distinction, which is not the same as what is shown on the federally prescribed airport layout plan. The magenta line on the plan indicates areas for potential property acquisition. **David Miller, CWE:** The magenta line and the notes on the plan indicate the areas as reserves that meet the FAA's requirements for acquisition in cases where there's a willing seller. ODAV is covered with the current depiction of these boundaries, including developed and undeveloped areas as part of the plan's provisions.
9.13	**Tony Helbling**	*Aurora Airport Improvement Association*	The CIP is not showing a runway extension until 2030, correct?	**David Miller, CWE:** The runway extension project is expected to start around 2030 or later, as there are several factors at play. Right now, the priority is rehabilitating the existing runway, which the FAA will fund for maintenance but not upgrades. The current runway will be maintained and its strength will be preserved, but no extension will happen at this stage. The FAA's expectation is that the non-standard conditions for the current runway will

				be corrected before a project is considered for extension. The implementation phase is in itself complicated. Tim House at the FAA has stated that they're looking for a plan with clear targets and understand that it will be a multi-step process taking many years. If progress is made toward meeting standards, it could affect the timing for the runway extension. There's a lot of work to be done before the FAA would seriously consider funding an extension.
			I don't appreciate how ODAV has controlled this process. It is not collaborative. I'm concerned that the Environmental Assessment might not start until 2030, and with potential opposition and lawsuits, it could push things out to 2035 or even later. This is a safety issue that needs to be addressed sooner. Also, I want to clarify something about the drain field easements and issues. The questions Tony Beach mentioned were tabled back in 2021 before this master plan even began. Those questions weren't relevant to this plan or the recent submission. Betty Stansbury asked me, as chair of HDSE, to table the discussion on geotextile fabric, and I agreed. At the time, Century West was managing separate septic work, not even involving James Kirby or Dave Miller's group. It was the Spokane group. They sent out a survey to assess how much effluent the airport was producing, but no one responded. I worked with Betty to gather that data for Century West. There was a discussion about porting all the effluent from the airport and the drain field going away, but it eventually disappeared. Now, to claim that those old technical questions are the reason we're not considering the geotextile fabric in the master plan doesn't make sense. Betty, the previous Director at ODAV, tabled those questions. It's absurd to say that's the reason for not considering it	

			and not even define who made that decision. This master plan is being pushed through without addressing the drain field issue properly. I won't just sit back and let this go through without ensuring it's on the record that it's unjustified and unconscionable.	
9.14	**Tony Helbling** (in the chat)	*Aurora Airport Improvement Association*	Identifying land use needs including adjacent property is an FAA requirement! That was not my entire question!!! unmute me please.	Airport land use and surrounding property land use was identified in Chapter 2 and evaluated in Chapter 4. The existing and future land use of the airport and surrounding area will also be depicted on the Land Use Plan sheet of the ALP.
9.15	**Austin Barnes**	*Marion County Planning Dept. Planning Organization*	Nothing to add.	Thank you for your participation in the PAC.
9.16	**Bill Graupp**	*Aurora CTE, Inc.*	None.	Thank you for your participation in the PAC.
9.17	**Brian Asher**	*Mayor, City of Aurora*	What percentage of these projects have been adjusted for inflation?	**David Miller, CWE:** Yes, the engineering cost estimates for the capital improvement program (CIP) were based on 2024 dollars. The common method for accounting for inflation in airport master plans is to use these 2024 dollars as a starting point. Airport management can then adjust the costs based on the change in the Consumer Price Index (CPI) when projects are planned in future years, whether that's 3, 10, or 15 years down the road. We can't precisely predict future inflation, so a base year (2024) CPI value allows costs to be adjusted in the future. The general expectation is that 2024-based costs will increase over time. As projects are implemented in the future, the (future) CPI will reflect these adjustments. It is reasonable to assume that over the next seven to ten years, and beyond, inflation will continue to push cost increases.
9.18	**Cathryn Stephens**	*ODAV Board*	I am the Oregon Aviation Board liaison. We've been having updates on a regular basis at our board	Thank you for your participation in the PAC.

			meetings and look forward to having additional updates as this process moves forward. Thanks to everyone.	
9.19	**Councilor Anne Shevlin**	*City of Wilsonville*	As a newly elected counselor for the city of Wilsonville, I'm honored to serve in this position. I wanted to express that the city is disappointed with the outcome of a four-year process that recommended spending $185 million for a runway extension, which could increase to $200-220 million. This includes the condemnation of private properties, relocation of State Highway 550, and improvements aimed at making the airport safer, but ultimately benefiting only a small number of interests while negatively impacting the surrounding communities. The process overlooked key issues, including municipal governance concerns, surface water and groundwater contamination, inadequate wastewater treatment, DEQ violations, FAA standards, stormwater pollution affecting endangered fish, toxic chemical pollution, and PFAS accumulation. Additionally, there were no studies on firefighting capacity or noise complaints from residents about low-flying aircraft. As we move into the next phase of this process, I want to thank the FAA for their participation and express that the city will continue to monitor the situation to ensure safety improvements and airport operations are addressed appropriately.	Thank you for your comments and participation in the PAC. Many of the concerns that you site are evaluated as part of the federal NEPA environmental process that precedes individual federally funded projects. However, they are outside the scope of this airport master plan.
9.20	**Dave Mauk**	*Charbonneau Country Club*	Thanks to Councilor Shevlin for her comments that she just made. How many acres does ODAV control now at the airport? How many acres are they conceivably going to control at the airport using the dotted lines that Ted Millar was walked through?	**David Miller, CWE:** The preliminary breakouts of property had identified approximate acreages, which will be shown on the draft airport layout plan. **Tony Beach, ODAV:** The existing property acreage and the future acquisition details can be found in the inventory chapter and the preferred alternative, which is number four. I was looking through the refined preferred alternative and found on

				page 19 out of 30 in tonight's presentation that it shows 25 acres for priority property acquisition and 153 acres in property acquisition reserves. I just wanted to close the loop on that. **Tony Beach, ODAV** (in the chat): The state has 140 acres at the Aurora State Airport, as explained on page 2-4 of Draft Working Paper 1.
9.21	**David Waggoner**	*Willamette Aviation*	While the Aurora Airport is a major economic driver for the surrounding areas, including Wilsonville, Canby, and Aurora, its impact is undeniable. However, despite this, I find it completely unacceptable that we would even consider taking private property from owners and businesses on the west side of Hubbard Cutoff Highway. I believe we need to explore alternative options to avoid this.	Thank you for your comments and participation in the PAC. As has been stated throughout the planning process. FAA has been consistent and clear in their guidance that there must be a plan to bring the ROFA and RSA up to FAA standards before any further runway improvements will be eligible for federal funding assistance. The alternatives evaluated options to bring the ROFA into standards, which all options had an impact to an adjacent property. Through the alternatives evaluation and the input provided by the PAC and public, ODAV has selected the option that was least impactful.
9.22	**Jamie Stickel**	*City of Canby*	Thanks for your presentation, David. I know there's a lot of information, and I appreciate how clearly you laid it all out. My question is, you mentioned that the percentage eligible for FAA funding could be up to 90%, depending on the project. I just want to clarify, is the local match through ODAV, or who would be responsible for that match? My second point is more of a comment. I understand there have been requests to hold these meetings in person, but since that's not possible, I think it would help if the ODAV representatives kept their cameras on and felt more engaged in the meeting. It might help bridge the gap between the PAC and ODAV, rather than just jumping in with an answer and then turning their video off.	**David Miller, CWE:** That would be the owner of the airport, in this case ODAV. The local match doesn't always have to come from just one source. Depending on the project, other funds could contribute, such as tenant-related improvements. Some airports are run by cities or towns, while others are owned by counties. In those cases, the local match could come from local governments or the State Department of Aviation. And in terms of the percentage, 90% is typically what we see for FAA funding.

9.23	**Jon Bickford**	*Atlantic Aviation*	No answer.	Thank you for your participation in the PAC.
9.24	**Melissa Ahrens**	*Oregon Dept of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD)*	No questions or comments, thank you.	Thank you for your participation in the PAC.
9.25	**Naomi Zwerdling**	*ODOT*	I also have no comments, thank you.	Thank you for your participation in the PAC.
9.26	**Pam Barlow Lind**	*Confederated Tribes of the Siletz Indians*	No comments, thank you.	Thank you for your participation in the PAC.
9.27	**Patrick Donaldson**	*Wilsonville Chamber of Commerce*	Looking at the chart for the capital improvement plan, I see both short-term projects for the next four to five years and long-term projects for 30 years or more. I've already commented on the economic displacement this will cause in people's lives, homes, businesses, and communities. This will happen over an extended period, not overnight. Economists can quickly calculate the impact, so it's not difficult to determine. Also, I noticed in the second chart about long-term projects, there's an estimate of $1 million for the next airport master plan. I remember from our first meeting that the cost for the contract between the FAA, ODAV, and the consultants was around $900,000, but I've heard that those costs have gone up. My question is, how much has been spent on this project so far, beyond the original estimate? And does the $1 million estimate on the chart now seem too low? Finally, I want to echo a quote I've heard before, "What FAA has joined together, let no person put asunder." It's interesting that although there were differences of opinion at the start of this process, ODAV has brought all these opposing forces together towards a common conclusion. Unfortunately, it feels like this project is heading off course. I'm really	**Tony Beach, ODAV:** I don't have the exact total amount for the grant, but it was discussed in previous meetings. What I can say is that we've definitely gone over both the time and the budget for this project. This is because we wanted to have such a thorough discussion, which included additional meetings beyond what was initially planned for the project. The goal was always to make sure we had a robust discussion. **Kenji Sugahara, ODAV:** A lot of the money that was spent beyond the original budget was to gather additional public comment and get more information to make sure we had a more robust discussion. I just want to clarify that this was all to enhance public involvement.

			disappointed that we've invested so much time, effort, and money into it, and I agree with the concerns raised by others. There's still an opportunity to get this back on track.	
9.28	**Whitney Stewart**	*Oregon Office of Emergency Management*	For the CIP and Master Plan, was there any consideration given to seismic improvements or general resiliency of the airport, particularly in terms of emergency preparedness? I was wondering if that was included in any of these potential plans.	**David Miller, CWE:** I'd say that when any engineering analysis is done for reconstruction, whether it's a runway, taxiway, or any other facility, resiliency is certainly considered. However, at this stage, I don't think specific seismic upgrades were included, though I could be wrong. As a project unfolds over the next 5, 10, or 15 years, the regulatory requirements and design standards may change, and whatever is applicable and appropriate at that time will likely be included in the effort.
9.29	**Aron Faegre**	*Helicopter Transport Service; AABC/TLM Holdings*	I wanted to clarify that both drain fields being discussed here have DEQ licenses and are regularly inspected. There are no violations, and they are fully functional. During a major earthquake, urban sewer systems are expected to be down for about a year. Aurora is an important airport with capabilities recognized by agencies like DOGAMI and it plays a key role in disaster response, like in California fires, where it's needed for aviation operations. Many of the helicopters fighting these fires come from Aurora. Additionally, I want to clarify that there are no violations at these drain fields. To clarify a previous point, some questions weren't answered because the previous director put it on hold, and I had suggested bringing in the two Geotechs for their expertise. They would likely agree, as they share staff between their companies, GRI and NV5. I hope this issue stays alive for further discussion, as I believe there are good solutions using modern technology. I'm also disappointed that the EMAS system, which works at other airports, was dismissed without much explanation. It would allow us to keep the drain fields in place. Lastly, the modification of standards seems to go	Thank you for your comments.

			against national advisory circulars, and I hope Oregon is not being singled out for some reason. I just want to ensure that what works for other airports can be applied here as well. Thank you.	
9.30	**Ben Williams**	*Friends of French Prairie*	I noticed there are two empty signature blocks at the bottom of the ALP. To follow up on my earlier comment about the Court of Appeals ruling the 2012 master plan invalid because it wasn't properly adopted and approved by the aviation board, the ALP that went with that plan was signed by Mitch Weipert, the then Director of the aviation department. However, the department couldn't provide documentation showing that the aviation board delegated authority to Mitch Swecker to sign the ALP on their behalf before submitting it to the FAA. Also, the project timeline shows the final document being delivered after FAA review in May. What's the plan for approval and adoption by the aviation board after that? Specifically, who will sign the ALP on behalf of Oregon? I understand there's a section on next steps, but I want to make sure these questions are addressed.	The remaining steps in the airport master plan process were outlined in the presentation available on the project website. Those steps are also listed below: • Prepare the Draft Final Report • Submit Draft ALP to FAA for Obstruction Evaluation/Airport Airspace Analysis (OE/AAA) review & post on project website for public information • Submit Draft Final Report to FAA for review & post on project website for public information • Once ALP & report are reviewed and approved, FAA and ODAV will sign ALP • Project Closeout with FAA • ODAV Board Adoption Process
9.31	**Bruce Bennett**	*Positive Aurora Airport Management*	There's a huge problem right next to a possible huge solution. The runway lengthening is needed for safety, especially for our neighbors, and it's been part of the plan since 1976. Originally, it was 1,000 feet, but now it's been reduced to 500 feet; still a significant compromise, but an improvement. This should be the top priority, and for it not to be included in the capital improvement plan is criminal. We've discussed safe, approved ways to avoid disrupting the neighbors and spending excessive money, such as moving the road, which is more economical. The airport will only ever be developed on one side due to that highway, so moving the road and taking that property isn't necessary. Getting the runway lengthening and	FAA has consistently stated that before runway improvements would be eligible for funding, the non-standard ROFA and RSA must be addressed. The proposed CIP prioritizes projects that will mitigate those nonstandard conditions. Timing of runway improvements will be based on the timing for completion of the nonstandard conditions.

			the ASAP done in the next few years is imperative.	
9.32	**Ted Millar**	*AABC/TLM Holdings*	I have two questions. First, is it possible to add the internal circulation road on private property that was shown in the 2012 master plan and has been submitted multiple times for this plan? It's not about who pays for it, but I believe there are ways to fund it that minimize the expense for ODAV or the FAA. It's a safety issue because this isn't like Portland International—this is a collaborative, commercial service airport where different entities need to work together without having to go out onto the highway. Second, I understand that ODAV needs to expand the airport boundary to include the Keil Road area and the entire aeronautical reserve. Just marking it as a future boundary isn't enough, and I'd like to see that addressed. If we don't have time tonight, I'd like to request one additional PAC work session so we can discuss these solutions collaboratively. I believe we're not that far apart, and we can find a win-win solution if we just sit down and talk through the options.	**Tony Beach, ODAV:** In our last meeting on December 10th, we discussed the vehicle service road and clarified some points. We asked the PAC for clarification regarding the internal circulation road after receiving a lot of feedback against the vehicle service road due to its impact on the existing hangars. We also explained that, as David mentioned, we can't show off-airport improvements like those that ODAV would undertake without property acquisition. Right now, what we're showing is the potential for property acquisition, which could allow us to proceed with something like the proposed internal circulation road if there's a willing seller. We believe this approach can work.
9.33	**Tony Helbling**	*Aurora Airport Improvement Association*	I have a different opinion on the airport boundary issue. My understanding is that the FAA won't provide funding for anything outside the defined airport boundary. This creates a catch-22. The FAA won't fund it unless it's within the airport boundary, but you don't want to include it because you don't own the property yet. I disagree with this approach, especially considering the potential for internal circulation roads that could save a lot of money. It doesn't make sense to me. Regarding the airport boundary, as Ben Williams pointed out, the state treats the ALP as a land use document. What we do now impacts future land use laws in Oregon. It doesn't make sense why the state wouldn't include properties you plan to purchase as part of the airport boundary. This would ensure you own	**Tony Beach, ODAV:** I think there's a bit of a misunderstanding here. The airport layout plan is showing both the current airport property and the future property acquisition, as required by FAA standards. What I believe you're referring to is a different issue. We're showing the current property line and the future line for property acquisition to meet FAA requirements. So, I think we're talking about two different things—current and future property configurations over the 20-year planning period.

			everything you consider part of the airport, and I don't understand why that's being avoided. The challenge we're facing is that this process feels less collaborative, as we're being presented with the airport layout plan for the first time and then expected to defend it. We can't see the details properly, especially when it's on small screens. You're asking us to comment on something we can't fully digest or understand, and it's frustrating. I also want to point out the yellow area on the east side of the current Ehlan Road. Where is the state airport boundary depicted there? We need to be able to see the full layout, not just presented at the last minute during a Zoom meeting and posted online during the meeting. It's hard to make informed comments when we don't have time to fully review the plan. Even Ben Williams agrees with me.	**Brandy Steffen, JLA:** I understand your concerns, Tony. That's why we decided to keep the comments open until the 25th, to give everyone more time to review. I hear you that the layout plan wasn't presented beforehand, and we tried to post it during the meeting so you could access it as quickly as possible and take a look.
			What's frustrating is that we've talked about this several times, and this is the third meeting in a row where the materials aren't presented to us beforehand. Instead, we see them during the meeting and are then asked to give feedback right after. In previous master plans, we had the chance to study things beforehand and work with our teams to form meaningful discussion. This current discussion isn't meaningful because we haven't had time to review the material. Also, I don't understand the difference between the future Keil Road line and the aeronautical reserve near Airport Road, as both need to be acquired, and we want the FAA to fund them. From what I've heard, if it's not in the airport boundary, the FAA won't pay for it.	**Tony Beach, ODAV:** To clarify, this airport layout plan is a technical drawing that we submit to the FAA for their review and approval to ensure it meets their standards. It's based on the refined preferred alternative we've been sharing with the PAC since June 2024, including updates in July, October, and January. The FAA reviews this plan to verify that the airport meets all necessary standards, and all the overlays and information included reflect the details we've shared with the PAC over the last six months.
			Can somebody show me on the ALP that is sitting on the computer in front of me right now, the difference between the line that is going to run on the future Keil Road and the aeronautical reserve line. If we had received this beforehand, we could have plotted it out on a large	**David Miller, CWE:** The resolution of this large image makes it difficult to distinguish details clearly. We have multiple lines competing for space, such as the realigned access road, which is positioned along the future property line. To clarify, the acquisition is necessary to move that

			piece of paper, understood it better, and made more effective recommendations or decisions. My question for David is, why wouldn't we extend the airport boundary from the yellow area to the east all the way to Airport Road and down to Arndt Road, including all of that in the airport boundary? Why wouldn't we do that?	section of Keil Road out of the object-free area. The property line would run along the outer perimeter of the realigned road. A full-size plot or enlarged view would make this clearer. The distinction here is that the priority property acquisition, shown in yellow, is necessary to meet FAA design standards. The other property identified as reserve isn't. If ODAV were to consider acquiring the entire magenta area, there would likely be significant pushback. Some PAC members even debated whether the reserve property should be included at all. The priority is to acquire property needed to meet FAA standards, while other potential acquisitions, like adjacent properties or pieces of land, are not necessary for those standards but could be pursued if they become available. This process allows for the possibility of FAA funding, though it's not guaranteed. Additionally, updates to the airport layout plan can be made between master plan cycles, allowing for adjustments as opportunities arise, such as if an individual hangar owner wanted to sell. **Tony Beach, ODAV:** David, you've touched on it, and we've discussed this in earlier PAC meetings and in the first couple of chapters. ODAV is the airport sponsor for Aurora State Airport, which has federal grant assurances for airport operation and master planning. Having an up-to-date airport layout plan is a key part of those requirements. This master plan is focused on the state facility at Aurora State Airport, and while we don't control changes outside state property, the layout plan reflects the current and future configurations for that state facility. That's why it's presented this way.
9.34	**Ben Williams**	*Friends of French Prairie*	The resolution on the screen version of the ALP is so bad, even when you zoom in, you can't read the fine print. (Response to Tony Helbling) Absolutely. We're all in the same boat	Thank you for your comment.

			now. Everybody hates the master plan.	
9.35	**Brian Asher**	*Mayor, City of Aurora*	I will be leaving the meeting for our council meeting	Thanks for your participation in the PAC.
9.36	**Tony Helbling**	*Aurora Airport Improvement Association*	Please let the record show the presentation was not made available on the web site till 6:32... 1.5 hours into the PAC meeting!!!!!	Thank you for your comment.
9.37	**Patrick Donaldson** (in the chat)	*Wilsonville Chamber of Commerce*	Thank you and Senator Johnson for focused and articulate comments. As Gregg Clapper used to say, "Shine a little light on them and see how they scamper."	Thank you for your comment.
9.38	**Tony Helbling**	*Aurora Airport Improvement Association*	I see a conflict here. What I hear from the consultants and ODAV is that the area outside the state property line is not the airport boundary. But in previous chapters, we've based aircraft there. George Van Hoomisson pointed out that we're excluding hangars where those aircraft are actually parked. So how do we justify calling them based aircraft at Aurora when they aren't sitting on state property? I know the answer you're going to give me, but my point is: Aurora is a through-the-fence airport. We need a collaborative effort that includes those properties in the airport boundary. I get what a master plan is, but there's a breakdown—we're counting aircraft for runway justification and safety, but then saying we can't count the hangars where those based aircraft sit. How can they be based at the airport if you're telling me they're not at the airport? Also, David keeps referring back to nine meetings ago, but we submitted significant information two meetings ago. Tony mentioned it in the record, but it seems like consideration was already given to this issue before the master plan even started. The timeline doesn't match in my head. The drain field technical questions; our submission from two	This question was answered in the meeting. Please see response to comment 9.40 below. It appears that you are referring to the runway length justification. Runway length is justified using documented operations counts by all aircraft that use the runway. Based aircraft counts are not considered in justifying runway length, nor in determining other airside requirements. Previously addressed. Please see comment 9.9 and response.

			months ago, was essentially dismissed because of questions that were unanswered before this master plan began. That doesn't make logical sense, and I want that on the record. I don't expect an answer to either one.	
9.39	**Ted Millar**	*AABC/TLM Holdings*	Is there any reason we couldn't include all of the through-the-fence property since the legislature has designated this as a through-the-fence airport? This is a cluster of airport businesses, which is completely different from a Portland International-type airport. Why can't all the through-the-fence properties be designated as part of the airport, even if they aren't owned by ODAV?	**David Miller, CWE:** In general, the FAA wants to see access points for through-the-fence development on the ALP. They don't expect details or dimensional standards for those properties since they aren't subject to FAA rules or eligible for FAA funding. One thing to be added to the ALP is the location of through-the-fence areas according to the agreements tenants have with ODAV. This will identify those locations, including common access points used by multiple property owners. Regarding the counting of based aircraft off airport property, the FAA allowed this for a time but typically does not count those aircraft, making an exception for the significant number of aircraft based off ODAV property.
9.40	**Tony Helbling**	*Aurora Airport Improvement Association*	I appreciate the chance to speak. The point I'm making is that we're a unique airport because we're through the fence. The FAA's decision to count based aircraft from through the fence properties shows they recognize those properties as important to the airport. This goes back to Ted's question—if the FAA considers those aircraft as based at the airport, why can't we just extend the airport boundary to include the through the fence properties? You've basically answered that question already. The point I'm making is that if this process were truly collaborative, we could all work together, you (David), Tim, Ben, and everyone else, to figure this out. Instead, we're presented with a document only after the meeting starts, and then we're expected to review it on a screen. If we had discussions like this earlier, we could propose potential solutions to the FAA	**David Miller, CWE:** I want to clarify that while the FAA allowed the inclusion of through-the-fence aircraft in our base aircraft count, this did not change the scope of the master plan. The plan was always intended to be a facility plan for ODAV-owned property, and while the FAA recognized the importance of those aircraft, they made it clear there would be no facility planning for those through-the-fence properties. We've adhered to that. However, the master plan will include detailed descriptions and notations about these areas, and their significance and limitations according to FAA rules will be clearer when you review the final report. Note: FAA sent an email dated 12/9/2021 to ODAV stating "*An aircraft that is stored off airport property but has access to the airfield via a through-the-fence (TTF)*

			together. The cost of this project is significant: $99 million compared to the $18 million from the 2012 AOP with a smaller runway extension. Given ODAV's current funding, I don't see how they can match the required $10 million to even get this project started.	*agreement is not considered "based" on the airport. However, the operations (takeoffs and landings) by these aircraft are included in the airport operations counts."*
9.41	**Ted Millar**	*AABC/TLM Holdings*	I just want to add that part of the through the fence agreement is that all the private enterprise airplanes and hangars pay a monthly fee per airplane to comply with FAA requirements. Additionally, we have a public-private partnership where the entire airport, including private and state property, is fenced, and the private property owners have paid their fair share. This arrangement has been in place for 25 years and goes beyond just FAA funding, as it includes the monthly fees paid by the through the fence airplanes.	Thank you for your comment.
9.42	**Ben Williams**	*Friends of French Prairie*	I want to point out a key issue from the last slide. Earlier in the meeting, Tony Beach stated that the ALP follows the master plan and is the final facility plan, but now it seems the ALP is being presented ahead of the master plan. This shift is concerning because, according to Oregon Administrative Rule 738-130-0055, the Aviation Board must adopt the final facility plan and ensure compatibility with local comprehensive plans and statewide goals before adopting the ALP. The situation mirrors a previous issue in 2012 where the Court of Appeals found the Department of Aviation at fault for putting the ALP ahead of the master plan, undermining their responsibility to properly adopt and approve both. This is a serious concern that needs to be addressed. Thanks for clarifying that. Is the implication then that the aviation board will approve and adopt both the master plan and the ALP before it's countersigned by Oregon?	**David Miller, CWE:** To clarify, the intention is that the draft final master plan report and the draft airport layout plan set will be submitted to the FAA simultaneously. The report will include the draft airport layout plan as one of its chapters. From our perspective, these two are connected. If adjustments are made to the airport layout plan during the public or FAA review, those will be reflected in the full plan set and carried forward to the master plan. I don't see any disconnect between this process and the requirements for Oregon rules on local coordination. Our approach assumes that we're working with staff who report to the board, and that any clarification on roles will be determined before documents are submitted to the FAA. By that point, there should be no disconnect between staff and the board, the sequence is as we've laid it out.

9.43	**Dave Mauk**	*Charbonneau Country Club*	I just want to reiterate the need for consideration, clarification, and enforcement of mitigating overflights in Charbonneau and Wilsonville. If another IFR could be established for takeoffs and landings—or approaches, technically—we would really like that to be considered. This has been our request from day one, but unfortunately, it hasn't been incorporated into the plan. I'd be remiss if I didn't bring it up again and push a little for our community. We've tried to be fair in this process, and we ask for the same in return. Thanks.	**Tony Beach, ODAV:** Dave, I appreciate your comments and all the correspondence we've had with Charbonneau and other neighboring communities. Airport noise has been a major topic throughout this master plan process, and we look forward to continuing those discussions.

Attendee Questions/Comments and Responses[2]

ID	Name	Question/Comment	Response
9.44	**Wendie Kellington**	The current draft of the master plan includes "off airport" improvements re Keil Road acquisition area, and the MP designated aeronautical reserve - these are all off airport property and yet are a part of the MP. How is it accurate to say it is a facility plan for the current airport only? It seems more accurate to say that the master plan is a long-term plan for the airport and includes all airport related features and development	The improvements to Keil Road would occur after acquisition of the properties needed to bring the ROFA onto airport property and up to standards. When the necessary property is acquired, it will be brought into the "airport property boundary". Prior to acquisition, identified properties are depicted on the ALP within the "future airport property boundary".
9.45	**George**	If you consider "the airport" to be only the land area that is owned by ODAV, then what do you call all of the other land area that is not owned by ODAV, but is zoned for airport use and is currently in active aeronautical use (for taxilane, hangars, and ramps), and which is identified as being for aeronautic reserve. Is that other area that is not ODAV owned NOT a part of "the airport"? If so, are you saying that both FBOs and most of the aircraft hangars are NOT located on "the airport"???	**David Miller, CWE:** Yes, that's correct. As we discussed at the beginning of this process, about nine PAC meetings ago, this master plan is specifically a facility plan for ODAV-owned property. We recognize that there are aeronautical use facilities adjacent to the airport, and nothing in this plan diminishes that reality. However, projects eligible for funding will be limited to property controlled by ODAV. This is simply an aspect of the airport layout plan process and the FAA approval process. It doesn't change the fact that the airport's operation is unique and complex due to the adjacent private property.
9.46	**Jason Paolo**	What considerations were made for current property owners that would lose their homes	**David Miller, CWE:** This is a preliminary assessment. ODOT has not yet weighed in on their design

[2] Live responses are included, along with additional information/clarification, as needed.

		and/or property as a result of the latest plan preferred by ODAV?	requirements, and it's entirely possible that as the process moves forward, ODOT may change its requirements, potentially lessening the impacts on adjacent properties. We don't know that yet, and we didn't want to presume any outcomes. This is simply an initial look at areas that may be affected. We've approximated the acreage that could be impacted, but until there's a final design, and more importantly, a thorough environmental and design review, this remains a conceptual plan. No specific actions or property owner contacts have been made at this stage. **Tony Beach, ODAV:** The state does have a process for property acquisition and that includes independent appraisals and compensation at a fair market value.
9.47	**Jason Paolo**	I find it hard to believe that the FAA and/or ODAV can spend millions of taxpayer dollars without an economic study and impacts to the surrounding public.	Economic and public impact studies are beyond the scope of this airport master plan. Social and environmental impacts of individual projects may be evaluated in the respective environmental processes.
9.48	**Jason Paolo**	Why aren't these meetings being held in person?	Virtual (Zoom) meetings were chosen as the platform to hold the PAC meetings as they provide increased accessibility and allow the most people, in the PAC and in the public, to attend and participate in the public process.
9.49	**Wendie Kellington**	I agree with Patrick, well said. There are several problems with the current version of the MP. (1) there is no difference between this version and the last in fact because ODAV condemns the hangars just as thoroughly by taking away the septic drain field as condemning the hangars directly. They cannot function. This version is wholly illusory. (2) The state absolutely must pay for the taking of the drain field easement and is responsible to move it to a viable location. It has failed. (3) State is obliged to base its decision on substantial evidence. The assertions that the proposed RSA drain field improvements are not good enough is not supported by substantial evidence. There is no evidence ODAV has considered any of the significant testimony and legal authorities and technical data regarding the proposed RSA	The refined preferred alternative does not condemn any hangars, directly or indirectly. Depicting the removal of the drain fields in the RSA does not mean that the TTF hangars cannot have drain fields. It means that the drain fields cannot be located in the RSA as they are unable support the weight of aircraft and emergency response equipment. Current users of the existing drain fields may consider other sites outside of the RSA (on or off ODAV property) and/or other methods of sewage management.

		improvements to the existing drain field in place. The only evidence in the record is that a G-6 could run over the drain field as it is proposed to be improved. That is hardly inadequate.	
9.50	**George VH**	Do you do any analysis regarding the "bang for the buck" on potential capital improvements? I would think that it would be in the public interest for ODAV to prioritize the potential improvements that can be accomplished most quickly and most cost-effectively in order to provide safety benefits as soon as possible. Does ODAV agree with that strategy?	Projects listed in the CIP are prioritized by need and order of operations. A "bang for the buck" evaluation was not performed.
9.51	**George VH**	Are the ALP and other slides in tonight's presentation on your website? If so, please advise us where they can be found. If not, please post them. Thank you.	The presentation slides are available on the project website.
9.52	**George VH**	Do you do any analysis regarding the "bang for the buck" on potential capital improvements? I would think that it would be in the public interest for ODAV to prioritize the potential improvements that can be accomplished most quickly and most cost-effectively in order to provide safety benefits as soon as possible. Does ODAV agree with that strategy?	Duplicate comment. See response to Comment 9.50 above.
9.53	**George VH**	Isn't the current runway length itself a non-standard condition? (It is shorter than required for the current airport designation.). Why does ODAV want to delay addressing the one non-standard condition that is the MOST important to all airport users, until it first addresses every other non-standard condition?	**David Miller, CWE:** The justification for runway length follows FAA methodology, outlined in Chapter 4 of the facility requirements. There's a difference between a hard standard (like a runway safety area) and a justified runway length. An airport with a shorter-than-justified runway isn't out of compliance; it just hasn't achieved the length it could support. Various reasons can account for that. The FAA won't fund a runway extension until non-standard items identified in the plan are mitigated or addressed. That's why the sequencing of improvements is structured this way.
9.54	**Chris**	Why can't these meeting be held in person?	Virtual (Zoom) meetings were chosen as the platform to hold the PAC meetings as they provide increased accessibility and allow the most people, in the PAC and in the public to attend and participate in the public process.

9.55	**Wendie Kellington**	Brandy, there is more than one person using my computer to participate in this matter. I will speak and then the other person will speak.	Thank you.
9.56	**Bruce Bergman**	What is the reason to acquire the narrow strip of property at the Wylee area. And how will that affect our drain field?	**David Miller, CWE:** The small bump out in that area is due to the proposed aircraft holding area being added to the extension of the parallel taxiway at the Runway 17 end. There is currently no holding area at that end, so that accounts for the slight extension beyond the OFA line for the runway.
9.57	**Jason Paolo**	At what point does the overwhelming opposition to the Aurora airports plans and planning process have any magnitude with the current "planning operatives"?	Thank you for your comment.
9.58	**Brett**	It seems that open community conversation affecting adjacent property owners has been limited on purpose. Many of the adjacent property owners I've talked to are not even aware that the airport is actively planning and working to implement a plan that directly affects their homes, business, and economic viability. To say you need a plan in place first seems to assume the outcome and forceful acceptance of this land grab.	**David Miller, CWE:** The process used by ODOT for state highway right of way acquisition is driven by a series of formal steps including detailed evaluations of environmental and design factors and impacts on affected property owners. As noted previously, the conceptual road layout depicted on the ALP is intended to demonstrate the ability to meet FAA runway object free area design standards. The planning assumptions used in the airport master plan regarding maintaining the width of the existing ODOT ROW and decisions about the future configuration of lanes, signals and other highway components will be evaluated and determined by ODOT in their design process. As noted earlier, the state does have a process for property acquisition and that includes independent appraisals and compensation at a fair market value.

Verbal Public Comment

ID	Name	Question/Comment	Response
9.59	**Wendie Kellington**	I have one more person sharing my computer, but I'll go first. I can't tell you how disappointed I am in this process and this ALP. I don't think ODAV has been honest with participants, and I don't think Century West has either because I believe you	

		know better. So, here's what I think you already know. First, this master plan is no different from the prior version. It still condemns the hangars and businesses, just not directly. Instead, it plans to take the drain field so they can't operate, which is just as much a taking as before. So the idea that we've made progress? No, we haven't. Second, I heard today that we should stop bringing up the drain field issue because the decision is already made. If that's the case, why are we here until 8 p.m. talking about what's supposed to be a public process? This is a state agency making a decision that must be based on substantial evidence, not just ODAV saying, "We think it doesn't meet standards." That's not good enough. There's no actual reason given why the drain field improvements wouldn't meet federal standards. The only evidence in the record says they do meet the standards. ODAV just dismissing that with no justification isn't acceptable. Third, the easement HDOC has for the drain field is a property right. ODAV can't just say, "That's your problem." No, ODAV owes just compensation and severance damages, which could include wiping out all the hangars relying on it. You haven't even considered that. You'd better increase your budget because this is going to be expensive. Next, this idea that ODAV doesn't have to plan for areas outside of its land ownership, or that there's a distinction between the land-use boundary and the federal boundary, just doesn't hold up. ODAV cannot seek or spend federal money on uses not allowed under zoning. That's a grant assurance requirement. Everyone knows it. If ODAV wants to move Keil Road into that EFU-zoned area, you should either increase your litigation budget because you will get sued, or you should expand the state land-use airport boundary. The same goes for the aeronautical reserve—federal money can't be used unless it's zoned correctly. You know this. The legislature gave you a roadmap: expand the land-use boundary. And yes, that has to be reflected in this plan because you are trying to use it for federal funding eligibility. Finally, I want to preserve for the record that I sent a letter objecting to Tony Beach's refusal to allow me to serve as an alternate. Other	Previously addressed. See response to comment 9.49. The existing drain fields in the RSA currently do not meet standards for surface gradient, obstructions, and weight-bearing capacity. The proposal submitted by the users and their consultant has been evaluated and found to be missing pertinent details which have been requested but not received. The master plan identifies the nonstandard condition and needed improvements to meet standards. Coordination on the drain field mitigation will continue beyond the planning process into implementation.

		substitutions have been allowed—like Councilor Shevlin and Aaron Fegri. But when I requested to be an alternate more than a week ago, I was refused—not because it wasn't allowed, but because my message isn't preferred. That's not okay. There are laws against that, and I want my letter included in the record. Thank you.	
9.60	**Betsy Johnson**	I want to thank the department for moving in a more positive direction regarding the hangars and responding to public input. But we shouldn't have had to fight so hard for that. What's unbelievably disappointing is that ODAV is still trying to achieve the same outcome, demolishing the hangars by making them unusable, depriving them of their drain fields. And it's distressing that ODAV refuses to have a real dialogue about how to mitigate this issue. My request is twofold: First, remove the closure of the south-end drain fields from the preferred alternative. Second, engage in meaningful dialogue about mitigation to allow the drain field to remain until an alternative is identified. It's ludicrous for ODAV to simply declare that the drain field can never comply with FAA standards without exploring real options. One could even suspect a hidden agenda—forcing annexation into the city of Aurora if no alternative for the drain field is found. On the master plan: The failure to plan for expanding the airport boundary and future FAA-funded land acquisition is short-sighted. This is supposed to be a long-term plan, and this oversight completely misses the point. On the runway: The runway must be lengthened for safety. The idea that adding 500 feet will fundamentally change the airport's character is mythology—misguided and untrue. The plan delays this extension until after 2030, which compromises safety. ODAV should act now to seek and gain approval for this extension as a safety issue. On finances: This master plan will never be built. David Miller's claim that finances "shouldn't matter" is silly. I've spoken to ODOT management; they cannot and will not pay to	Previously addressed. See response to comments 9.49 and 9.59. The Refined Preferred Alternative and the ALP depict the existing airport property boundary, and the future airport property boundary based on recommended property acquisition, as required by FAA guidance (AC 150/5070-6B, Airport Master Plans, and *ARP SOP 2.00, Standard Procedure for FAA Review and Approval of Airport Layout Plans)* Previously addressed. See response to comment 9.31. FAA has reviewed the preliminary alternatives, refined preferred alternative, and cost estimates. FAA has not indicated that the proposed

		move the highway. ODAV can't afford much of anything and is already asking the legislature for permission to raise user fees because their financial model is unsustainable. I'll conclude with this: I lobbied to create ODAV. I ran the agency for five years, managing the Aurora Airport and leading a master planning process. I served 21 years in the legislature. I know what an acceptable public process looks like. And ODAV has failed both in policy and process. ODAV should be embarrassed for their lack of transparency, their willingness to shade the truth, and their discriminatory approach to who may speak, how, and when. This process fails to meet Governor Kotek's expectations for high agency performance in service to Oregonians. If ODAV rams through their preferred alternative, and I believe they will, this process will be a case study in how not to do it. It will result in expensive, endless litigation. Finally, I was asked to be included in the PAC as an alternate due to my unique experience as a former airport manager and agency head. Tony Beach flatly refused. He stated on the record that there would be no proxies or substitutions, yet there were substitutions tonight. This further proves ODAV's arbitrary approach to message control and public participation. This is beyond disappointing, for me personally, as someone who helped create this agency. Thank you.	improvements are beyond what can be supported by anticipated future funding.
9.61	**Betsy Johnson**	Regarding maintenance of the record - My curiosity is that it's been very difficult to follow your recitation of the questions and any answers. We just don't have access to that. I am looking for assurances from Mr. Beach and Mr. Sugahara that this record will be preserved in its entirety and recorded verbatim. The reason I ask is that Mr. Helbling and I went to a Board of Aviation meeting and testified, and our testimony got lost. That is completely unacceptable in a public process. I want to hear from Kenji and Tony that this record will be maintained in full and verbatim. And you can understand my concern, given that our testimony has previously disappeared.	**Tony Beach, ODAV:** I want to be very clear for the record that we did issue a response to the testimony received in our December board meeting. There was a brief technical issue where a few seconds of audio were cut out, but the overwhelming majority, about 13 to 14 minutes of testimony, was captured. When Mr. Helbling and Ms. Johnson informed us about the audio lapse, we were happy to include their written comments to address that.

Additional Emailed Comments

ID	Date	Name	Question/Comment	Response
9.62	**2/10/25**	**Chris Neamtzu, AICP** *Community Development Director* City of Wilsonville	I am writing to let you know that I have a personal issue that has arisen that is in conflict with the PAC meeting tomorrow evening. As a result, I am unable to attend. If you would please be so kind as to ensure that Councilor Shevlin receives the zoom access link as the alternate, I would appreciate it. Councilor Shevlin can be reached at Shevlin@wilsonvilleoregon.gov .	**2/10/25, Brandy Steffen:** Thanks for the heads up Chris! Please let Councilor Shevlin know to check their junk folder for the invite from Zoom.
9.63	**2/17/25**	**Bruce Bergman** *Wylee Hangars Condominium Association*	During the last Master Plan meeting, I picked up off the layout plans that a portion of our property is slated for State acquisition. I asked a question during the meeting on why and how it affected our drain field. The quick response was for Taxiway Safety Area, but the drain field question was not answered. So, please explain the reason this property needs to be acquired and the ramifications for our vital drain field. Assuming this is not reversible, when will we receive details on boundaries, value, timing, etc.	The proposed property acquisition depicted adjacent to the Wylee Hangar area is intended to bring all property within the ROFA into the airport property boundary. A small portion of the existing drain field encroaches upon the taxiway safety area (TSA). Drain fields are not allowed within a TSA as they cannot support the weight of an aircraft or emergency equipment. Any area of drain field within the TSA will need to be removed. Further evaluation of the drain field is needed to determine how much drain field infrastructure – if any – encroaches on the TSA. Details regarding boundaries, value, timing and so forth will be discussed outside of the planning process and through implementation of the project.
9.64	**2/19/25**	**Chris Gage**	I attended the Feb 11, 2025 meeting. I have to say I was embarrassed for the ODAV team that could not answer simple questions that were asked over and over. The ODAV representatives on the call were defensive and lacked information that was being asked. It is apparent that this being attempted to be pushed through. I am strongly opposed to this "preferred alternate plan" The cost is extremely outrageous, taking EFU land and converting it "airport reserve" is against current county law. The impacts this will have to the congestion of	Thank you for your comments.

			Wilsonville and Boone Bridge will be detrimental to the current congested issue. Be prepared to add many dollars to the budget for litigation expense from many parties.	

TRANSCRIPT

Please note that this transcript is taken from a Zoom recording and may contain minor inaccuracies due to potential audio limitations or transcription errors.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 16:56:13
All right. Well, welcome everyone. We're a few minutes before the start of the meeting.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 16:56:19
And so for our PAC members, you should be able to unmute and just test your audio if you'd like.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 16:56:28
You should also be able to hover over your name in the panelist section or your picture and just hover over. There should be three little dots that show up and then you should be able to rename yourself if you'd like to have your affiliation there.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 16:56:44
Or if you need to correct your name, your spelling or anything.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 16:56:49
And for those of you participating. From the community. We have the Q&A section open and you are more than welcome to submit any questions.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 16:57:01
Throughout the meeting there as well. So yeah, welcome to meeting number nine, or depending on your count number 12, if we count all our working group.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 16:57:14
Meetings. So thanks, everyone. We'll get started here in just a few minutes.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 16:58:17
Well, hi, everyone. We'll get started here in just a few minutes. We're just a little bit early.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 16:58:23
Just to reinforce, I see a couple of people are testing out the Q&A. Thanks, Wendy, for testing that.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 16:58:32
And that's coming through on our end. For community members.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 16:58:37
I'm sorry, for public members here, you can use that Q&A throughout the night for panelists.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 16:58:45
Pac members. You can use the Q&A. We do ask you to try to select everyone so that the public in attendance can see any comments that you might add.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 16:59:00
And… But if not, I will try to restate anything that you've said in the chat.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 16:59:07
Or share that out. Okay.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 16:59:16
Great. Well, again, we're just a few minutes out from starting the meeting.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 16:59:21
So, um. Pac members, you should be able to unmute if you have any technical issues, if you want to test your audio. Usually it we haven't cross our fingers. We haven't had any major technical issues. But if you'd like to test it out, feel free.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 16:59:40
You can also, again, hover over your picture or your name if you're looking at the panelists.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 16:59:46
Window and there's three little dots that pop up and then you can rename yourself if you'd like to add your affiliation.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 16:59:56
And otherwise, we'll get started here in just a minute.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 17:00:13
All right.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 17:00:21
Okay. Well, I think we are just about at our time.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 17:00:25
So we will get started here. Welcome to our ninth Planning Advisory Committee meeting.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 17:00:36
Plus, we've had a couple of working sessions, so we really appreciate you all sticking around for the last four years. It's hard to believe.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 17:00:46
So thank you so much for being here for our last meeting. So I will go to the next slide.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 17:00:55
And just want to walk you through our agenda really quickly. We'll do some quick introductions as usual. Then we will have David from Century West review the

refined preferred alternatives.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 17:01:09
That PAC members saw as part of emails.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 17:01:14
Then we will have some clarifying questions, some time for you all to ask clarifying questions.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 17:01:20
Then David will present the draft capital improvement plan, the CIP, as well as the airport layout plan, the ALP.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 17:01:30
And then again, we'll have a lot of time for the PAC members to ask questions.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 17:01:36
And provide feedback. Then we will have time for public comments. And then we'll have some time to review our next steps.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 17:01:46
So that is our agenda for tonight.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 17:01:54
Okay, so I'm going to hand it off to Kenji and the rest of the ODAB team who are here tonight.

[Kenji Sugahara] 17:02:02
Hi, everybody. This is Kenji Sugar, Director of the Oregon Department of Aviation.

[Kenji Sugahara] 17:02:08
Well, first off, I want to take a moment to provide an update on the PAC process and our next steps.

[Kenji Sugahara] 17:02:14
And first, I want to set some expectations. We will not be holding additional PAC meetings to discuss changes to the preferred alternative.

[Kenji Sugahara] 17:02:23
The process has been thorough. And we are now moving forward with the next phase.

[Kenji Sugahara] 17:02:28
Following the upcoming PAC period, we will submit the draft final report, including the airport layout plan, based on the preferred alternative to the FAA for their review and approval.

[Kenji Sugahara] 17:02:38
So over the past three and a half years, we have engaged in an extensive process to gather feedback from both the PAC and the public.

[Kenji Sugahara] 17:02:46
This has included nine PATH meetings. Two-pack working sessions.

[Kenji Sugahara] 17:02:51
Including this last one where we actually went above and beyond and said, hey, let's do a final review and get as much feedback as we can.

[Kenji Sugahara] 17:02:59
And two public open houses. We went beyond the original project scope to ensure ample opportunity for discussion and input.

[Kenji Sugahara] 17:03:07
Because that's super important to make sure that we hear from everyone.

[Kenji Sugahara] 17:03:12
The final outcome reflects the collective feedback we received. We are deeply appreciative of the thoughtful discussions and diverse perspectives from each PAC member.

[Kenji Sugahara] 17:03:23
We might disagree with each other, but that's okay. All of you represented a wide range of organizations connected to or affected by the Aurora State Airport.

[Kenji Sugahara] 17:03:34
This process has been long. And at times challenging I mean, over the past three and a half years.

[Kenji Sugahara] 17:03:42
Of which only I've been the director for only a year and a half.

[Kenji Sugahara] 17:03:45
So walked into it fairly new. But through collaboration.

[Kenji Sugahara] 17:03:49
We believe we have arrived at the best possible outcome that balances a lot of different competing interests.

[Kenji Sugahara] 17:03:56
So I want to thank all of you. For your dedication.

[Kenji Sugahara] 17:04:02
Time and invaluable contributions. And with that, I'm going to hand it off to Tony.

[Tony Beach] 17:04:07
Good afternoon, everyone. Tony Beach, State Reports Manager with the Oregon Department of Aviation and Thank you, Kenji. And I just want to echo Kenji's comments and thank you all for your participation and investment throughout these last four years or so.

[Tony Beach] 17:04:24

Has been a big time investment and really appreciate all your feedback because it has made a positive impact on the final result of this.

[Tony Beach] 17:04:34
Master plan. I also just want to point out that all of the PAC meeting summaries are on the website. They're posted Throughout our last several PAC meetings, we've had significant feedback and In our efforts to be thorough.

[Tony Beach] 17:04:51
They may not have been immediately posted to the website however We wanted to reassure everyone that all the comments were immediately sent to the entire master planning team for consideration.

[Tony Beach] 17:05:03
So we have reviewed all the feedback we've received. And taking that into consideration and now everything is posted on the website.

[Tony Beach] 17:05:13
With that, we look forward to the discussion. Thanks again. And… And that's it for me. Alex?

[Tony Beach] 17:05:21
And Brandon?

[Alex Thomas] 17:05:24
Not a whole lot here. Good evening, everybody. I'll just, yeah, again, echo what Director Kenji and State Airports Manager Tony just mentioned. Thank you, everybody, for all your time and I don't want to repeat too much, so we'll continue it moving along.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 17:05:41
Wonderful. Okay. Thank you all so much. So this is the rest of our project team.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 17:05:48
You've seen us a lot, so I won't go through it too much, but just wanted to reinforce that.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 17:05:56
The next slide is just a reminder for you all, as Tony mentioned, the information is posted on the website.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 17:06:04
So we do have the resources document page that's up there.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 17:06:10
The meeting page includes all of the materials. So after this meeting, I'll be posting the presentation. We'll be posting the video. We've been posting the transcripts upon request from you all for the last couple of meetings. So we'll post those as well.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 17:06:30
And then the summary. And so those are up there under the meetings page. The public Resources or um comments page is also up there and many of you have submitted comments there. So that's where you can find all of those.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 17:06:48
The next slide is just a reminder for you all. We have such a large group here with us tonight. A big thank you again for being part of this group.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 17:06:59
And we really appreciate all your time over the last several years. You can see there are so many of you here tonight as well. So thank you for taking the time out of your day.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 17:07:09
And then I wanted to just also briefly touch about our meeting guidelines as usual.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 17:07:16
So again. Our summaries include all comments that we collect during these meetings, whether they're presented verbally, whether from the public or from you all, or whether they're in the chat or the Q&A section.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 17:07:30
Additionally, we are collecting comments after this meeting through December, I'm sorry, through February 25th. We're already in February. And our time really is for you all, the PAC members to speak and provide comments.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 17:07:50
We do want to focus on our agenda items. Anything related to non-agenda items, we please request that you submit those via writing so that we can address those in the summary.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 17:08:03
And then, yeah, we can just, we ask that you please submit any comments by the 25th so that we can make sure we incorporate those into the technical team's work.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 17:08:14
The next slide continues some of the guidelines. Again, we're just hoping that we're approaching this conversation with a willingness to work together, assuming good intentions, and trying to be open and honest with one another.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 17:08:29
We know that you all are representing your organizations and we hope that you're bringing this information back to them.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 17:08:37
And that's If you have any questions.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 17:08:42
With the technical issues of Zoom, please let us know in the chat.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 17:08:48
And we are just making sure that there's one representative of the PAC who is included as part of the panelists here tonight. Any alternates.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 17:09:00
Would be in the attendees section. But again, you can always submit comments or questions through that Q&A feature.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 17:09:09
Here tonight. Those are our meeting guidelines.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 17:09:16
This is our long schedule here that you all have seen and participated with. You can see our nine meetings there and those little yellow hexagon shapes.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 17:09:27
And then you can see our working sessions in those red triangles over the time. You can see our public events in that kind of blue circle. And so you can see that we've worked through so many of these different topics and we are here tonight really to kind of wrap out the project, we are here to

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 17:09:50
Talk about that financial plan, the ALP in that green section in progression for the final document and making sure that this documentation kind of wraps up. So that is where we're at there in the green and that last little gray black area.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 17:10:14
There at the bottom. So this is just kind of a zoomed in view of that, just kind of looking at the last year, 2024, and then 2025. And so we just have a few months left of this project.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 17:10:33
And now I am going to hand it off to David and David is going to start taking us through the review of the refined preferred alternative. And again, we will have time for clarifying questions before we get into the airport layout plan and the capital improvement plan.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 17:10:51
So take it away, David.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:10:53
Thank you, Brandy. And thanks, everyone, for being here tonight. I'm David Miller. I'm the lead aviation planner.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:11:00
First century West Engineering. As has been mentioned already, I just want to reiterate the fact that we're going to focus tonight's presentation on the materials specifically related to the refined preferred alternative that was published on the project website on January 6th.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:11:17
Along with the capital improvement program and the cip And as Brandi mentioned, if there are any other questions, questions on other topics or subjects related to earlier meetings.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:11:28
If those can be provided in writing, we'll refer back to with a direction to the website.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:11:34
Linked to actual information. So where we picked up is, as has been mentioned on the schedule, this is PAC meeting number nine.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:11:46
And PAC meeting seven and eight were held in October and December.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:11:52
As Kenji mentioned, PAC meeting 8 was we used that as an opportunity to have a roundtable discussion with the members And each of those meetings produced input from us both during the meetings and in the subsequent two week review period. So really where we are today, the January 6th version of the preferred alternative that was posted was the product of

[David Miller - Century West] 17:12:18
Of these meetings and the refinement specifically that came in After that PAC meeting number eight.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:12:26
And the feedback that we had heard, some of it relates all the way back to the October meeting and some of the themes were presented earlier in the planning process as well.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:12:35
There were a couple of items that really emerged in the discussions in December.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:12:40
They're listed below. I don't think I need to go through them all in detail because you're all familiar with them.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:12:46
Some interest in having a no-build alternative, eliminating options that impacted hangers some direction that we didn't need really the parallel taxi lane or the vehicle service road.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:13:00
Ideas that the drain fields could be left in place, modified perhaps various pieces of input, minimizing the shift of the Hubbard Highway, et cetera.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:13:11

So those were things that were presented and they are in the record.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:13:15
And we're considered, as Tony mentioned, in ODAB's final evaluation of the preferred alternatives.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:13:23
So based on the input that was received, there were a couple of very specific changes made to the preferred alternative that was presented in January, January 6th.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:13:34
One was, as I mentioned, the parallel taxi lane that was identified.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:13:40
Along the south apron area was removed, eliminated As was the vehicle service road that was proposed to run parallel to the both taxi lane and the parallel taxiway.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:13:54
So those two changes were the most significant. And of course, that eliminated the need to acquire property that would impact the existing row of hangers fronting the south apron.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:14:08
And then there were some other refinements on the apron located on Odaf property to reconfigure some helicopter parking.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:14:16
And aircraft tie-down positions uh just based on the adjustments that were there.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:14:23
That were made. Also, the theme of property acquisition was detailed because of the elimination of the taxi lane and the vehicle service road, the need to acquire property along that hangar furniture was eliminated so really where we ended up with the refined preferred alternative was

[David Miller - Century West] 17:14:42
That only the property needed to conform to the FAA standards, clearing standards and control standards.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:14:49
For the object-free area and the runway safety area. And the taxiway object for you as well. Those were Those are the priority project or property acquisition areas that we've identified. We'll look at some graphics here to show that The additional property, the discussion of identifying property along the east side of the airport that

[David Miller - Century West] 17:15:14
Majority of it has existing through the fence access to the airport. The decision ODAB made was to continue to identify that area as a potential reserve.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:15:26
Which would open the door to possibly acquiring property if there was a willing seller situation. And if it's depicted as being stated, if it's depicted on the airport layout plan in that way.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:15:38
Creates the possibility of accessing FAA funds for that. But it's been said numerous times during the meetings that ODEV is only looking at willing sellers for those areas that are identified for reserves.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:15:56
So with that, those were the changes made. The things that did not change.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:16:01
From the presentation in December, October, and December onto the January 6th.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:16:07
Refined alternative. There were no changes to the proposed runway extension to the north.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:16:13
There's no change to the recommendation to remove the drain fields from the runway safety area.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:16:19
In taxiway safety areas. The recommendation to ship the Hubbard Highway and maintain the ODOT right-of-way is unchanged also kyle road adjustments to clear the object-free area for the runway.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:16:34
The other items, again, no changes to the recommendations, primarily to clear the object free area or runway safety areas and meet standards.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:16:47
No changes to the future hangar sites that are located on odaf property and or to improve the drainage ditches that are also on the deaf property.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:16:55
So those are the things that didn't change between the October and December conversations in the current final preferred alternatives.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:17:08
So this is where we are. This is what was posted on the January 6th after the republic impact on that after the December meeting.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:17:19
Was acquired and then reviewed. So this, as I said, highlights the elements in the preferred alternative, which by now you're all, I think, probably very familiar with.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:17:31
The areas of priority property acquisition I mentioned earlier are highlighted in the sort of the crosshatch yellow area.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:17:39
That's the frontage along the Hubbard Highway and portions along the east side of the runway taxiway system in the area to accommodate the kyle road realignment.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:17:51
And then if you recall from our October and into our December meetings, we talked about how the preliminary preferred alternative was presented in phases or independent elements, if you will.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:18:06
So one of those was kind of the highest priority item, if you will, that was to meet the runway, the FAA standards for the runway object-free area.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:18:17
And runway safety area. So the improvements that were needed to achieve that were represented in this particular phase.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:18:28
Another phase was the runway extension and the parallel taxway extension, which was, as noted earlier at the north end.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:18:37
And this is where the north drain field that's depicted on this graphic comes into play. So we know the drain field is not currently in the runway safety area, but it will be in the future runway safety area.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:18:52
So it would require relocation. Meet FAA standards.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:18:59
And then on the property acquisition, I discussed this earlier. This is the priority project uh property acquisition is highlighted with the hatching the crosshatch And the yellow is what we're identifying as reserve. If there is a willing seller approaches I'd have about purchasing a hangar or buildings multiple

[David Miller - Century West] 17:19:18
Properties. Creates the path that a dev could follow.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:19:23
To achieve that. So Brandy, now's a good time to Launch over, hand it over to you.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 17:19:30
Okay, great. So I just wanted to check with you all and see if you have any clarifying questions about what David just presented.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 17:19:38
About their refined preferred alternative. So go ahead and feel Just raise your hands. I can see many of you. So you can also just visually raise your hands.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 17:19:51
But let me know if there's any questions. All right, Ben, I see that you have your Hand raised. Go ahead.

[Ben Williams-FOFP] 17:20:02
Thanks, Dave. What are the plans or proposals on the relocation of the drain fields?

[David Miller - Century West] 17:20:12
The recommendation of the plan is that the drain field be relocated outside of the runway safety area and as we discussed in the last meeting and then presented to the board last week.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:20:24
There are two issues with the FAA and FAA has weighed in on this and their recommendation was to relocate out of the safety area.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:20:31
One is the great issue from the end of the runway.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:20:37
And the inability to carry the weight of an aircraft or emergency vehicle across that.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:20:43
And that's the way the plan addresses it. As far as where it is located or relocated, that will be between the That would be a decision for the owner of the drain field.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:20:54
The drain field currently sits on leased ground on the airport, but it's servicing buildings that are off the airport.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:21:01
So that is to be determined. The plan will not address possible locations off airport property since we're limited to the ODF property.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:21:11
There have been no proposals to locate it elsewhere on the airport.

[Ben Williams-FOFP] 17:21:15
Thank you.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 17:21:26
Great. Thanks, Ben. Any other clarifying questions? Oh, I see Tony Helbling's raising um visually raising your hand i'm guessing Let me unmute you.

[Tony Helbling] 17:21:39
Can you hear me now? Okay. Just real quick, I kind of disagree with the on airport versus the off airport because strikes me as odd that The master plan can consider off airport items like the relocation of the highway

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 17:21:41
Yes.

[Tony Helbling] 17:21:57
But cannot consider the internal circulation road Because it's only on airport.

[Tony Helbling] 17:22:04
Portions of the internal circulation road would be off the airport Just as the highway is off the airport. So why can we consider one but not the other?

[David Miller - Century West] 17:22:15
Okay, I'll keep my answer short. So the underlying theme in terms of on and off has to do with what the scope of the master plan called for in terms of this would be a master plan.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:22:29
That would evaluate facility needs within the boundaries controlled by ODAV. That's both current and future.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:22:38
The potential, say, for example, the relocation or addressing the off airport or the through the fence area vehicle service road, circulation road is beyond the official airport boundary that's observed by the FAA. So that's kind of the the distinction there. The reason that property acquisition and improvements within the property acquisition

[David Miller - Century West] 17:23:04
Are evaluated is that those areas would become part of the airport proper.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:23:09
So the shifting of the Hubbard Highway, for example. Requires a shifting of the right of way or a relocation of the road within the right of way.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:23:19
So it's in large part because the project is being completing the project will clear or meet the FAA standards in the case of the highway would be the object prayer for the runway The plan recommendation as it currently stands is that the drain field would be relocated

[David Miller - Century West] 17:23:37
Out of the runway safety area and that will satisfy the FAA's requirements.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:23:41
As I said, the future decision will be that of the we uh

[Tony Helbling] 17:23:42
Good. The dream field issue, it has to do with a taking because there is an easement in perpetuity on the south drain field.

[Tony Helbling] 17:23:54
And if the state pursues a taking of that easement.

[Tony Helbling] 17:23:59
Then it becomes incumbent on the state to find a new location for the drain field.

[Tony Helbling] 17:24:04
And as we've suggested in the acquired area to the east of the current Kyle Road.

[Tony Helbling] 17:24:10
Would be a logical place to put it. So I'm not sure why we're not depicting that.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:24:16
Well, I'll defer all the questions related to the legal issues to tony i know dev staff. Our understanding is that the conversations have focused on clearing the safety area based on the Okay.

[Tony Helbling] 17:24:33
Well, there's further questions I have in the drain field, but I think Aaron has his hand up. I think he's going to ask about them.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:24:36
Well, as I said. All the questions related to future actions, future options of relocating will need to be dealt with outside the master plan.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:24:48
At this point we are the finding master plan is that the priority is to clear the runway safety area to meet FAA standards.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:24:54
I'll leave it up to Tony and others that would have to Undoubtedly, there'll be a lot of conversations after the master plan through implementation to address that but it's not really going to This is input that, as you've mentioned, has been received throughout the process, including the last couple of meetings. Odev is fully aware of that and that

[David Miller - Century West] 17:25:15
Did enter into their consideration on the final decisions.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:25:22
So maybe, Tony, is there anything you want to add to that or did i

[Tony Beach] 17:25:27
No, I think you summed that up well. Thanks.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:25:30
Okay.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 17:25:31
And Tony Hebbling did Was that your only other question at this time?

[Tony Helbling] 17:25:38
Yeah, that's it.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 17:25:39
Okay, okay. All right, Erin, I see your hand up.

[Aron Faegre] 17:25:48
Can you hear me? Okay. Yeah, I guess I, you know.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 17:25:50
Yes.

[Aron Faegre] 17:25:54
We hear interpretations of what the FAA rules are.

[Aron Faegre] 17:26:00
But I guess I want to particularly say to Kenji as the head of the the odav.

[Aron Faegre] 17:26:06
That i think you know we we should be paying a lot of attention to what other airports are allowed under FAA rules. And so, for example.

[Aron Faegre] 17:26:19
To my knowledge, I've never seen any ruling that a drain field is not allowed in a runway safety area.

[Aron Faegre] 17:26:28
You know, the The key issue is whether it can support an aircraft.

[Aron Faegre] 17:26:35
And, you know, as you all know, we've already submitted from NV5, very detailed study of that particular site how the use of certain modern materials would create a you know an ability to support even a Gulfstream 550 So… You know, my question to david is is

[Aron Faegre] 17:27:01
Why at least in the master plan one wouldn't feel, one wouldn't have some obligation to show solutions or potential solutions And, you know, and if not on the, well, I would hope they'd be on the plan as as options kind of thing but even but if not there, then at least in the narrative

[Aron Faegre] 17:27:24
And I think the i think the FAA circular on master plan says you're supposed to show options.

[Aron Faegre] 17:27:34
And it asks, you know, it specifically references you can have modifications of standards. You should be discussing them.

[Aron Faegre] 17:27:44
So, you know, and I've talked with headquarters, you know, the modification of standards program is existing.

[Aron Faegre] 17:27:52
They've even eliminated the five-year-old required resubmittal.

[Aron Faegre] 17:27:57
It's designed for multi-phase projects And it's supposed to be applied for before you apply for a grant because otherwise you wouldn't know if the grant was going to be successful if you didn't have some idea of how this works. So I just feel like

[Aron Faegre] 17:28:17
You know we're getting Oregon is getting the short stick here And I would ask david to ask put into the plan you know we we provided two FAA-approved methodologies.

[Aron Faegre] 17:28:33
Of dealing with the drain fields, keeping them where they are.

[Aron Faegre] 17:28:38
And, you know, even if ODav didn't really like those at least suggest what their solution is.

[Aron Faegre] 17:28:46
Some would say you can't put it into EFU land. So that would make it doubly important that the ALP or the plan identify where the airport boundary will be from a land use standpoint.

[Aron Faegre] 17:29:05
Because that's… you know that's in the courts have said without that You can't convert the EFU land.

[Aron Faegre] 17:29:14
So I think it's incumbent on that. So, you know, it's probably a little more of a statement than a question, but I guess the real question would be.

[Aron Faegre] 17:29:25
Why the master plan can't show and discuss alternates that have been submitted.

[Aron Faegre] 17:29:33
It seems very short-sighted. In terms of You know, what, you know, Oregon shouldn't have less rights than other states, which all around us are are allowed these things.

[Aron Faegre] 17:29:49

So I'll stop there.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:29:52
Thanks. Thank you, Aaron. Yeah, I won't go back through all the detail, but as I mentioned earlier.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:29:59
The evaluation, the conversation about the drain field has involved ODEF staff, the FAA staff, and the Seattle ADO.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:30:07
Or poor district office. The information that that Century West, our group has been involved with not really as much in the master planning as it is just sort of a valuation on the engineering side.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:30:18
Is that the information that's been provided to date to our team has not demonstrated that the options are feasible.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:30:25
People may disagree with that, but at this point, the information that was available when they have… made its decision on the refined preferred alternative. That's essentially where that conversation is.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:30:42
As I mentioned, there are gradient issues. The runway safety grade from the end of the runway that is I think James Kirby has mentioned in some of our other conversations portions of the greenfield rise up above that.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:30:52
And disrupt the grade. So that's a non-standard condition. The inability to taxi or drive a vehicle over emergency vehicle over it or an aircraft that might leave the runway.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:31:04
As another non-standard condition. The other thing I would just throw in.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:31:08
Modification standards may be possibility, but even with the FAA's changes And the way they've gone project specific on modifications to standards, runway safety areas are not considered modifiable.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:31:21
So the standards that are more rigid than protected areas. So I'll stop there. And if Tony wants to add more, please.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:31:31
Please feel free.

[Aron Faegre] 17:31:35

Yeah, and I would agree with you the modification of standards is not for for a runway safety area.

[Aron Faegre] 17:31:46
But I guess, you know. We submitted a very, very detailed geotech report and never the state's geotech was gri To our knowledge, GRI never even issued a was given an opportunity to review it or or give specific comments back and

[Aron Faegre] 17:32:08
That's before Kenji's time, but I think it's really disappointing to not have a real discussion NV5.

[Aron Faegre] 17:32:18
You know is is perhaps the largest geotech in Oregon and it's national And why would we question them that that this isn't possible. They discussed it in detail.

[Aron Faegre] 17:32:31
So it never was really given a fair.

[Aron Faegre] 17:32:37
A fair reading and it seemed to be cut off before it could be really considered in a serious way. And then in any case, more recently we submitted the EMAS option Which, again, is a standard FAA is a standard

[Aron Faegre] 17:32:56
Approach to the runway safety area for a c2 Airport.

[Aron Faegre] 17:33:02
You know. It's just odd that that's not even acknowledged again used used at other C2 airports.

[Aron Faegre] 17:33:16
Seems strange.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 17:33:19
Yeah, thanks, Erin. Tony, did you want to respond?

[Tony Beach] 17:33:24
I did have a couple of comments on just on top of what David said, and I'll just address Aaron's comments as well briefly.

[Tony Beach] 17:33:33
What David said is correct. We are showing that… an improvement to make an improvement to make Runnery safety area standard by removing the drain field that does not comply with FAA standards.

[Tony Beach] 17:33:48
And we do not have… a proposed location or we don't have any plans Currently in the master plan for relocating it on state property So this is really, as David mentioned, has been focused on correcting the non-standard condition We have not

looked at.

[Tony Beach] 17:34:12
At future locations or future locations accommodations for the drain field at this time.

[Tony Beach] 17:34:19
I… won't commit to or, you know, I can't speculate on feasibility for relocating it on state property at this time but Just wanted to comment that we haven't looked at that.

[Tony Beach] 17:34:31
Yet. I do want to add that To Aaron's comments, we have very closely considered and looked at the very closely report that Aaron mentioned.

[Tony Beach] 17:34:44
We've looked over that with our engineers. We even put on our project website for this master plan, the correspondence After our most recent talk meeting or two where we had some discussion on the stream field And we have not been convinced that that

[Tony Beach] 17:35:04
The drain field can be made to meet FAA's standards. So that is why we are still showing it as needing to be removed from the running safety area.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 17:35:16
Okay, great. Thanks, Tony. I see Bruce has his hand up. Aaron, do you have anything else that you want to add or?

[Aron Faegre] 17:35:25
I would just say to Tony, you know, I wish I wish that you would be open actually meeting on that subject and having our geotech there and your geotech and actually considering it because Again, it feels very kind of false and like a intentional

[Aron Faegre] 17:35:47
Avoidance of the issue without actually having the the specialists who are the most knowledgeable actually talk to each other and that was refused that we Our geotech couldn't talk to your geotech you know it's kind of a kind of a…

[Aron Faegre] 17:36:04
Pretty negative approach to solving problems. And I would still ask that we consider that and have the ability for NV5 and GRI to be in the same room with us and and everyone and talk creatively it's it's… Again, you know, this this

[Aron Faegre] 17:36:27
This modern materials is being used to provide places for fire engines and, you know, to function it's It's used all over the place. And we think this is a place where it could function as well.

[Aron Faegre] 17:36:43

But it would require you looking at it as an opportunity rather than just trying to close the door on it.

[Aron Faegre] 17:36:50
As quickly as possible.

[Tony Beach] 17:36:52
Aaron, I really appreciate your comments and I assure you we have taken a very close look at this.

[Tony Beach] 17:36:59
We have… gone thoroughly over the report that you've submitted and And we had questions that as far as we're aware have not been answered.

[Tony Beach] 17:37:09
Again, the drain field has not been proven to meet FAA standards and function at its current location.

[Tony Beach] 17:37:16
So we need to remove it from the the primary safety area.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 17:37:23
Okay, great. Thanks, Tony. I saw Bruce had his hand raised. Go ahead, Bruce.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 17:37:29
And then Tony Hebling afterwards.

[Bruce Bennett] 17:37:33
Yes, good afternoon. I had recommended the the acre of land that's available midfield that would connect the taxiway to the state ramp be put on the priority purchase status and i i was wondering if Am I ahead of myself or has that been has that change been made

[Bruce Bennett] 17:37:55
To the preferred alternative.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:38:04
I… Tony might want to weigh in on this. The basic change as it related to the vehicle circulation road was that the proposal that was presented in PAC meeting seven and eight, the on airport or the addition of the vehicle service road was eliminated from the preferred alternative.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:38:26
The connections between the existing circulation road Off airport adjacent to the airport.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:38:34
And connections onto the airport or have not been modified in the preferred alternative.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:38:40
So where the existing off airport roads are located There's been there.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:38:47
Modification of the alternative to draw connections to those. I'm staying there.

[Bruce Bennett] 17:38:52
This is not exclusively or specifically a vehicle circulation road this is This is aircraft ramp so we It would confound me if that change hasn't been made I know that the last plan showed spending hundreds of millions for a parallel taxiway

[Bruce Bennett] 17:39:16
And vehicle roadway uh get i thought those were outrageous and absurd because it it entailed destroying all the major hangars on the airport.

[Bruce Bennett] 17:39:29
Just totally unrealistic. But it showed that it showed that that was a need a vehicle and mostly aircraft and with that one addition, 1.07 acre the state's ramp could then connect to the entire south end of the airport, which is right now cut off right now

[Bruce Bennett] 17:39:57
Only the north half of the airport can be accessed from the main state ramp.

[Bruce Bennett] 17:40:04
Pivot coast avionics. All of the state ramp and property.

[Bruce Bennett] 17:40:10
Is only available on the north end I'm i'm… Confounded.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:40:19
Well, just, oh, I'm sorry, Bruce.

[Tony Beach] 17:40:20
Very good. If I can just jump in, Bruce, the way that the preferred alternative shows potential for property acquisition on all of the property and aeronautical use. We believe that it currently reflects the comments to acquire the property that I believe you're commenting on.

[Bruce Bennett] 17:40:41
Well, I did. It makes it an option. Possibly, which is a step.

[Bruce Bennett] 17:40:47
But there's a bit of it that's marked with yellow hashes, and that's the priority purchase, which I think because of this is because of this basically because of this making a significant difference a thousand feet of less.

[Bruce Bennett] 17:41:07
Restricted taxiway. That's what I had recommended a number of times.

[Bruce Bennett] 17:41:12
That it be put on the priority purchase list and not and and not the the light yellow possible someday purchases.

[Bruce Bennett] 17:41:22
I mean, it's a difference. It seems small, but it's significant.

[Bruce Bennett] 17:41:29
In the flow. Access to the runway and for aircraft.

[Bruce Bennett] 17:41:36
You know, I agreed with your idea that a full-length parallel taxiway would be a significant improvement.

[Bruce Bennett] 17:41:46
But because of the The space constraints it's as you've ended up finding, it's impossible.

[Bruce Bennett] 17:41:55
This would be a this would be a compromise And you'd be spending pennies on the dollar or percentages of pennies.

[Bruce Bennett] 17:42:05
So it uh and it's it's obtainable.

[Bruce Bennett] 17:42:09
Isdily versus is versus maybe years down the road.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:42:15
Okay, thank you. I would just point out, as Tony mentioned.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:42:19
Also. The identification of the property and light yellow on the various alternatives which has been identified as reserve doesn't preclude a more timely acquisition. If the owner of the property approaches ODAB proposal to require it for a specific purpose. There's nothing about a reserve designation that would

[David Miller - Century West] 17:42:46
Prevent that. So I think by identifying it, it's a good example of why identifying aeronautical use lands in the reserve sense is good because it leaves options available.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:42:59
I'd say that's that is part of that evaluation.

[Bruce Bennett] 17:43:05
Great. Thank you. And if I may shift from I know it's not a question, but a couple of comments that that I completely agree with the need.

[Bruce Bennett] 17:43:16

The need to make the septic systems work for everyone's sake.

[Bruce Bennett] 17:43:22
It's just the most efficient, the least expensive and the best way forward.

[Bruce Bennett] 17:43:31
And I want to really thank, I mean, it's been a while but this.

[Bruce Bennett] 17:43:37
This refined preferred alternative without removing all the hangers is a significant step forward.

[Bruce Bennett] 17:43:47
And I believe we can do it also. With with the road and with the road the distances it's really critical for everyone to understand We are not anything like PDX. We never want to be anything like PDX.

[Bruce Bennett] 17:44:08
That's not a remote possibility. And we need to be a safer airport.

[Bruce Bennett] 17:44:17
We're relatively short And that doesn't mean that has nothing to do with changing aircraft. That's the current aircraft that have been operating since as documented by the master plan since 1976 The airport needs some improvements, safety improvements.

[Bruce Bennett] 17:44:37
It doesn't need any… changes. No one's trying to be a I guess this is off the subject I can tell you a lot of a lot of people have taken the master plan and somehow think this means a recipe for change or growth

[Bruce Bennett] 17:44:56
I know the planners operators know it's an FAA requirement trying to do the right thing and trying to do the right thing make growth safe and reasonable.

[Bruce Bennett] 17:45:08
But I think it's important to keep in our minds. That we're never going to be and don't want to be PDX.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 17:45:19
Great. Thanks, Bruce. Anything else before we move to Tony? And then we might just have one more time for one more clarifying question for the refined alternative.

[Bruce Bennett] 17:45:29
Not for me, thank you.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:45:30
Thank you, Bruce.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 17:45:30

Okay, great. Thanks. Okay, Tony Helpling. And then again, we will probably have time for one more clarifying question on the refined preferred alternative.

[Tony Helbling] 17:45:41
I hate to beat the drain fields to death, but I'm going to beat them to death. Tony, you mentioned earlier, and I do agree with you, that we do need to bring the RSA into conformity. I don't disagree with that. I think we've suggested two ways to do it. One is the email.

[Tony Helbling] 17:45:55
And one is the geotech system that we've suggested. What I've heard you say, and correct me if I'm wrong, but you stated we looked at the proposed alternative for the geotech fabric and we decided that it was unacceptable.

[Tony Helbling] 17:46:11
For the record, I need you to define who we is and what their qualifications were to make that determination.

[Tony Beach] 17:46:21
So I believe the report and when Aaron was saying you know this This was submitted, this discussion happened years ago ODAV staff and our consult engineers we have looked at the information that was submitted, we did respond back with some questions and

[Tony Beach] 17:46:39
And have not had sufficient responses to those questions to Give us confidence that the brain field could meet standard with the improvements that were proposed.

[Tony Helbling] 17:46:53
Okay, so please define your consultants And then who were the questions sent to?

[Tony Beach] 17:47:00
So Tony, we're looking for PAC questions on the refined alternative. If we want to get into more detail on the drain field. We've had a lot of discussion on that.

[Tony Helbling] 17:47:01
Because…

[Tony Beach] 17:47:11
We really want to keep this conversation for this.

[Tony Beach] 17:47:16
Topic on the refined alternative.

[Tony Helbling] 17:47:18
Okay, and I agree with you. I'm talking about the refined alternative and the drain fields because we're talking hundreds of millions of dollars of investment.

[Tony Helbling] 17:47:26
And the claim is being made. That that packet that we submitted within the last

couple PAC meetings had the geotic fabric And then I think what I hear you saying is there were requests for information In response to that submittal.

[Tony Helbling] 17:47:46
That were not responded to. And also, I'm looking for the identities and the qualifications of the consulting? Was it an engineer? Who was it that determined that it was not acceptable?

[Tony Beach] 17:48:01
Tony, we've had a lot of discussion directly on this topic. We did We did look at the proposal from the feedback we received recently installing EMAS.

[Tony Beach] 17:48:15
We did not think that that was a feasible solution either.

[Tony Helbling] 17:48:19
I'm not talking about emails. I'm talking about the geotextile fabric solution that we proposed.

[Tony Beach] 17:48:19
Emas for… Right. And in that topic we have discussed at length and we really want to keep our conversation tonight focused on

[Tony Helbling] 17:48:30
But for the record, what I'm asking you to do is identify who is the we.

[Tony Helbling] 17:48:36
Because if you personally don't like it. Then that is a subjective.

[Tony Helbling] 17:48:41
Thing. Objectively, the faa states and their ACs if there is a way to figure out how to do these things, it isn't allowed.

[Tony Helbling] 17:48:50
It's allowed. But if somebody subjectively decides that i don't want it We want to know who.

[Tony Beach] 17:48:59
So we can certainly provide all of that information on who, but all the conversations that ODAF have had internally with our board, with our engineers.

[Tony Beach] 17:49:08
And with the FAA have completely agreed that the drain fields need to be I've removed from the runway safety area.

[Tony Helbling] 17:49:16
And I agree with you that you've had those conversations that you all agree it should be removed. That's not the question I'm asking.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 17:49:23

So Tony.

[Tony Helbling] 17:49:23
And you keep giving me an answer to your question. I'm not asking i'm asking who has decided that the geotextile fabric option is not acceptable.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 17:49:35
So just to clarify, so Tony Helbling, you are asking um if there were consultants involved in the decision to not use the geotextile fabric for the drain field. Is that correct?

[Tony Helbling] 17:49:48
That is correct. And for the record, we would like this entered into the record. Who made the decision?

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 17:49:50
Okay.

[Tony Helbling] 17:49:54
The geotextile fabric was not acceptable for the FAA to accept is uh use in the drain field because there's other issues all over the united states with runway safety areas with safety You know, at Greenfield, Tehachapi actually pumps their effluent over the surface.

[Tony Helbling] 17:50:15
Inside the RSA. So i'm just dumbfounded nobody can cite who decided that the geotext of Fatburg would not be allowed.

[Tony Beach] 17:50:27
And Tony, so we had a discussion in our last couple of PAC meetings on the drain field issue and on our review of the the report that was submitted.

[Tony Helbling] 17:50:39
Sure.

[Tony Beach] 17:50:42
Years ago and that conversation and the questions that we had that have gone unanswered.

[Tony Beach] 17:50:46
Are posted on the website, on the project website for the mouse report.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 17:50:50
So it sounds like we might need to clarify for Tony Helbling who those who had that conversation. It sounds like we maybe need to have that figured we need to figure that out. And so Tony Helding, I hear your question. We'll try to circle back and

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 17:51:09
Get you an answer for that. I'm not hearing that we can get it for you right now.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 17:51:16
Um so

[Tony Helbling] 17:51:16
No, I get it. But what I hear is ODA won't tell us who made the decision.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 17:51:23
I'm not sure, but I think we can try to figure that out and get you the answer.

[Tony Helbling] 17:51:28
No, that is now in the record. I'm stating that. Odav won't tell us who made the subjective decision that geotextile fabric would not be allowed.

[Tony Beach] 17:51:39
So Tony, I'll just be clear right now. I am not… I have not seen answers to the questions that Odaf has asked.

[Tony Beach] 17:51:49
We have asked questions we have not asked had responses to. And so I'm just going to clarify Right now that until we get clarification, until it's proven Until we are confident that that improvements can be made to the drain field.

[Tony Beach] 17:52:04
Then we cannot assume that they can stay in the Romasic area.

[Tony Beach] 17:52:08
Therefore, we do have to have it shown as being removed from the runway safety area.

[Tony Helbling] 17:52:13
And I don't disagree with you, but again, I'm asking who is we and who did you send the questions to? Because we submitted that geotextile fabric report less than two months ago. And none of us have received questions from ODAV.

[Tony Beach] 17:52:19
I'm in me right here.

[Tony Beach] 17:52:27
We have posted the questions on the website. We've had a lot of discussion over the recent years on this.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 17:52:33
I think i think

[Tony Beach] 17:52:33
So we will follow up with a link and we will resend those questions and make sure that we can stay connected on that topic because I understand it as a a hot topic. And absolutely, if there's a way that we can

[Tony Beach] 17:52:45

Resolve it together. I'm happy to do that. But we do need to get answers to our questions.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 17:52:51
So, and I think the emails that maybe Tony Beach is referencing are on the meetings page on the website and um And so we can make sure that we have some questions and answers here clarified as well.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 17:53:11
I also see that Patrick Donaldson would like to ask a question. Patrick.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 17:53:17
You should be able to unmute now.

[patrick donaldson Wilsonville Chamber] 17:53:19
Yeah, good evening. Fascinating work, very detailed.

[patrick donaldson Wilsonville Chamber] 17:53:25
From the very beginning of this process. We have been under the impression, perhaps incorrectly, but from the original document that talks about what is an airport master plan, I take from that very first submittal that you gave to us today with the refined preferred alternatives.

[patrick donaldson Wilsonville Chamber] 17:53:45
It talks specifically about just like a homeowner The Oregon Department of Aviation needs to think about how to keep the buildings and outdoor areas like runways and safe working use. And it goes on and talks about that analogy.

[patrick donaldson Wilsonville Chamber] 17:53:59
About how you have to save for these projects to maintain them, et cetera, et cetera.

[patrick donaldson Wilsonville Chamber] 17:54:05
It also talks about that document, identifying a realistic financial plan. It talks about terms like economic impacts and economic grounds. And it's woven this concept of economic impacts is woven all throughout the documents and multiple times the Chamber of Commerce has asked the questions

[patrick donaldson Wilsonville Chamber] 17:54:27
About we have the hard cost of what it costs to relocate a highway, to acquire land, all those things.

[patrick donaldson Wilsonville Chamber] 17:54:33
But we've been under the impression, perhaps incorrectly at this point.

[patrick donaldson Wilsonville Chamber] 17:54:38
That there would be an assessment of the displacement of businesses either temporarily or permanently No assessment, but we were told was going to be done of the number of employees and how that would be impacting their livelihood, either temporarily or permanently. And we sent you a letter on January 21st, which is part

of the record.

[patrick donaldson Wilsonville Chamber] 17:54:59
And I just want to read this one paragraph to ask for clarification about this is, will we or will we not get those costs identified? And it's a pretty straightforward process. This is not rocket science about this.

[patrick donaldson Wilsonville Chamber] 17:55:13
It says that we were represented that these costs would be identified. And we said what we've repeatedly asked for that fact-based meaningful discussions about the economic impact about these proposed alternatives.

[patrick donaldson Wilsonville Chamber] 17:55:28
And despite assurances that these discussions would take place, they've not occurred. At least we haven't been invited or heard them talked about here. As a result, the Wilsonville Area Chamber of Commerce cannot endorse the final report in its current form because it fails to provide any credible analysis of the economic impact upon our regional businesses and communities.

[patrick donaldson Wilsonville Chamber] 17:55:50
So the potential consequences for these businesses and these employees and these communities has yet to be determined. And perhaps that's for another time and place.

[patrick donaldson Wilsonville Chamber] 17:55:59
But as I looked at the original charge. The comments that we've made I wouldn't say we've been deflected.

[patrick donaldson Wilsonville Chamber] 17:56:07
We've been assured that things would happen. And I would just comment that this last conversation And the dialogue between the dialogue people. I sit here and I think to myself.

[patrick donaldson Wilsonville Chamber] 17:56:20
I feel like I'm being shined on as I'm watching this.

[patrick donaldson Wilsonville Chamber] 17:56:24
This is a pretty straightforward question about who was involved in making certain representations and decisions And that'll be simple enough to answer.

[patrick donaldson Wilsonville Chamber] 17:56:32
So I guess I have the same niggling sort of concern that Something is going on here that isn't exactly as transparent as has been represented. And when we first got involved in this process.

[patrick donaldson Wilsonville Chamber] 17:56:46
We were hopeful that this master planning effort would change the dynamic that existed from the previous one where there were too many questions left unanswered.

[patrick donaldson Wilsonville Chamber] 17:56:57

And so I just, I'm disappointed that that simple question, which was represented to us about economic impact and displacements temporarily or permanently, has not been identified as at all like we have in terms of land acquisition and displacement of roads and some of those and drain fields and all those things.

[patrick donaldson Wilsonville Chamber] 17:57:17
So I guess the question is. Will we have that analysis or not?

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 17:57:24
Great. Thanks, Patrick. David, can you answer that question?

[David Miller - Century West] 17:57:28
Well, I'll give you a part of it, and then Tony may want to weigh in as far as some of the other pieces.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:57:35
As far as economic analysis, economic impact statements. They're not typically included in FAA master plan scopes of work and that is work that is not included in our FAA approved scope of work.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:57:50
The other part about that is that the… refinement of master plan concepts, particularly when you're looking at something like trying to assess the impact on adjacent properties with the Hubbard highway shift.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:58:11
We've evaluated things, as you touched on, property acquisition and that sort of thing at a preliminary sort of conceptual level which is appropriate for a conceptual plan. The ODOT process unto itself for highway design.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:58:28
Will fuel both an environmental evaluation and right-of-way evaluation so it's really not possible to pin down the kinds of details you're asking about until there's a more refined.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:58:42
Design, if you will, because the master plan simply identifies a path forward to conform to the FAA standard. The final design and what ODEV and ODOT worked together on in terms of adjustments or changes to the right of way

[David Miller - Century West] 17:58:57
Are yet to be determined or certainly to be you know implemented.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:59:03
Similarly with the drain field, without having an alternative location identified.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:59:09
It's not really possible to evaluate or even quantify impacts on potential tenants or users, if you will.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:59:17
I think there's a you know the idea that the idea that Other locations, as Tony mentioned, there may be some other options for refinement that may work.

[David Miller - Century West] 17:59:31
To the conversation. But if Alternatively, the drain field is relocated off of ODEF property onto the adjacent aeronautical use areas it's difficult and certainly not really part of the master plan to evaluate whether that's going to create any sort of an economic impact on the

[David Miller - Century West] 17:59:53
Property owners or the tenants. I would say also, just as a side note.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:00:00
For the FAA-funded portions of the project, individual project elements all of the individual projects are subject to FAA NEPA requirements, environmental review.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:00:13
And as Neap has currently written, that does include some analysis of economic impact.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:00:19
So I think it's a case where Once the concepts are established, the more detailed analyses are yet to come, which is really a function of the implementation process.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:00:30
That may not satisfy your question, but that's essentially the situation we're in.

[patrick donaldson Wilsonville Chamber] 18:00:30
All right, David. So I want to clarify

[patrick donaldson Wilsonville Chamber] 18:00:35
Okay, so let me clarify. So when I think I hear you saying is that details will follow and they so because if you look at the original documents you all set out It talks very specifically about some of these things. And what I just heard you say is that we're not at a point yet

[patrick donaldson Wilsonville Chamber] 18:00:53
Where we can identify some of those impacts. And those costs. And I can understand that. But I also want to make sure, I don't want to put words in your mouth.

[patrick donaldson Wilsonville Chamber] 18:01:01
Is that those will be forthcoming. So if we get to an end where suddenly we're done.

[patrick donaldson Wilsonville Chamber] 18:01:06
And that hasn't been done. Is that a misrepresentation from the original covenant between this project and the participants, public and panelists?

[David Miller - Century West] 18:01:20

I would say it is not. And I think the issue in any master plan, and I've been involved in And a lot of them is that there are practical limitations of the analysis that are defined by the FAA's approved scope.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:01:34
And economic analysis, airport business plans of that sort of thing are not typically funded by the FAA as part of master plans.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:01:43
Does that mean that the analysis isn't needed at some point in the future to support a project design? No, of course not.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:01:50
I think the question is, what level of analysis is going to be required to satisfy the decision makers.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:01:57
And in that case, it'll be the FAA for a NEPA environmental assessment or perhaps ODOT.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:02:05
For highway related impacts. That's the nature of the planning process in the FAA airport master plan world is that it's a long-term facility plan that identifies key issues, many of which will require action in future phases and implementation.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:02:25
So that's the intent. Broadly, I think that the evaluation of when the earlier references to the goals of master planning to reduce impacts i think The example that I would offer is that the difference between the preliminary preferred alternative

[David Miller - Century West] 18:02:44
And the refined preferred alternatives, the final version. The January 6th, 2025 version.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:02:50
Is that ODAB did in fact consider that. In their decision making.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:02:55
Because the previous alternative recommended acquiring a significant amount of And hangers, many of which include or housing businesses with employees.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:03:07
Was there a detailed environmental analysis to support that decision? Not the way you're describing, but it was a consideration, I think, in the And sort of weighing the advantages and disadvantages.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:03:19
I'll just stop there. But I think that That is common for master planning. That is the methods that are most observed and followed.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:03:30
So there's always an interest in more information as projects become more real when they're becoming going through the design evaluation phases and then ultimately into implementation.

[patrick donaldson Wilsonville Chamber] 18:03:43
Well, when things become more real, I would respectfully request that we all return back to the original commitment that was made at the process about what is an airport master plan And what was represented And whether or not we have met that test, at this point, I would suggest that the chamber does not believe that

[patrick donaldson Wilsonville Chamber] 18:04:08
Covenant has been fulfilled. So I'll leave it at that.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:04:13
Thank you. I was just going to just one last thing on the on the you've been perhaps you've been involved with environmental assessments or environmental impact statement documents. It's important to point out that when a project that's proposed from a mass plan is being implemented, meaning the first stage of implementation might be environmental evaluation.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 18:04:14
Thanks, Patrick.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:04:36
That that process is entirely separate from an airport master planning process.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:04:42
And the evaluation is specific to the design contemplated for that project and in no way is the FAA bound by the recommendation of the master plan. They have to reach an independent finding that the project will not create significant impacts on communities or areas so

[David Miller - Century West] 18:05:04
That level of analysis is not typically found in the airport master plan. So I would say yes, when projects are going forward.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:05:12
The environmental process the FAA will be involved with will be uh we'll be covering some of those same issues.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 18:05:21
Okay. Thank you all for your questions. I'm i just i'm just want to pause real quickly and just see if there are any other additional clarifying questions Otherwise, we can move into the airport layout plan and the capital improvement plan, which I'm not sure

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 18:05:41
If this will get at some of your questions, Patrick, but it might so any other last

clarifying questions about the refined preferred alternative.

[Kenji Sugahara] 18:05:53
Hey, Brandy. Yeah, go ahead, Tony. I was going to refer to you, so go for it.

[Tony Beach] 18:05:54
Yeah.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 18:05:55
Yeah.

[Tony Beach] 18:05:58
Okay. Yeah, I did just want to jump in and I just wanted to make sure that we were being completely clear on the drain field.

[Tony Beach] 18:06:06
Topic specifically. And you said it, it's in the meeting.

[Tony Beach] 18:06:13
Section of the section of the publicproject.net website for the Aurora Airport Master Plan.

[Tony Beach] 18:06:18
When you click on meetings and then you go to pack meeting number eight.

[Tony Beach] 18:06:23
We have… the attachments that were provided.

[Tony Beach] 18:06:29
Including the information that was provided to us on the dream field improvements and the GeoWeb technical overview And then we have the email correspondence on the issues including where we left off the conversation back in February of 2022 with um with on the

[Tony Beach] 18:06:52
Lessee and Lessee's engineer on the drain field as well as our engineers at Century West where ODAP staff and our engineers we're having those conversations. So all of that is included In PAC meeting number eight where we have attached that since our previous PAC meeting

[Tony Beach] 18:07:12
Back in December.

[Kenji Sugahara] 18:07:14
Yep. And to add that in that correspondence. It details exactly what questions were asked and were not answered. So I want to be clear for the record that we did take an analysis. It also includes the exact engineer that was involved

[Kenji Sugahara] 18:07:31
And also the questions that were asked and that were not answered. So I just want

to clarify that we have been And that when we asked her questions, they were not answered.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 18:07:47
I know there's probably some more thoughts around this. I do want to make sure that I see Ted and Tony's hands. I do want to make sure that we also get to the capital improvement plan and the airport layout plan, because I know that's new information here tonight.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 18:08:05
But um I'm wondering if we could hold that until the end when we can come back to it. Is that okay? Thanks, Jen, for posting the link to the website.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 18:08:19
There in the chat. So again, that's under the meetings tab.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 18:08:24
I do know that that our agenda today is really focused on the capital improvement plan and airport layout plan and I want to make sure there's enough time for this. We do have plenty of time for questions and answers later. So I think there will be plenty of time to come back to this. So David, I'm going to let you move forward with this and then we can circle back

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 18:08:44
With the drain field conversation after you walk us through these two items.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:08:50
Okay. Thanks, Brandi. So this is a summary of the capital improvement program, the numbers that were shared in the previous PACH meetings If you remember, I think initially the some of the overall costs were in the overall $185 million range with significant property acquisition on the east side, etc.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:09:11
So right now what we've got here is we've broken out the projects related to meeting FAA standards.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:09:20
And also some ongoing work on the short-term side, the project that's identified is the rehabilitation of the existing runway. And that's the project that is ODAB has been coordinating with FAA on since probably before the master plan so that is

[David Miller - Century West] 18:09:38
That is the first project out of the chute, if you will, that will come come forward.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:09:45
And then there are some other obstruction removal projects identified and some easement acquisition These are things that we anticipate would be completed in the next five years.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:09:58
Over the next five years. Over on the right side, we've got a breakout of projects that we are identifying as longer term So these are beyond five years.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:10:12
They will not necessarily fall in this order, but this is kind of a sort of an area by area breakout.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:10:20
There are several projects related to the reconstruction of the parallel taxiway and some mitigation of the drainage ditch that's adjacent.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:10:28
We're talking sort of environmental design and construction. So a lot of times you'll see projects listed three times because of those components.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:10:37
And then beyond that, then the Hubbard Highway project comes into focus and that again is environmental project, or I should say property acquisition or right of way and then design and construction so lot of complications with that project.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:10:56
The kyle road project is listed and then down toward the middle third we reach the point where with those other projects identified we're looking at the project to extend and reconstruct the runway. So that would be the 497 foot extension of the north end.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:11:16
Also, the parallel taxiway. It's been mentioned before, but it's important to remind ourselves that the ability for ODAV to extend the runway really rests on their ability to meet FAA standards for the object-free area.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:11:30
So the guidance we've been provided by FAA throughout this process has been getting the object-free area for the runway up to standards, the runway safety area up to standards is a is a priority in order to improve the airfield beyond its current capacity to

[David Miller - Century West] 18:11:48
And in terms of runway length. There are a handful of other projects listed there, some apron improvements and some road improvements and so on.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:11:59
The long-term grouping is just shy of $100 million. It is a huge number, lots of cost involved.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:12:07
On the highway side with obviously with shifting right of way and extend and uh design and construction of it.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:12:17
Section of highway there. So that's really the layout. As the notes there, which are probably a little difficult to read, there are some things that We didn't include that are routinely incorporated into capital spending for airports, such as pavement maintenance.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:12:36
Talking seal coats and slurry seals, crack filling, repainting markings, things like that routine.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:12:41
A lot of those fall into the maintenance category. And of course, this doesn't include things like property acquisition that might be opportunistic in the sense that If an adjacent through the fence hanger owner approached I'd have to purchase their hangar.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:12:59
Just because it's not listed here, if it's identified in the airport layout plan it could it could end up falling into a category under the CIP.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:13:09
But at this point, we haven't identified any property in the reserve area for that purpose, nor have we costed out what that would look like.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:13:21
I think that's probably, I'll stop there and see if there are any questions Oh, before I do, let me back up one thing. Typically, projects of this kind are eligible for FAA funding up to 90%.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:13:35
Sometimes, depending on the congressional authorizations, it can be higher. But essentially, approximately 90% of this would be FAA eligible with the local match.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:13:49
And then we can kind of, again, their FAA doesn't make a commitment across the board from the beginning of a master plan, they'll go through each project uh case you know each project sort of case by case and they'll

[David Miller - Century West] 18:14:03
They will do this. Been mentioned and questioned a lot that this is a huge amount of money for the FAA to commit and the FAA has indicated that when they're looking at a project of this magnitude at any airport in the system nationally they they

[David Miller - Century West] 18:14:18
Bring in sort of a regional perspective to the evaluation of funding and It's a little bit of an unusual situation because most airports don't require this level of upgrade.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:14:31
To meet standards. Maybe before I jump in, just to put some context into this i

could just skip ahead and we can take a look at the airport layout plan and the terminal air plan just to get a visual information. I know it's difficult to see

[David Miller - Century West] 18:14:49
This is essentially the same, this is now on the airport layout plan format, the improvements that are were presented in the present prior table, everything on the highway side is i think pretty well understood in terms of the pathway there.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:15:06
The runway obviously the parallel taxiway improvements uh the road extension, the Kyle Rotary alignment, et cetera, the property acquisition.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:15:16
That in this particular drawing is shown in yellow not to be um Not to be confused with the yellow and the alternatives. We've got notes on here to indicate that the other areas are identified for that reserve.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:15:30
And then this area over, this is the ODAV terminal area around the control tower.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:15:36
We've got a more detailed view of that on our terminal area plan.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:15:40
So some circulation roads which do tie into some of the off airport through the fence roads.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:15:47
Future apron improvements, reconfiguring tie downs taxi lane reconfigurations and hangar development in this area here.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:15:58
And again, this gives us a little bit more detail, some of the things that we're dealing with up at the north end of the runway and the parallel taxiway.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:16:06
They are in yellow is property that is not currently owned by ODAV.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:16:10
But it would need to be acquired to control the object-free area for the runway and the adjacent parallel taxiway.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:16:19
So with that, I'd be happy to go back uh questions i can go back to the list of projects or I can leave it on the graphics if it's easier.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:16:27
So I'll just… see what you'd like to see.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 18:16:31

Okay, I see Ben Williams first.

[Ben Williams-FOFP] 18:16:38
Thank you, David. As you pointed out, this has been going on for four years now.

[Ben Williams-FOFP] 18:16:43
Would you refresh my memory, please? Um from i think it was the first pack meeting about the normal time horizon for an faa approved master plan.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:16:59
Ben, are you asking about the planning horizon for the master plan or the time to actually complete a master plan?

[Ben Williams-FOFP] 18:17:06
Well, once a master plan is completed and reviewed by the FAA and approved and goes into effect as an approved and adopted master plan. That's what I mean.

[Ben Williams-FOFP] 18:17:16
Is the timer, I think, is the time horizon 10 years or 20 years

[David Miller - Century West] 18:17:17
Okay. The master airport master plans are by FAA definition have a 20-year planning horizon so effectively 2024 2025 is our You know, you can be considering that this process has taken longer, we did our forecast based on an earlier year. So essentially, it's a

[David Miller - Century West] 18:17:41
20 year window from the approval of the forecast. So that should put the the window the master plan out into the early 2040s so 20 21 to 41, 24.

[Ben Williams-FOFP] 18:17:51
Okay.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:17:53
To that kind of thing. Now, having said that, let me just add, having said that.

[Ben Williams-FOFP] 18:17:55
So that's…

[David Miller - Century West] 18:17:59
It is not typical. For most airports, certainly the size and the complexity of Aurora state airport to update their master plan once every 20 years. They are typically updated more frequently as conditions change or standards change and obviously this is a new master plan.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:18:17
And it will replace the last plan that was adopted in 2012.

[Ben Williams-FOFP] 18:18:22
Okay, well, so I was going to ask a second question, but I need to make a statement

first.

[Ben Williams-FOFP] 18:18:28
Technically, your last statement's incorrect because according to the court of appeals of the state of Oregon, the 2012 master plan was never adopted.

[Ben Williams-FOFP] 18:18:37
But let's not parse the details. So if it's a 20-year planning horizon normally for a master plan.

[Ben Williams-FOFP] 18:18:44
How come in the capital improvement plan slide, you showed three slides back.

[Ben Williams-FOFP] 18:18:51
In the right-hand column that says 23 beyond, and I understand beyond is a very general term. There's another master plan for another million dollars.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:19:04
Well, what the expectation is is that within the next 20 years, the airport will require another master plan update. When that falls.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:19:14
Within that 20-year window. Our expectation is it's likely to be beyond 10 years.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:19:20
When exactly that falls really depend on the priorities at the time and the progress made on the other projects.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:19:28
It is just a reflection of the fact that that an airport like Aurora needs master planning to be done on a fairly regular basis. So that's why it's showing up as another plan.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:19:41
As I said. I mean, it is a 20-year plan But the practical reality is that you know, there will need to be money set aside by faa and ODAV to update their master plan before 20 years.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:19:59
Arise, if that makes sense.

[Ben Williams-FOFP] 18:20:01
David, does that mean as another way of saying what you just said, because you used 10 years that you expect all of the items listed in the long-term projects table.

[Ben Williams-FOFP] 18:20:12
Can be completed within 10 years.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:20:15
No, no, there's no assumption that that would be the case.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:20:19
Typically, when we get into capital improvement program listings and master plans, there's a lengthy detailed list of projects.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:20:27
And quite often because of funding limitations or difficulty in implementation.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:20:33
It is very common for longer term master plan identified projects to be pushed out beyond 20 years.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:20:41
That is very common in most of the master plans I've been involved with over my career, when we go in and update a plan.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:20:47
We find a lot of projects that were recommended previously haven't yet been implemented. That doesn't mean they're obsolete or no longer relevant. They just There are other priorities affected are the ability to fund projects can affect that.

[Ben Williams-FOFP] 18:20:50
Understood.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:21:00
I think the only way I would suggest to look at that is that this master plan identifies the projects based on forecast demand and applicable standards.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:21:09
That should take the airport out over the next 20 years.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:21:13
And however, as conditions change, it is the airport's decision And in coordination with FAA when it's time to update the plan. As I said.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:21:25
One distinction in the planning world from the FAA standpoint from the 2012 plan to where we are today Is the FAA updated its airport design standards significantly in that period. That wasn't anticipated when the plan was last done. So those things happen.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:21:40
They're out of the control of the airport owners so It's just a placeholder to say hey ODAV and FA when you're looking at priorities and spending down the road, keep in mind that they're likely going to need to find another master plan.

[Ben Williams-FOFP] 18:21:55
Okay, thank you.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 18:21:58
Great. Thanks, Ben. Other questions, clarifying comments, questions around the airport layout plan or the capital improvement plan that David has just shown?

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 18:22:11
Ted, I see your hand is up. Go ahead. You should be able to unmute.

[Ted Millar] 18:22:18
Yes, I had a couple of questions. On the airport layout plan.

[Ted Millar] 18:22:24
It's my understanding that for ODev to be able to that they need to expand the airport boundary to show all of these improvements like kyle road And all of those things.

[Ted Millar] 18:22:40
The airport boundary Airport use boundary shown on this new master plan. I don't see it on there.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:22:51
Your first comment, yes, again, this is following the FAA's airport layout plan checklist requirements And one of the items that the definition that the FAA requires is They want to see on the airport layout plan the existing airport property line and that

[David Miller - Century West] 18:23:11
It isn't related to the use of the property. It's related to the ownership of the property.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:23:16
The grant obligations that ODEV has as the airport sponsor extend to the property boundary.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:23:23
And the FAA is absolutely clear about this. Along the same lines.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:23:28
When an airport master plan, airport layout plan identifies property acquisition.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:23:34
Such as the area shown here in yellow. There would be a future airport property line shown also, which we have done.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:23:41
The aeronautical use areas that you're referring to to the east, I think if I remember, we looked at this the other day again.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:23:49
There are notes on the drawing and in the data sheet that will indicate that the current status of that, but It is the official airport property line that the FAA

wants to see.

[Ted Millar] 18:24:02
I understand that. That's just for the part that the state owns.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:24:05
That is correct. Or we'll own through the acquisition, right? Yes.

[Ted Millar] 18:24:06
For purposes of For purposes of the through the fence and for purposes of where you have the yellow indicated for future purchase.

[Ted Millar] 18:24:19
Is that boundary go? Like, for instance, the entire area between the roadway boundary and then these new boundary Acquisitions.

[Ted Millar] 18:24:30
That you're showing.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:24:32
Are you referring… to the yellow area. I'm sorry, Bernie.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 18:24:36
Is…

[Ted Millar] 18:24:38
Well, not this yellow, but on the previous one that you had out there for the future properties that you wanted to be able to have the ability to purchase in the future.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:24:47
Oh, I see. I see.

[Ted Millar] 18:24:48
It's my understanding that those have to be included in the airport boundary to be able to be eligible. Is that correct?

[Ted Millar] 18:24:57
Yeah. Yes.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:24:57
To be eligible for purchase? No, not necessarily because they're not currently owned by the airport so They can be identified as possible areas for acquisition.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:25:10
So they'll be identified in that reserve sense. They wouldn't be part of the current airport boundary. And because there aren't specific parcels identified for acquisition.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:25:26

Because they would be driven by individual willing sellers that have yet to have yet to identify fully.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:25:35
The capture is sort of acknowledging that the areas in this aeronautical use facilities in this area would meet that requirement. They are acknowledged on the plan as potential areas to require if there's a willing seller situation.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:25:50
So you don't need to identify every individual parcel of privately owned land to make it eligible, if that makes sense.

[Ted Millar] 18:25:51
I guess where I'm concerned.

[Ted Millar] 18:25:59
Well, I guess what I'm trying to get to is that all of the buildings on the airport are all on private Homer threw the fence agreement.

[Ted Millar] 18:26:08
And so none of those that I see on here show that they're within the airport use boundary. And I think those Shouldn't those be defined?

[Ted Millar] 18:26:19
Because that's… They have 56% of the airport land and it's the airport use And it's not owned by the state, but it's owned by private enterprise with a through the fence agreement so the airport use boundaries should be included to cover all of those, shouldn't it?

[David Miller - Century West] 18:26:26
Yeah.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:26:34
Yeah.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:26:39
I believe that on this drawing where we get there is the magenta line that runs along the perimeter of these parcels.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:26:47
You'll notice that the entire area that you're referring to has bordered by this magenta line.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:26:53
And then the note will refer to that line. So that is sort of acknowledging that that's where those parcels are and they are therefore captured, if you will, on the airport layout plan.

[Tony Beach] 18:27:06
And David, if I can just jump in for a second. So Ted, I believe the airport

boundary that you're referring to is a state level distinction.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:27:08
Sure.

[Tony Beach] 18:27:17
That is not necessarily the same exact thing that we would show on our federally

[Tony Beach] 18:27:29
Prescribed or assigned airport layout plan.

[Ted Millar] 18:27:34
Yeah, it was my understanding that ODAB must expand the airport boundary to take in Kyle Road area that's shown and the entirety of the aeronautical reserve So that those areas can be developed with aeronautical uses and minimize the temptation of opponents to engage in years

[Ted Millar] 18:27:54
Long litigation. So I think to be able to purchase those even in the future, they have to be shown within the airport use boundary in some way that makes it all identifiable and and meet those requirements.

[Ted Millar] 18:28:13
Isn't that right?

[Tony Beach] 18:28:14
So just as David was mentioning, the magenta line does reflect It's in the legend.

[Tony Beach] 18:28:24
Of the left table, the legend, right where that cursor is There's a magenta line that says airport property acquisition.

[Tony Beach] 18:28:31
In that magenta line, it shows on magenta shows all of the boundaries where the preferred alternative showed potential for property acquisition. So I believe that is shown here in this document.

[Ted Millar] 18:28:43
But shouldn't it also say like a future airport boundary or that's the Airport use boundary or something like that that clearly defines it though.

[Ted Millar] 18:28:53
Because all this shows is potential future acquisition, but I understand you can't acquire it.

[Ted Millar] 18:28:59
Unless it's shown in the master plan. As within the airport boundary.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:29:06
Well, I think what Tony said is accurate. The note two reference, it's a little

hard to see on here, but this essentially indicates what we've said earlier, and that is that These areas are identified as reserves that can meet the FAA's requirement for

[David Miller - Century West] 18:29:25
Acquisition in a situation where there's a willing seller and I would have initiates that process.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:29:32
I think ODAB is covered with this depiction of these boundaries.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:29:37
And I think that part of it is, as we've talked about, part of it is the is the areas that are currently developed and there are areas that are not yet developed so I think… I think that that possibility has been addressed.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 18:29:57
Okay, great. Ted, did you have anything else if you did wave um that you want to add. Otherwise, I'll go to tony helpling Okay, and then after Tony, I think I might check in with you all. So we've had a lot of information here tonight. And so I'm just going to go around the group and you can obviously pass. But I'm going to go alphabetically by first name because that's how it shows up in my

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 18:30:26
My little list of all of UPAC members. So after Tony Helbling, I'll go around to all of the PAC members and just check in with you if you have any questions or thoughts or comments.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 18:30:40
And then we can get back into it for anyone who has additional comments.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 18:30:44
So Tony Helbling.

[Tony Helbling] 18:30:49
Okay, the CIP, we're showing a runway extension, but not until 2030, is that correct, David?

[David Miller - Century West] 18:30:57
Correct right now that project has identified somewhere at 2030 or beyond. And as I said There are a couple of factors. One is the short-term priority is the ongoing rehabilitation of the existing runway.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:31:11
And as we talked about in the last couple of several PAC meetings.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:31:17
The FAA position is that they will fund rehabilitation or maintenance on the runway, but not upgrades. So the existing pavement will will be essentially maintained.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:31:29
Or the pavement strength, if you will. And it will be rehabilitated at its current length. No extension.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:31:36
Strengthening uh so But the second part of the conversation is, as I mentioned earlier.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:31:43
There's an FAA expectation that the non-standard conditions for the current runway will be corrected before a project is considered for extension. So that's the reason that it's down the list. There's a lot of work to do.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:31:58
To get to that point. The implementation phase, as we talked about earlier, is in and of itself very complicated.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:32:06
And I think what Tim House at the FAA has said a number of times is that the FAA is looking for a plan with a target that can be followed and they recognize that this is a a multi-step process that will take many years. So I'm not prepared to say that, you know.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:32:25
I think at this point we'd say that if progress is made toward meeting standards, which is going to be, again, a project by project effort that may affect the decision on when the timing on when that extension would be considered.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:32:38
So there's a lot of I guess the way I'd characterize it is there's a lot of work to do at this airport before the FAA would seriously consider funding a runway extension.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 18:32:52
Oh, okay. Tony, you should be able to unmute again.

[Tony Helbling] 18:32:56
We got to figure this out, Brandy, because this is not collaborative. This mute, unmute. I mean, let's have a conversation this control issue where we can't talk in before This is not conducive to collaboration. This is control on ODEF's part.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 18:33:14
Yeah. Yeah, I'm sorry it's Yeah, go ahead.

[Tony Helbling] 18:33:14
And I don't appreciate it. Next thing is Okay, so the other part of that question is then the EA wouldn't start till 2030. Is what you show on the slide so that pushes an EA with opposition filing lawsuits I mean, this could push out to 2035

[Tony Helbling] 18:33:38
Or later and that's or later I mean, this is a safety issue that we need to get addressed further. And then also, I just want to make sure everybody understands the record here I'm going to talk about the drain field easements because or the drain field issue again

[Tony Helbling] 18:33:55
Because what Tony Beach is referring to is questions that were tabled in 2021 before this master plan ever started.

[Tony Helbling] 18:34:01
Those questions were not relevant to this master plan. Or the submittal that we just made. And to be clear, Betty Stansbury talked to me as the chair of HDSE And we tabled that discussion about the geotextile fabric at the time at her request and suggestion

[Tony Helbling] 18:34:18
Because Odav had maintained or retained Century West separate from this master plan and not even James Kirby and Dave Miller, your group, it was the Spokane group that handles septic type work for Century West.

[Tony Helbling] 18:34:34
And they put out a survey to try to figure out how much effluent the whole airport was putting out.

[Tony Helbling] 18:34:40
And nobody answered their survey. So I worked with Betty collaboratively at the time to gather that data for Century West.

[Tony Helbling] 18:34:47
Because at the time there was a discussion about porting all the effluent at the entire airport and our drain field going away.

[Tony Helbling] 18:34:54
But to the north, the Columbia helicopters. And we explored that. Then that disappeared. It evaporated. The whole study.

[Tony Helbling] 18:35:02
So to now claim that technical questions that were asked at that time are the basis for a decision to not allow consideration for the geotextile fabric in this master plan is just it's I can't understand how you could even think that.

[Tony Helbling] 18:35:21
Because at the time, those questions were tabled by Betty Stansbury herself.

[Tony Helbling] 18:35:27
The director of ODAP. And to claim that that's the reason why we're not going to consider it and say we decided that it isn't.

[Tony Helbling] 18:35:36

Because and then not define who we is I think that's absurd. And I think the master plan, as we've stated several times.

[Tony Helbling] 18:35:44
Is being rammed through this drain field issue is being rammed through without consideration.

[Tony Helbling] 18:35:50
And I'm just not going to sit back and let you guys push it through without at least getting into the record that you're ramming this through and it's unjustified and it's unconscionable.

[Tony Helbling] 18:36:01
So I'll shut up.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 18:36:03
Hey, Tony, thank you for your comments. I do want to check in with other PAC members who haven't chimed in tonight.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 18:36:14
So if you don't have anything you want to add or questions that you might have, please just say skip, that's totally fine. So Austin barnes

[Austin Barnes] 18:36:27
Hey, Brandy, nothing more to add. Thank you.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 18:36:29
Okay, Bill Graup. Okay. Brandon.

[Bill Graupp] 18:36:32
A pastor.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 18:36:35
Pike, wait. Wrong person. Sorry, my notes.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 18:36:42
Brian Asher.

[Brian Asher] 18:36:52
Thank you. My question, I think it's been addressed on this capital improvement plan. What percentage of the numbers here has a… factor for inflation.

[Brian Asher] 18:37:09
You know, I know our projects in the last two years have just gone out of sight.

[Brian Asher] 18:37:14
So, you know, you're talking about projects here that are 10 years out. I just wondered, I know it was discussed If you could just reiterate about that, David, I'd appreciate that.

[Brian Asher] 18:37:25
Thanks.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:37:25
Yeah, absolutely. Great question. So the engineering cost estimates that went into building the capital improvement program were developed using 2024 dollars and the common method for adjusting or accounting for inflation in airport master plans is the um 2024 dollars essentially

[David Miller - Century West] 18:37:47
Built into the CIP. The airport management can use the CIP as an index. So any future year They can adjust the costs based on the change in the CIP.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:38:02
If it's three years down the road or 15 years down the road, there's a fixed point CIP to begin and then wherever they are in the planning period.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:38:11
And it's a great point. I think it's we again Because we can't predict the future in terms of inflation.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:38:20
We're establishing the CIP in 2024. And the expectation is, yes, as projects are implemented In the future with the adjustments and the costs of everything going up, things will cost more. Absolutely.

[Brian Asher] 18:38:35
My prediction would be in the next seven or eight years, it's going to double in price so Most likely.

[Brian Asher] 18:38:42
That's the kind of way we've been running our lives. Thank you for your time. I appreciate it.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:38:47
Thank you very much.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 18:38:48
Great. Thanks, Mayor Asher. I see Catherine Stevens.

[Cathryn Stephens] 18:38:53
Yeah, hi there. I've been listening in. Appreciate all of the questions and dialogue. Thank you so much to staff and to our consultants for continuing to move this process along and I will just continue to listen in i'm the

[Cathryn Stephens] 18:39:08
The Oregon Aviation Board liaison. And so we've been having updates on a regular basis at our board meetings and look forward to having additional updates as this process moves forward. Thanks.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 18:39:22
Thank you. All right, Councillor Anne Shevlin.

[Councilor Anne Shevlin] 18:39:25
Thank you. Thank you, Brandy. I'll take just a moment to introduce myself. I know that the group here is used to seeing Councillor Joanne Linville.

[Councilor Anne Shevlin] 18:39:33
Sitting in this seat, she's completed her term. I'm a newly elected counselor for the city of Wilsonville.

[Councilor Anne Shevlin] 18:39:41
I'm honored to serve in that position. I just have a few comments, no questions particularly I'd like to say that to say that the city of Wilsonville is disappointed in the outcome of a four year long process that recommend spending, I'm going to stick with $185 million planning to Mr. Asher's point, it could be up to two million two hundred million rather

[Councilor Anne Shevlin] 18:40:04
By the time we get around to some of these projects. But anyhow, recommended spending $185 million on a 500 foot runway extension condemnation of private residences and businesses relocation of a significant portion of State Highway 550 and associated improvements to make the airport safe

[Councilor Anne Shevlin] 18:40:26
Which will ultimately only benefit a small number of interests while still impacting the larger communities.

[Councilor Anne Shevlin] 18:40:32
Would be an understatement. For us, the flawed process at no point discussed some of the issues that I'm going to list here.

[Councilor Anne Shevlin] 18:40:41
Now, Mr. Miller did point out that the environmental impact study and other environmental studies would occur after this fact. But for the record, I'm going to list them here.

[Councilor Anne Shevlin] 18:40:53
So we've been concerned that the issues have not addressed the concerns of the surrounding communities of Wilsonville and Aurora.

[Councilor Anne Shevlin] 18:41:02
The process thus far has failed to address issues associated with municipal governance.

[Councilor Anne Shevlin] 18:41:08
Surface water or groundwater contamination inadequate wastewater treatment necessary to address DEQ violations and FAA standards lack of review of stormwater pollution that impacts endangered fish.

[Councilor Anne Shevlin] 18:41:24
No study of toxic chemical pollution and PFAS accumulation No study of firefighting capacity nor discussion of lack of appropriate apparatus at the airport.

[Councilor Anne Shevlin] 18:41:36
And no study of recommendations regarding area residence noise complaints about low-flying aircraft.

[Councilor Anne Shevlin] 18:41:44
So in conclusion, as this process moves into its next phase, the city does want to thank the FAA for their participation in this process.

[Councilor Anne Shevlin] 18:41:52
The city also appreciates being able to participate in this process and will be watching very closely in the future to ensure that there's an appropriate blend of all the safety improvements that we've mentioned and others I know that will come up

[Councilor Anne Shevlin] 18:42:08
And that these are undertaken along with work to improve airport operations. Thank you.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 18:42:14
Great, thanks. All right, Dave Malk.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 18:42:21
You should be able to unmute.

[Dave Mauk] 18:42:25
Quick comment and quick question. I'd like to thank Councillor Shevlin for her comments that she just made.

[Dave Mauk] 18:42:32
Thanks very much. And my question is, how many acres does ODAF control now at the airport?

[Dave Mauk] 18:42:39
And how many acres are they conceivably going to control at the airport using the dotted lines that Ted Millar was walked through.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:42:53
I would have to pull that. Tony probably has the number currently.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:42:58
The current ownership of acreage and then the acquisition that's identified. I don't have those numbers right at my fingertips, but we can provide

[Dave Mauk] 18:43:06
If you could post those somewhere or get back to me and I suppose a few others would like that information.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:43:12
Yes, absolutely. I know that preliminary breakouts of property, we had identified approximate acreages, so it was in the some of the analysis of alternatives but And it will be depicted on the draft airport layout plan in the data sheet in terms of existing acreage and future acreage, but we will

[David Miller - Century West] 18:43:31
Will not be able to respond to your comment. Perfectly.

[Tony Beach] 18:43:34
So I'm sorry, David, I'm just going to jump in. I'm going to take a quick look now, but I believe it's in the inventory.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:43:36
Yeah.

[Tony Beach] 18:43:43
Chapter. That would be the existing property acreage and then in the in the preferred alternative, it Number four, how many acres would be acquired?

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 18:43:44
Okay, great.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 18:44:00
Okay, great. So you might get back to us, Tony and um just Let me know when you're ready. All right, so we'll get back to you, Dave, on that number.

[Dave Mauk] 18:44:09
Thank you.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 18:44:09
Okay, David Wagner.

[David Waggoner] 18:44:15
Good evening all. Despite the fact that the Aurora Airport is just a huge economic generator for the surrounding area.

[David Waggoner] 18:44:24
The money that it pours into Wilsonville, Canby, Aurora is just unbelievable in its scope. But despite that economic impact and despite the fact that as the airport mat that will grow in benefit of the local communities I find it absolutely unacceptable

[David Waggoner] 18:44:42
That we would even consider taking private property from private property owners and businesses that are on the west side of the Hubbard cutoff highway So I think we need to look at a different option for that.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 18:44:55

Okay, great. Thanks, David. All right, I see Jamie Stickle next.

[Jamie Stickel, City of Canby] 18:45:04
Thank you. Jamie Sickle, City of Canby. David, thank you first for your presentation. I know there's a lot of information and appreciate it all laid out this way. The question I had was, and maybe you said this and maybe I just missed it, but that the percentage

[Jamie Stickel, City of Canby] 18:45:22
Eligible for FAA funding might be 90%. It depends on the funding and the project.

[Jamie Stickel, City of Canby] 18:45:27
But that it would be up to then having a local match. Is that through ODAV or is that Who is the local match?

[David Miller - Century West] 18:45:36
Great question. Thank you. I should clarify. Yeah, the local in this case is the the owner of the airport, which is Odepth.

[Jamie Stickel, City of Canby] 18:45:47
Okay.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:45:47
So that does not mean, of course, that other sources of funds could contribute to the local match.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:45:53
Depending on the project. There may be tenant related improvements.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:45:58
That's not uncommon to see sometimes. The distinction is some airports are run by cities, towns, some are owned by counties.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:46:06
And in those cases, local are those governments so local is State Department of Aviation.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:46:14
And as far as I was going to say just as far as a percentage, 90% is typically what we see.

[Jamie Stickel, City of Canby] 18:46:14
Thank you so much.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:46:20
But of course. Faa Reauthorization Act surpassed by Congress.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:46:26
Periodically and they're free to change formulas as needed.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:46:32
That's based on what is in place today.

[Jamie Stickel, City of Canby] 18:46:35
And my second one my second piece was actually just a comment and not for David, but I know that there have been asks for these meetings to be held in person and I understand due to reasons that we're not able to do that. But I do think it would be nice to have the ODAV representatives with their cameras on and feeling like they're participating in the meeting. Maybe that would feel like less of a divide between the PAC

[Jamie Stickel, City of Canby] 18:46:57
And ODAO itself, rather than just jumping in with an answer and then taking their video off.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 18:47:03
Great. Thanks, Jamie. John Bickford.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 18:47:13
Maybe I got the wrong name. Sorry about that. Melissa Arens.

[Melissa Ahrens, DLCD] 18:47:20
Good evening, everyone. No questions or comments at this time. Thank you.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 18:47:24
Great. Naomi Zordley.

[Naomi Zwerdling, ODOT] 18:47:30
Yes, I also have no comments, so I will just pass. Thank you.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 18:47:37
Okay. Pam Barlow Lind.

[Pam Barlow Lind] 18:47:44
Hi there, Ditto. Same there, no questions, no comments. Lots of thoughts, but… Nothing to add at this point.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 18:47:50
Okay, great. Thank you. Patrick Donaldson.

[patrick donaldson Wilsonville Chamber] 18:47:56
Looking at the chart of the capital improvement plan, I see the short-term projects for the next four to five years.

[patrick donaldson Wilsonville Chamber] 18:48:02
And I see long-term projects for 30 and beyond. I've already made comments about the economic displacement and impact that's going to take place in real people's lives, real people's homes, real people's businesses, real people's community.

[patrick donaldson Wilsonville Chamber] 18:48:16

So this is not just something that happens overnight, but over a long extended period of time. And there's a simple way of doing this.

[patrick donaldson Wilsonville Chamber] 18:48:23
Economists are capable of doing this in a nanosecond, quite frankly. That said.

[patrick donaldson Wilsonville Chamber] 18:48:27
Secondly, I ask the question, when I start adding these figures up on these things, I notice down on the second chart about long-term projects.

[patrick donaldson Wilsonville Chamber] 18:48:36
An estimate is made of $1 million for the next airport master plan. I recall from our first meeting that it was estimated that the cost of this, the contract between FAA and ODAV and the consultants.

[patrick donaldson Wilsonville Chamber] 18:48:50
Was approximately about $900,000, but that I've heard a number of things since that time that those costs have crept up. So my question is, as of today, how much has been spent on this project above and beyond, both totally and also above and beyond the original estimate.

[patrick donaldson Wilsonville Chamber] 18:49:10
And does that mean that the estimate that's in this chart of $1 million is significantly less than it really is in real time dollars?

[patrick donaldson Wilsonville Chamber] 18:49:18
And I would just echo the fact that, and I'm going to take some liberty here, we perhaps have heard this quote before about what God has joined together, let no man put asunder.

[patrick donaldson Wilsonville Chamber] 18:49:31
What FAA has joined together, let no person put asunder. I think that what's interesting at the beginning of this process, there was differences of opinion.

[patrick donaldson Wilsonville Chamber] 18:49:41
But an unintended consequence about this process is that ODAV has joined all of these opposing forces to come to a common conclusion.

[patrick donaldson Wilsonville Chamber] 18:49:51
Which is that this thing is about ready to go off the end of the runway I'm just very disappointed that we've invested all this time, effort, and money and and counselor Shevlin and Dave Mock and other people have spoken well about this.

[patrick donaldson Wilsonville Chamber] 18:50:06
And there's an opportunity to get it back on track. And that is that We've already testified to it. I just have to stop because enough has been said.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 18:50:18
Okay, thank you patrick. So I think

[patrick donaldson Wilsonville Chamber] 18:50:18
Thank you

[David Miller - Century West] 18:50:21
I would just defer to Tony on the question that was asked and I think that

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 18:50:28
Yeah, specifically about the cost of the planning, the airport master planning process.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 18:50:35
And how much more it has been spent than originally estimated, I believe, was Patrick's questions.

[Tony Beach] 18:50:45
So thank you for restating that i was looking through the preferred, the refined preferred alternative and found where on page 19 out of 30 I'm sorry, the 19 out of 30 is in tonight's presentation.

[Tony Beach] 18:51:02
Where it shows 25 acres for priority property acquisition and 153 acres in property acquisition reserves. So just wanted to close the loop on that.

[Tony Beach] 18:51:13
But thank you for restating the question. And I don't have the total amount.

[Tony Beach] 18:51:20
The grant amount that we have for this project was discussed in previous meetings and I don't have the exact number in front of me But we have gone well over time and well over budget on this project because we wanted to have such a robust

[Tony Beach] 18:51:40
Discussion and have had additional meetings beyond what was originally scoped.

[Tony Beach] 18:51:44
For this project. And again, just to make sure that we could have robust discussion.

[Kenji Sugahara] 18:51:51
Yeah, and Tony, just for everybody out there, to be clear, a lot of the money that was spent above and beyond with in order to get additional public comment and actually get more information to have more robust discussion.

[Kenji Sugahara] 18:52:06
So that is the reason that it was above and beyond.

[Kenji Sugahara] 18:52:09
So I just want to be clear on that. This was to enhance public involvement.

[Kenji Sugahara] 18:52:16

So thank

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 18:52:18
Okay, great. Thank you. Ben, I do see that your hand is up, but I want to get through a few more people, so I'll circle back with you.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 18:52:27
Whitney, Stuart, do you want to read your comment or should I read it?

[Whitney Stewart] 18:52:33
Hi, thank you. No, yeah, I can restate that question really quick. So just essentially, and again, give me folks if I'm kind of speaking outside of my knowledge base here and some ignorant showing.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 18:52:38
Okay.

[Whitney Stewart] 18:52:44
But in this, the capital improvement plan or the master plan, was there any thought given to kind of seismic improvements or any kind of general resiliency of the airport in an idea that like emergency preparations that was just kind of an idea of if that was baked into any of these potentialities.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:53:03
I think, great question. I was going to say that when any sort of engineering analysis of reconstruction Whether it's a runway or a taxiway or any other facilities. I think that resiliency is one of the factors that is considered.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:53:23
So I would… defer to our engineers in terms of the assumptions but i I think at this stage, there weren't specific seismic upgrades included that I'm familiar with. I could be wrong, but I think that when a project unfolds

[David Miller - Century West] 18:53:39
5, 10, 15 years down the road, the regulatory requirements, the design standards may be different in that field.

[David Miller - Century West] 18:53:47
Whatever is applicable appropriate would be built into that. Effort, I think it's fair to say.

[Whitney Stewart] 18:53:52
Thank you

[David Miller - Century West] 18:53:54
Thank you.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 18:53:56
Okay, great. So I'm going to circle back with Erin. Do you have anything else to add at this time, Erin?

[Aron Faegre] 18:54:13
Yeah, I guess I wanted to mention someone claimed there were violations, but I can say that both drain fields that are being discussed here.

[Aron Faegre] 18:54:24
Have our DEQ license. They get regular inspections There are no violations in them at all.

[Aron Faegre] 18:54:31
They're very functional. And actually kind of following up on the prior question.

[Aron Faegre] 18:54:40
In a major earthquake, it's estimated that urban sewer systems will be down For about a year.

[Aron Faegre] 18:54:48
And because Aurora is such an important airport. With its capabilities for, and that's comes from Dogami and others who've studied it. So the year I'm not making it up.

[Aron Faegre] 18:55:03
Um. So Aurora, one of the things I wanted to say, I wanted to remind people that in the California fires, who's fighting those fires, who's moving power lines?

[Aron Faegre] 18:55:16
Many of the helicopters and the work being done it is Coming from Aurora, it's that important of an airport. And so I hope people realize we're not talking hypothetically about aviation business as we're talking about you know crucial, incredibly important aviation businesses that

[Aron Faegre] 18:55:36
That pretty much any airport would love to have. But I just did want to clarify there are no violations at either of these drain fields that are being discussed.

[Aron Faegre] 18:55:47
And, you know, just to further up, I saw Tony put a note in the chat reminding everyone that if there was a reason that questions weren't answered, it's because the director And this is before Kenji's time, so maybe Kenji didn't know this.

[Aron Faegre] 18:56:04
She put it on hold. And our last request was because the questions had gotten so detailed I said, you know, let's have the two geotechs in the room Because they're the experts on what can and can't be done and where these numbers come from.

[Aron Faegre] 18:56:21
And I feel confident they would have agreed with each other, GRI and NV5 are great companies. They share staff.

[Aron Faegre] 18:56:30

You know, often between them So I just still think that whole issue really never got clarified so i think You know, again, I would just say to Kenji i hope to you will keep that alive and not throw it out because I think there are good solutions there using modern technology.

[Aron Faegre] 18:56:53
And I was disappointed to hear that the use of the EMAS system, which again is used at other airports was just discarded without really any reason.

[Aron Faegre] 18:57:04
You know, clearly it does work and it would allow the drain fields to remain where they are in both ends of the runway. And we submitted a a drawing showing how that be done. But I think those are the main comments I have, just that I and, you know, in the whole

[Aron Faegre] 18:57:24
Modification of standard. It's so counter to what the advisory circulars, which are Federal Register, I mean, that's what the nation airports run on and that someone it's been attributed to someone in the FAA regionally as saying we can't use it.

[Aron Faegre] 18:57:46
All of you who fly commercially have been into many airports that do use the MOS.

[Aron Faegre] 18:57:53
All the time and it could be used here, clearly. But I'll stop there. I'll just hope that… as this progresses.

[Aron Faegre] 18:58:05
What's available to the rest of the country can be made available for Oregon as well and that we're not singled out for some reason.

[Aron Faegre] 18:58:14
Thank you.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 18:58:14
Thanks, Aaron. Thanks. All right, I'm going to go to Ben Williams and then bruce And then Ted Millar, and then Tony Helpling.

[Ben Williams-FOFP] 18:58:24
Thanks, Brandy. David, will you go back two slides, please, to the ALP?

[Ben Williams-FOFP] 18:58:32
Great, thanks. I'm… noticing the two empty signature blocks at the bottom of the ALP.

[Ben Williams-FOFP] 18:58:42
And to my earlier comment about the Court of Appeals. Ruling that the 2012 master plan isn't valid because it wasn't properly adopted and approved by the aviation board.

[Ben Williams-FOFP] 18:58:56
The ALP that went along with that master plan was signed by the then Director of the aviation department Mitch Weipert.

[Ben Williams-FOFP] 18:59:08
What the department was unable to deliver to either Luba or the Court of Appeals with any documentation on the part of the aviation board that they had delegated to Mitch Schwecker the authority to sign the alp on their behalf on the aviation board's behalf

[Ben Williams-FOFP] 18:59:27
In order to submit it to the FAA for counter signature.

[Ben Williams-FOFP] 18:59:33
At the beginning of this presentation, you had the project timeline and it still has conclusion in May showing delivery of the final document following FAA review.

[Ben Williams-FOFP] 18:59:48
Presumably that's delivering that document your client, which is the Department of Aviation.

[Ben Williams-FOFP] 18:59:56
What is the plan for the next step after that? I'm talking now about approval and adoption by the aviation board that has the statutory responsibility And B, the specifics about signing the ALP on behalf of the state of Oregon.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 19:00:16
And I wonder, David, I know you have a whole section on the next steps. I'm wondering if we could pause that question maybe, Ben, because I know David has a whole section on next steps and what those what that entails. Is that okay if we just pause that?

[David Miller - Century West] 19:00:20
I do. I do. Yeah, okay.

[Ben Williams-FOFP] 19:00:33
If the answers to those questions are being covered, yes. My assumption was it was next steps in this PAC process.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 19:00:33
Sure.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:00:37
Okay.

[Ben Williams-FOFP] 19:00:40
And the timeline shows that all ending in May.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 19:00:43
Yeah. Yes, David, correct me if I'm wrong, but I believe that you're going to talk

about the whole process for closing out the airport master plan.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:00:53
Yes, yes. And just to quick clarify, the may uh submittal is the draft final report that will be submitted for FAA review.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:01:02
But I'll come back to that when we go through the next steps.

[Ben Williams-FOFP] 19:01:07
Okay.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 19:01:07
Okay, thanks, Ben. Did you have anything else, Ben? Okay, great.

[Ben Williams-FOFP] 19:01:12
No, ma'am, that does it. Thank you.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:01:14
Randy, I need just 30 seconds to step out for a sec if you can

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 19:01:17
Okay, great. Okay. Bruce, do you have any questions, comments?

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 19:01:27
I thought you were here. Oh, there you are. Okay.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 19:01:33
You should be able to unmute.

[Bruce Bennett] 19:01:35
There it is. Thank you. Yeah, I see you.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 19:01:37
Okay.

[Bruce Bennett] 19:01:41
A huge problem right next to a possible huge solution.

[Bruce Bennett] 19:01:48
The runway lengthening is safety. That's for our neighbors. And that's that's in the plan since 1976.

[Bruce Bennett] 19:01:59
As required by the FAA for safety. In 76, it was 1,000 feet.

[Bruce Bennett] 19:02:07
Now they've reduced it to 500 additional feet. That's a significant compromise, half, but But it's an improvement and i think it's an improvement is that is the top priority and for it not to be in the capital improvement plan is

[Bruce Bennett] 19:02:23
Is criminal. And the solution we've been talking about safe approved ways of avoiding ways of avoiding disrupting the neighbors.

[Bruce Bennett] 19:02:34
And spending tons of money that no one has. On moving the road.

[Bruce Bennett] 19:02:41
Doing that a more economical way, realizing it's a one-sided runway because of that highway The airport is only developed and will only ever be developed on one side.

[Bruce Bennett] 19:02:55
Uh the uh

[Bruce Bennett] 19:03:00
Avoiding moving that road and taking that property

[Aron Faegre] 19:03:01
Can you testify? That there are two non-standard

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 19:03:06
Oh, sorry, I muted you, Erin. Go ahead, Bruce.

[Bruce Bennett] 19:03:07
And… That's all right.

[Bruce Bennett] 19:03:12
Getting the lengthening And the ASAP.

[Bruce Bennett] 19:03:17
Not in the third year, I think. Is imperative.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 19:03:24
Okay. Thank you, Bruce. I… I see Ted and then Tony Helpling.

[Ted Millar] 19:03:40
This is Ted. I just had two questions. One. Is it possible to go back and add the internal circulation road on private property that was shown in the 2012 master plan.

[Ted Millar] 19:03:56
And has been submitted several times in our submittals for this master plan.

[Ted Millar] 19:04:03
Not talking necessarily about who would pay for it. But I believe there are ways to get that paid for that would minimize any expense by ODAV or the FAA. And that's also a safety issue Because this isn't Portland International.

[Ted Millar] 19:04:22

Where everything is controlled. According to the airlines. This is a collaborative, what they call

[Ted Millar] 19:04:32
Commercial service Airport free.

[Ted Millar] 19:04:37
Private enterprise and construction companies and things like that. It's an entirely different kind of an airport. And so everybody needs to work back and forth together and to be able to drive back and forth one under the other because they work together without going out

[Ted Millar] 19:04:55
The highway. And so I like to see that added back into the master plan.

[Ted Millar] 19:05:02
Also, the other is my point I tried to make earlier It's my understanding that ODAV must expand the airport boundary to take in the Kyle Road area that's showing at an airport and the entire and the entirety of the aeronautically reserve

[Ted Millar] 19:05:24
It has to be shown in there as part of the airport boundary and just to show it in that magenta line as something about the future boundary doesn't accomplish that. So I'd like to see those two things really addressed.

[Ted Millar] 19:05:38
And if we don't have time tonight, I'd like to request one additional pack work session to where we could actually collaboratively talk about some of these solutions because I don't think we're that far apart It's just a matter of we don't have to have one person win and one lose.

[Ted Millar] 19:05:58
I think we need to figure out a way to get a win-win for all of us.

[Ted Millar] 19:06:03
And I think it can be achieved very easily if we could just sit and talk about the options and find a ground that would work for everybody.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 19:06:15
Great. Thanks, Ted. Um so I guess I'm not sure if David or Tony could answer your question if that could internal circulation could be added back into the plan.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 19:06:31
Tonight.

[Tony Beach] 19:06:33
Yeah. Yeah. Thanks, Brandy. So in our last meeting in December 10th.

[Tony Beach] 19:06:39
We did have some discussion on that and we clarified We actually asked the PAC for

clarification when we were talking about the the vehicle service road that was shown in And when we were getting a lot of comments against that vehicle service road because of the impacts they had to the existing hangars.

[Tony Beach] 19:06:58
We did ask for clarification on um the internal what was being proposed as the internal circulation road and we also explained in that meeting that we can't show, as David mentioned also in this meeting, that we can't show the improvements off of airport

[Tony Beach] 19:07:20
That ODAB would undertake without you know doing the property acquisition. So right now, what we're showing is potential for property acquisition that again we think enables us to accomplish something like the proposed internal circulation road If there's a willing seller. So we believe that the way it's currently shown, we can work through that.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 19:07:48
Okay. Tony Helbling.

[Tony Helbling] 19:07:57
Okay, this goes back to the airport boundary issue. I have a difference of opinion on the airport boundary issue.

[Tony Helbling] 19:08:07
It's my understanding the FAA won't provide funds for something that is not inside what the sponsor is deciding the airport boundary is.

[Tony Helbling] 19:08:21
And that gets into a mess. It gets into a real sticky wicket and i get it.

[Tony Helbling] 19:08:26
Because the state doesn't own that property now, but to designate it for future reserves for eligibility for FAA funding, you're going to I believe a catch-22.

[Tony Helbling] 19:08:38
The FAA won't fund it unless it's in the airport boundary, but you're saying you don't want to put it in the FAA boundary.

[Tony Helbling] 19:08:43
Because or the airport boundary because you don't own it. So I disagree with your analysis and it just begs the question begs that you've got the road acquisition on the far side, but you can't put the road acquisition or the potential for the internal circulation road, which would save you a ton of money

[Tony Helbling] 19:09:05
That we're suggesting on this proposed ALP. It just, it doesn't make sense to me.

[Tony Helbling] 19:09:12
But going back to the airport boundary issue as a whole.

[Tony Helbling] 19:09:15
The problem is, and I think even Ben Williams brought this up and here I go agreeing with Ben Williams again the way the state looks at land use the state looks at the ALP and looks at it as a land use document.

[Tony Helbling] 19:09:33
And it makes a difference. And what we do now and what we don't do makes a huge difference for land use loss in the state of Oregon.

[Tony Helbling] 19:09:41
Because of how the court looks at the ALP and what the ALP is.

[Tony Helbling] 19:09:46
And it makes no sense to me why the state would not choose to make the airport boundary include properties that you're openly declaring that you want to purchase.

[Tony Helbling] 19:09:57
So that you can own the entire everything that is the airport, what you consider the airport to be we just don't understand why you're refusing it to do it.

[Tony Beach] 19:10:11
So Tony I made a couple of comments earlier when Ted made a comment earlier but But I believe, if I'm understanding your comment or understanding your or disagreement correctly, I believe what you're referring to as the airport boundary um there's a

[Tony Beach] 19:10:30
State definition. And what this airport layout plan to meet FAA requirements This is showing the current property and the future property acquisition.

[Tony Beach] 19:10:43
And I believe we're looking at apples and oranges here. I think we're talking about two different things.

[Tony Beach] 19:10:48
But to meet the FAA's requirements, we're showing the current airport property line and the future property line and future property acquisition.

[Tony Beach] 19:10:59
So our existing and ultimate configuration over the 20 year planning period.

[Tony Helbling] 19:11:04
Okay. And see, here's the challenge that we face, Tony, with this this You know, Kenji said it's collaborative. It's not. It's you present and then we have to defend This is the first time we've seen this airport layout plan.

[Tony Helbling] 19:11:16
And it's going to go steamboat right through. We're on our computers. We can't see the detail in this airport layout plan.

[Tony Helbling] 19:11:24
But this is the airport layout plan. That the courts are going to look at.

[Tony Helbling] 19:11:29
And what I'd like to see is if you look at the area on the east side of the current Elan Road.

[Tony Helbling] 19:11:36
And it's shaded in yellow. Where is the state airport boundary depicted on that?

[Tony Helbling] 19:11:43
And see, we can't see only these little bitty screens, but you're asking us to comment on it.

[Tony Helbling] 19:11:48
And to talk about it, but how can we do this without actually seeing it?

[Kenji Sugahara] 19:11:54
So quick thing for you, Tony. Did you have a chance to look at the materials that were provided to you before the meeting?

[Tony Helbling] 19:11:56
Yeah.

[Tony Helbling] 19:12:03
The materials that were provided before the meeting. Was this LP in it?

[Kenji Sugahara] 19:12:05
Yes. So the meeting materials. Yes.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 19:12:09
No apart.

[Tony Helbling] 19:12:09
Yes.

[Kenji Sugahara] 19:12:09
Brandy, is this layout plan included in the meeting materials that were provided to the to the PAC members? No.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 19:12:16
No, no, sorry. No, sorry, Kenji.

[Tony Beach] 19:12:17
It's posted. It's posted on the website right now.

[Tony Helbling] 19:12:20
Yeah.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 19:12:21

But we did post, yeah, we did post it just now so that hopefully you can zoom in and see it. Yeah, sorry.

[Kenji Sugahara] 19:12:22
Okay.

[Tony Helbling] 19:12:26
Okay. Yeah. Hopefully we can, but we're in a zoom meeting with you seeing people's faces It's now up on the site.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 19:12:30
Okay. Mm-hmm.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 19:12:34
Yeah.

[Tony Helbling] 19:12:37
And the night of and then telling us what your next steps are, where we don't have time to digest this.

[Tony Helbling] 19:12:42
I mean…

[Ben Williams-FOFP] 19:12:43
And the resolution on the screen version of the ALP is so bad, even when you zoom in, you can't read the fine print.

[Tony Helbling] 19:12:49
Hey, Ben Williams agrees with me.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 19:12:50
Okay.

[Ben Williams-FOFP] 19:12:51
Absolutely. We're all in the same boat now. Everybody hates the master plan.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 19:12:58
No, I mean, I think, you know. That was one of the reasons we wanted to make sure that we kept comments open until the 25th.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 19:13:08
But I definitely hear you, Tony, that This was not presented beforehand to you. And so we tried to post it during the meeting to to get it to you as soon as possible so you can look at it.

[Tony Beach] 19:13:20
And there's…

[Tony Helbling] 19:13:20
Well, what's frustrating, I guess, what's frustrating, I guess, is we've talked

about this numerous times. This is, I think, the third meeting in a row the stuff isn't presented to us beforehand.

[Tony Helbling] 19:13:32
It's showed to us during this meeting And then we're asked to give you our feedback on it. And then given time after the meeting.

[Tony Helbling] 19:13:39
I mean, previous master plans, stuff was presented long before so we'd have time to study it.

[Tony Helbling] 19:13:44
Look at it intelligently, work with our team to kind of figure out what we thought about it so we could prevent present meaningful discussion.

[Tony Helbling] 19:13:52
This discussion is not meaningful because we haven't had a chance to look at this.

[Tony Helbling] 19:13:55
And for the life of me, what's the difference between the line that's around what is the future Kyle Road And the aeronautical reserve proposed further to Airport Road.

[Tony Helbling] 19:14:08
Because both of them have to be acquired and you want the FAA to pay for both.

[Tony Helbling] 19:14:12
And it's my understanding talking to people at the FAA that it's less it's depicted in the airport boundary The FAA is not going to pay for it.

[Tony Beach] 19:14:24
So if I can just add, Tony, and David might be able to speak to a little more detail to this But this airport layout plan, this is a technical drawing that gets submitted to the FAA for their review and approval.

[Tony Beach] 19:14:37
They approve this document to show that it meets standards, meets their standards.

[Tony Beach] 19:14:43
But this is the result of the result refined preferred alternative which we have shared with the pack going back to based on iterations going back to Jing of 2024.

[Tony Beach] 19:14:57
And so as we have refined the The preliminary alternatives through the we had the preliminary alternatives in June, we had the refined preliminary alternatives or refined alternatives in July. And then we had shared Our preferred alternative in October, and then the refined preferred alternative in January.

[Tony Beach] 19:15:20
This, again, it's a technical sheet showing all the overlays and information that

the FAA looks at reviews approves to show the airport meets standard. But it's based on exactly that information we've shared over the last six plus months with the pack.

[Tony Helbling] 19:15:37
I get it. But I guess let's go back to my question.

[Tony Helbling] 19:15:40
Can somebody show me on the alp that is sitting on the computer in front of me right now.

[Tony Helbling] 19:15:45
The difference between the line that is going to run on the future kyle road and the aeronautical reserve line.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:15:56
Well, I'll attempt to answer. I think, as I've been pointed out, I think the resolution on an image this large or the scale is challenging. I think what we run into typically with drawings is We have multiple lines competing for visual space. So we've got a realigned access road, which is sitting effectively

[David Miller - Century West] 19:16:17
On the future property line. So to your point, I think the acquisition is needed to move that section of Kyle Road out of the object-free area.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:16:29
So that sort of yellow shaped area on the end there the property line would effectively run along the outer perimeter of the realigned road.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:16:38
And I think on either a full-size plot on paper or an enlarged view, that would be more clear.

[Tony Helbling] 19:16:39
Okay.

[Tony Helbling] 19:16:45
Right. And because we would look at this if we'd had it beforehand, we could have plotted it on the problem.

[Tony Helbling] 19:16:52
Large piece of paper and understood it and made you know recommendations or effective decisions I guess my question is, David, and this is to David Miller, why would we not make the airport boundary proceed from that yellow area to the east all the way to airport road all the way down airport road

[Tony Helbling] 19:17:11
To Art Road. And include all that area in the airport boundary. Why would we not?

[David Miller - Century West] 19:17:13

Yeah. Well, I won't speak on behalf of ODAV. I would tell you, though, that the distinction is that the priority project or the priority property acquisition, which is shown here in yellow.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:17:28
Is intended to meet FAA design standards. The other property that's identified as reserve isn't. And I think the potential problem is if if If I would have, I can guarantee just based on the feedback.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:17:45
If ODAB was identifying all of the area identified in magenta boundary.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:17:51
As property two to acquire there would be significant pushback from that.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:17:58
And I think there was even some debate among the PAC members in prior meetings whether ODAP should even consider showing that as a reserve at all. And a lot of people think no.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:18:09
For various reasons. So I think it is kind of the effective balance between prioritize projects for property acquisition. Again, the property that's needed to meet FAA standards.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:18:21
The potential acquisition of the adjacent through the fence property, or even if you look at Columbia or HDS, is not needed to meet standards. It's if that property becomes available piece by piece.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:18:33
This just creates a vehicle for ODAV to pursue that. With the possibility, not guaranteed, but the possibility of FA funding.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:18:41
And it is an unusual process, but because there are no specific targets. There are no individual buildings hangars or bare ground that ODAP says within the developed area that ODAV is identifying to pursue.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:18:58
I think it's, as we've talked about, it's It's identifying it on the reserve. I think the other point too is As airport layout plans sort of reside, live within master plan cycles there are opportunities to do minor, what we call pan and ink updates between master plan cycles.

[Tony Beach] 19:18:58
And…

[Tony Helbling] 19:19:01
Well, right?

[David Miller - Century West] 19:19:16
And I would imagine that if an individual hangar owner came to Tony's office and said, I want to sell you my building.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:19:22
And they identified that it's within the area identified on the plan And there was some sort of an agreement that could be shown as a with a boundary, an actual property line adjustment.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:19:35
Through a pen and ink change. But that's kind of putting the cart before the horse i think because That is where we are.

[Tony Beach] 19:19:40
Well… And David, and you you Definitely touched on it. We've explained this in the first couple of PAC meetings as well and in the first couple of chapters.

[Tony Beach] 19:19:52
Where we show we have a map that shows the state facility this is the Oregon Department of Aviation is the airport sponsor for The Aurora State Airport and this is that we're going to permit aviation sponsor that has the federal grant assurances for the operation of the airport and

[Tony Beach] 19:20:15
Master planning and having a current airport layout plan is one of those requirements of those those grant assurances.

[Tony Beach] 19:20:21
When we're looking at when we're looking at keeping our airport layout plan current and up to date. And we don't have control over changes or development.

[Tony Beach] 19:20:34
Alterations that occur off state property This master plan is a planning document for the state facility of the Aurora State Airport.

[Tony Beach] 19:20:45
And so this airport layout plan is showing the current and ultimate configuration of that state facility and that's why It is showing the way that it does.

[Tony Beach] 19:20:59
For again for the state property current and ultimate configurations.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 19:21:05
So I want to pause because we do have several people who are attending tonight who want to give public comment.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 19:21:13
And so Tony Helbling, is there anything else you'd like to add before we go to the people who are in the attendee section.

[Tony Helbling] 19:21:22
Nope.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 19:21:23
Okay, great. So we also have several questions and comments that have come through. So for those of you in attendance.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 19:21:35
In the audience here tonight. I see Wendy has her hand raised and I know you messaged me. There's a couple people who would like to give some comments.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 19:21:44
And then if anyone else would like to give some verbal comments.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 19:21:47
Please raise your hand. And then otherwise I can read some of the questions and answers that have or the questions have come through the question and answer section.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 19:21:57
So Wendy, I will allow you to talk here. You should be able to unmute.

[Wendie Kellington] 19:22:08
So I have one additional person here sharing my computer. I'll go first, though. Thank you, Wendy Killington.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 19:22:09
Okay.

[Wendie Kellington] 19:22:16
I can't tell you the number of things that I'm disappointed about this process and this ALP.

[Wendie Kellington] 19:22:24
And what we've seen and what we've heard today I do not feel that Odav has been honest with the participants. I do not feel that Century West has been honest with the participants because I think you know better. So here I'm going to go.

[Wendie Kellington] 19:22:40
And tell you what I think you already know. But number one, this master plan has no difference between the prior version And this one. It still condemns the hangers and all of the businesses. It just doesn't do it directly.

[Wendie Kellington] 19:22:56
It plans to do a wink and a nod and to take their drain field So they can't be at the airport any longer. And that's as much of a taking as they first planned.

[Wendie Kellington] 19:23:08
So the idea that, boy, we've really come a long way. You haven't come a long way.

[Wendie Kellington] 19:23:12
Number two. I heard today that we really ought to just stop bothering you about the drain field issue because you've already made your decision. Well, that's the case. Why are we here until eight o'clock at night talking about what's supposed to be a public process. I think the reality is that this is a state agency that is making a state agency decision that has to be based on substantial evidence in a whole record

[Wendie Kellington] 19:23:41
And that means that the decision has to be made based upon the evidence, the positions that are taken.

[Wendie Kellington] 19:23:49
And thoughtfully decide whether or not the best alternative is one that meets relevant standards. It's not okay for ODAB to say or its consultant to simply say.

[Wendie Kellington] 19:24:01
We've looked at your information and it's not good enough. It's sort of like the Mozart movie when he talks to the emperor. Did you like my play, the magic flute?

[Wendie Kellington] 19:24:11
And the emperor says, well, it had too many notes. And I feel like this is a too many notes response.

[Wendie Kellington] 19:24:18
There's never been any reason given why the improvements to the drain field in the RSA would not meet federal standards. And in fact, the only evidence in this record is that it does meet standards.

[Wendie Kellington] 19:24:33
And Odeb continuing to say, oh, if we just really think secretly it doesn't, that's not okay. You've got to have a record. So that dog isn't going to hunt. Number two, three.

[Wendie Kellington] 19:24:43
The easement that the easement HDOC has for this drain field that ODAB wants to take out, that is a property right.

[Wendie Kellington] 19:24:51
And ODAB can't simply say, gee, it's your problem to figure out what to do about it. No, ODAV owes just compensation for taking it.

[Wendie Kellington] 19:24:59
And severance damages. And I tell you, you better increase your budget because the severance damages are going to include wiping out all the hangers that rely on it.

[Wendie Kellington] 19:25:07
You haven't even thought about that. The other thing I want to talk about is this master plan.

[Wendie Kellington] 19:25:17
Idea that, well, we don't really have to do any planning because this is a This is a facility plan and so areas that are outside of places we own why we don't We don't have to worry about that and that there's this big distinction between the land use boundary and the federal boundary. And so we don't have to make any adjustments to the airport's boundary for the property that we are relying upon for this master plan. And just to say it shows that it's a disconnect. The truth is

[Wendie Kellington] 19:25:45
And I think ODAB knows this, and I think Century West knows this.

[Wendie Kellington] 19:25:50
Is that the ODEV may not seek or spend federal money on uses that are not allowed in the zoning district. There is the federal equivalent of a land use compatibility statement. It's a part of grant assurances. Everybody knows it.

[Wendie Kellington] 19:26:11
If ODEP wants to take that yellow area on the right as I'm looking at it.

[Wendie Kellington] 19:26:17
That is zoned EFU to move around Kyle Road You'd be well advised to either vastly increase your litigation budget Because the opponents are going to sue you or sue you include that property in the land use airport boundary. And yes, you need to show it here.

[Wendie Kellington] 19:26:35
And the rest of this property that ODAV wants to buy for an aeronautical reserve You can't get federal money for that unless the use is allowed under the applicable zoning. And guess what? Unless you move the boundary, again, just increase your litigation budget because you're going to get sued that you know.

[Wendie Kellington] 19:26:55
Maybe you can do it, maybe you can't. But the way the legislature told you to do it, the roadmap, is to expand the state land use airport boundary. And yes, that has to show up here. Why?

[Wendie Kellington] 19:27:05
You are showing these areas as a part of your master plan, trying to get eligibility for federal money.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 19:27:12
Thank you, Wendy. So it has been about four minutes and Okay.

[Wendie Kellington] 19:27:13
The other thing. I've got one last thing that I want to preserve for the record, and that is I sent you a letter strongly objecting to Tony Beach's refusal to allow me to serve as an alternate. There is a substitution here, which I think is great. Councillor Shevlin is here in place of, I think it's the mayor.

[Wendie Kellington] 19:27:34
And Aaron Fegri is there as a delegate for And I think that's great. But when I asked to be asked an alternate for a PAC member More than a week ago, about 10 days ago.

[Wendie Kellington] 19:27:52
I was refused, not because I was refused because it's not okay to have me speak.

[Wendie Kellington] 19:27:58
But because the message I have is not preferred And I think probably I'm not very well liked, but there are laws and rules against that.

[Wendie Kellington] 19:28:07
And I sent a letter for the record and I want it to be included. Thank you.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 19:28:11
Great. Thanks, Wendy. And whoever's there with you, can you just say your name um Before you speak?

[Wendie Kellington] 19:28:19
Sure, I'm happy to. My name is Betsy Johnson. For the record, I served 21 years in the Oregon Legislature and I ran the department and managed the Aurora Airport for five years.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 19:28:23
Great.

[Wendie Kellington] 19:28:30
I want to thank the department for moving in a more positive direction with respect to the hangars responding to public input we shouldn't have had to work that hard to get that movement.

[Wendie Kellington] 19:28:41
What's unbelievably disappointing is that ODAV is attempting to get the same outcome by demolishing the hangars.

[Wendie Kellington] 19:28:50
By rendering the hangers useless in depriving the hangers of their drain fields.

[Wendie Kellington] 19:28:54
It's very distressing that ODVA won't allow a dialogue about how to mitigate the drain fields.

[Wendie Kellington] 19:29:02
My request is twofold. Remove closing the south end rain fields from the preferred alternative And secondly, enter into a meaningful dialogue about mitigation to allow the drain field to remain until an alternative can be identified.

[Wendie Kellington] 19:29:15
It's ludicrous that ODVA is simply announcing that the current location of the

drain field can never comply with FAA standards without exploring options in a legitimate, authentic way.

[Wendie Kellington] 19:29:28
One could surmise that there may be a hidden agenda to force annexation into the city of Aur If those south end rain field alternative cannot be identified.

[Wendie Kellington] 19:29:38
My second point, the master plan is a long-term view to determine a plan for the airport.

[Wendie Kellington] 19:29:43
The failure to plan to expand the airport boundary, to contemplate future FAA funding land acquisition is short-sighted and misses the point completely.

[Wendie Kellington] 19:29:54
Third point, the runway must be lengthened for safety. The preposterous mythology that 500 additional feet of the runway will fundamentally alter the character and uses of the airport is just that mythology.

[Wendie Kellington] 19:30:06
Misguided and untrue. You don't plan to extend the runway until after 2030.

[Wendie Kellington] 19:30:13
I believe you're compromising safety. I request that ODVA plan for, seek, and gain approval to lengthen the runway as a safety issue right now.

[Wendie Kellington] 19:30:23
My fourth point, this master plan will never be built. David Miller's assertion that finances shouldn't matter is just silly.

[Wendie Kellington] 19:30:29
I've talked to ODOT management and they cannot and will not pay to move the highway. Odav can't afford much of anything and has a bill before the legislature right now to allow them to raise fees by rule In order to charge users more because their current financing scheme is unsustainable.

[Wendie Kellington] 19:30:48
I'll conclude with this. I lobbied to create ODVA. I ran the agency for five years, including managing the Aurora Airport and going through a master planning process.

[Wendie Kellington] 19:30:58
I served in the legislature, as I said, for 21 years. I believe I have standing to comment on acceptable public process.

[Wendie Kellington] 19:31:05
Odva has failed on both the policy and the process. I think the agency should be embarrassed for their lack of transparency, their willingness to shade the truth and dissemble, their discrimination with respect to who may speak, how, and when.

[Wendie Kellington] 19:31:20
Odva process. In developing this plan has failed Governor Kotek's expressed expectation of a high level of agency performance in their service to Oregonians.

[Wendie Kellington] 19:31:33
If ODVA rams their preferred alternative through, and I think they'll try.

[Wendie Kellington] 19:31:39
This process. Will be used as a case study in how not to do it and will lead to expensive, endless litigation.

[Wendie Kellington] 19:31:47
I also was asked to be included in the PAC as an alternative, given my unique status as a former manager of the airport and head of the agency.

[Wendie Kellington] 19:31:56
Tony Beach turned me down flat. And stated it for the record in front of staff.

[Wendie Kellington] 19:32:01
He stated that there would be no proxies or substitutions in tonight's proceedings. I believe there were substitutions tonight.

[Wendie Kellington] 19:32:09
This further enforces the arbitrary approach that ODVA has taken with respect to message, messenger, and a public process that should have been managed much more collaboratively.

[Wendie Kellington] 19:32:22
This is a disappointment. Beyond my ability to express as the person who helped create the agency.

[Wendie Kellington] 19:32:30
Thank you.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 19:32:30
Great. Thank you so much. I don't see any other hands for verbal comments, so I'm going to quickly read through the questions and answers that have come through tonight so that those of you who are here can hear those.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 19:32:49
George said, if you consider the airport to be only the land area that is owned by ODAV, then what do you call all of the other land area that is not owned by ODAB?

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 19:33:01
But is zoned for airport use and is currently in active aeronautical use and which is identified as being for aeronautic reserve.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 19:33:08
Is that other area that is not ODAV Sorry, that is not ODAV.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 19:33:17
Owned not a part of the airport? If so, are you saying that both FBOs and most of the airport hangars are not located on the airport?

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 19:33:26
And I believe that David answered this that there's on airport and through the fence what's owned by ODAV.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 19:33:36
Versus what's not is that? David, would you like to

[David Miller - Century West] 19:33:39
Yes, no, that's correct. And I think as we talked about at the very beginning of this process.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:33:45
I think it was nine pack meetings ago this master plan by definition was a facility plan for ODAV own property.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 19:33:55
Great.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:33:55
And that's highlighted we're not dismissing the fact that there is aeronautical use facility development adjacent to the airport and and nothing in this plan diminishes that.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:34:10
Reality. But again. As the projects that are eligible for funding will be related and limited to property that is controlled by ODF.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:34:19
So that's the distinction it's just As Tony touched on, it's really just really a an element of the airport layout plan process and the FAA approval process. It doesn't alter the fact that this operation of the airport is unique and complicated with adjacent private property.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 19:34:21
Great.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 19:34:33
Great.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 19:34:41
Jason Paulo asked what considerations were made for current property owners that would lose their homes and or property as a result of the latest plan referred by ODAV.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 19:34:55
And… Oh.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:34:56
I can touch, but if Tony wants to go into that, he can.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:35:01
My response is that it's a preliminary view. It's a preliminary assessment, but keep in mind ODOT has not weighed in on their design requirements. It is entirely possible once the process were to go forward that ODOT may change its requirements. And it could be that the

[David Miller - Century West] 19:35:21
The impacts on those adjacent properties could be lessened. We don't know that. We didn't want to presume that. So this is a preliminary look at areas that may be affected.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:35:34
We've approximated the property. Acreage affected.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:35:39
But again, until there's a final design, and more importantly, perhaps a thorough environmental and and design review.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:35:48
It's a conceptual plan. So no specific actions or property owner contacts have been made.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 19:35:58
Tony, do you want to add?

[Tony Beach] 19:36:00
Just the only thing that I would add to that, that's exactly right.

[Tony Beach] 19:36:04
The state does have a process for property acquisition and that includes independent appraisals and compensation at a fair market value.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 19:36:17
Okay. Let's see.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 19:36:22
What is the reason, sorry, Bruce Bergman asked, what is the reason to acquire the narrow strip of property at the Wiley area and how will that affect our drain field?

[David Miller - Century West] 19:36:37
We're talking in this area here, if I'm remembering that correctly.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:36:42
Is that correct, Tony, can you confirm? Okay.

[Tony Beach] 19:36:44
Yeah. Yep. That's right. And I could just offer a quick explanation. It's for the rendering object free area.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:36:47
Sure.

[Tony Beach] 19:36:51
Just adjacent to the wiley Association.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:36:55
Right. Yeah. And I think the little bump out there is due to the fact that there is a proposed aircraft holding area added to the extension of the parallel taxiway at that runway 17 end.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 19:36:57
Great.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:37:08
There's currently no holding area on the runway 17 end so that that accounts for the small bump out beyond the OFA line for the runway.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 19:37:18
Great. There was another comment. Is okay um by george v h is it ODAB's position that all the areas which ODAB does not own, which by the way, includes both FBOs and most of the aircraft hangars And most of the available aircraft ramp space are not included in the airport. And I believe that

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 19:37:42
Goes back to what we just answered. Previously.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 19:37:50
Another. Question that came up by George V.H. Isn't the current runway length itself a non-standard condition? It is shorter than required for the current airport designation.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 19:38:05
Why does ODAB want to delay addressing the one non-standard condition that is the most important to all airport users until it first addresses every other non-standard condition?

[David Miller - Century West] 19:38:17
I can answer that very briefly. Basically, runway length is the justification of runway length is what we're talking about.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:38:26
So if you go back on the website and look through the chapters the fourth chapter facility requirements identified the methodology that the FAA uses.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:38:36

It's a little bit of a difference between a hard standard such as a runway safety area and justified runway length.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:38:45
Airports that have less than their justified runway lengths are not out of compliance. They just have not been able to achieve the length that they could justify.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:38:53
There can be a lot of reasons for that. So it is not accurate to say that The current length is non-standard.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:39:00
It's just less than the length that would be justified by the current and forecast air traffic.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:39:05
So the reasoning for not pursuing a runway extension first was simply a reflection of FAA's position that they will not, and this is strictly from the FAA's guidance, they will not consider funding improvements to the current runway, such as a runway extension until

[David Miller - Century West] 19:39:27
The non-standard items that have been identified are mitigated or addressed in some other way.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:39:32
So that's why the sequencing is what it is.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 19:39:37
Great. Thank you, David. I do see that Senator Johnson would like to ask a question about the maintenance of the record. And then I think that's our last public question.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 19:39:51
So Senator Johnson, I think you can unmute.

[Wendie Kellington] 19:39:53
Thank you very much. My curiosity is it's been very difficult to follow your recitation of the questions and any answers. We just don't have access to that.

[Wendie Kellington] 19:40:05
And I am looking for assurances from Mr. Beach and Mr. Sukahara that this record will be preserved in its entirety. And if it's recorded in its verbatim entirety.

[Wendie Kellington] 19:40:17
And the reason that I ask that is, Mr. Hudling and I made the effort to go down to a Board of Aviation meeting and we testified.

[Wendie Kellington] 19:40:25

And surprisingly, our testimony got lost. That to me in a public process is completely unacceptable.

[Wendie Kellington] 19:40:34
And I would like to hear from Kenji and Tony that this record will be maintained in its entirety and verbatim.

[Tony Beach] 19:40:43
Thank you for the comment, and I will absolutely confirm that the public record for this process.

[Tony Beach] 19:40:51
Everything is on the project website. Currently, and everything will be maintained verbatim.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 19:40:58
And typically we post video recording of this meeting, typically the day after the meeting. So hopefully we'll have it up tomorrow.

[Wendie Kellington] 19:41:08
But you can understand my concern given that our testimony has previously disappeared.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 19:41:13
Yeah, thank you for calling that out.

[Tony Beach] 19:41:17
Just want to be very clear for the record that we did issue a response to the testimony we received in our December board meeting.

[Tony Beach] 19:41:26
And there was a very brief technical issue where a few seconds of audio got cut out but the overwhelming, I believe, 13, 14 minutes worth of testimony were captured. And then we have included additional remarks in writing written form

[Tony Beach] 19:41:44
When uh when Mr. Helbling and Ms. Johnson let us know that there was a lapse in audio recording and we were happy to include their written comments to that effect.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 19:41:56
Great. I see Tony Helbling has a question about the through the front properties and excluding those. I am hoping that, Tony, we can get through that really quickly and then David can wrap up the next steps.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 19:42:10
So go ahead, Tony.

[Tony Helbling] 19:42:12
Okay, so I guess… I see a conflict here because i see conflict What I hear… the consultants in ODEV say is the area that is outside the state property line is not

the airport boundary.

[Tony Helbling] 19:42:30
But in previous chapters, we have based aircraft. George Van Humenson brought up the point that we're excluding those hangers where those aircraft are parked.

[Tony Helbling] 19:42:43
So how how do we justify the explanation of based aircraft at Aurora But those aircraft are not sitting on state property.

[Tony Helbling] 19:42:54
And I guess it's a rhetorical question. I already know the answer you're going to tell me.

[Tony Helbling] 19:42:59
But I guess the point that I'm trying to make is we're a through the fence airport.

[Tony Helbling] 19:43:04
And we need to have a collaborative effort and include the through the fence properties in the airport boundary.

[Tony Helbling] 19:43:10
And I get what a master plan is. I understand it.

[Tony Helbling] 19:43:15
But it just seems that it just seems it there's a there's a breakdown Because we're going to count them as based aircraft.

[Tony Helbling] 19:43:21
The ships that are here And for the justification for the runway and we all want safety But then you tell us that you can't count the hangers in which the based aircraft sit.

[Tony Helbling] 19:43:34
So I'm lost how they could be based at the airport when you're telling me they're not at the airport.

[Tony Helbling] 19:43:40
And then the other question I had real quick is I keep hearing David refer back to nine meetings ago when we started considering this and we'll we've shared with you the information from nine meetings ago And I guess what I'm lost as we submitted some significant information

[Tony Helbling] 19:43:59
Two meetings ago and Tony referred to it in the record But apparently consideration was exposed to or given to that prior to this master plan ever starting.

[Tony Helbling] 19:44:07
So the timeline doesn't match in my head. And that's the drain filled technical questions. So I just want that in the record.

[Tony Helbling] 19:44:14
That our stuff that was submitted two months ago was tossed off the table because of questions that were unanswered before this master plan ever started. That doesn't make logical sense.

[Tony Helbling] 19:44:27
So I just want that in the record. I don't expect an answer to either one.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 19:44:34
Okay.

[Ted Millar] 19:44:34
This is Ted. Can I ask one more question? Is there any reason why we couldn't Add all of the through the fence property because this is designated by the legislature as a through the fence airport.

[Ted Millar] 19:44:48
And it's a cluster of airport businesses that's entirely different Portland International type airport.

[Ted Millar] 19:44:57
Why can't you include all of the through the fence properties as a designated part of the airport that isn't necessarily owned by low dev.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 19:45:10
Tony or David, can you answer that question?

[David Miller - Century West] 19:45:14
Well, I can, in the most general sense, what the FAA wants to see with airports that have through the fence development is they want to see the access points called out on the airport layout plan.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:45:25
They do not expect to see details or dimensional standards, any facility planning assigned to those through the fence properties in large part because they aren't subject to FAA rules and design standards.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:45:37
And they're not typically eligible for FAA funding. So that's kind of the distinction. One of the details to be added to the ALP as it's refined is to locate the actual through the fence per the agreements that tenants have with ODV.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:45:57
To identify those locations. We realize that there may be common access points used by multiple property owners, but that would be detailed.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:46:06
As far as the earlier question, I just want to put out that that The FAA's position on counting based aircraft that are Off airport kind of it's evolved over time I

would remember, though, that in the initial conversations with the FAA about whether or not those aircraft that are off airport

[David Miller - Century West] 19:46:26
Off of ODAB owned property should be counted. The FAA allowed those to be included.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:46:31
But they said they generally would not. So they made an exception just to acknowledge the fact that the significant number of aircraft that operate at this airport are based off of airport owned property.

[Tony Helbling] 19:46:41
And I guess that's the point I'm trying to make, David.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:46:42
But…

[Tony Helbling] 19:46:45
And I appreciate you letting me talk for a second. That's the point I'm trying to make.

[Tony Helbling] 19:46:50
That we're a unique airport. We did not completely in the world But because we're through the fence.

[Tony Helbling] 19:46:57
That unique experience that the FAA allowed was the counting of the based aircraft that gave me the impression that the FA cared about the through the fence properties and therefore recognize that the through the fence properties are important to the airport they're and

[Tony Helbling] 19:47:14
To me, you just answered the question right there. If they're considering the through the fenced hangers as those aircraft based at the airport then the FAA recognized the through the fence property as part of the airport It goes back to Ted's question, why can't we just put the airport boundary around the through the fence properties?

[Tony Helbling] 19:47:33
All the way around the airport. You just answered the question.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:47:37
Well, my interpretation, or I would caution about that as far as interpreting, the FAA, for the purposes of updating our based aircraft count.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:47:47
Allowed the through the fence aircraft to be included. But there was no change or any change of opinion from the FAA standpoint or the scope.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:47:57

To expand the scope of work for the master plan. It was specifically written to be a facility plan for Odavon property so Yes, I think the FAA through that acknowledgement of those aircraft, recognized that they are significant and they're important.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:48:12
But that was sort of the line they drew and there was no expectation there would be any facility planning related to that, you know, and we've held to that throughout. So I do believe, though, that the definition of these reserve areas and the notations

[David Miller - Century West] 19:48:29
Acknowledges that. I think the other thing too is in the narrative of the master plan report This scenario or this situation can be described pretty detailed in ways that drawings can show but I think the significance of that and the limitations of that

[David Miller - Century West] 19:48:45
Relative to the FAA rules will be I think we'd be more clear when you have an opportunity to review their final report.

[Tony Helbling] 19:48:50
Well, I guess that's the point I'm trying to make, though, is if this was truly a collaborative effort where we could get you, me, Tim, this entire group, Ben Williams, everybody in the room.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 19:48:52
So.

[Tony Helbling] 19:49:01
And figure this out together in a collaborative method by having discussions like we're having right now rather than this present a document and make it available to us an hour and a half after the meeting starts.

[Tony Helbling] 19:49:14
On the website and then we're supposed to look at a computer screen and try to figure it out.

[Tony Helbling] 19:49:19
If we could come together and have a collaborative discussion over what this could be we could we could look at those things that we could present to the faa together is maybe potential solutions.

[Tony Helbling] 19:49:31
And there's ways to make this come to fruition. I mean, the FAA's got to look at this $99 million that that You know, we went from an AOP, you know, back in 2012 that was 18 million and had a thousand foot extension on it.

[Tony Helbling] 19:49:47
And we were a C2 airport at that time. I understand that we need to achieve c2

safety and I get all that But over $100 million when you add the $4 million up front to the 99 million.

[Tony Helbling] 19:50:02
I just don't see the FAA is going to cough up that money in the state. I mean, with ODAS current funding, they don't have the 10 million match to even get the project going.

[Ted Millar] 19:50:14
Can I add one other comment?

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 19:50:14
Yeah, thanks. Well, I do just want to make sure that David has enough time to present kind of the next steps. And then I think You know, depending on Tony and Kenji maybe we can stay on to answer some questions.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 19:50:32
David, maybe if you can present just the next steps and then if anyone needs to drop off at eight o'clock They can, but at least then we could address some additional comments. Ted, I'll make sure that we get to you first, okay?

[David Miller - Century West] 19:50:43
Sure. Thanks, Bradley.

[Ted Millar] 19:50:47
Okay, because the reason I wanted to just make one more statement to David while he's there is part of the through the fence agreement, and I don't know whether everybody knows that.

[Ted Millar] 19:50:58
But all the private enterprise airplanes and hangars pay a monthly fee per airplane to comply with the FAA requirements.

[Ted Millar] 19:51:09
And so this is, and we also have a public-private partnership where we fence the entire airport around the private property and the state property in the past and private property paid for their share so this is more encompassing than just that part of the FAA funding.

[Ted Millar] 19:51:28
Was based on the through the fence airplanes paying a monthly fee. So we pay our fair share. And that was determined 25 years ago.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 19:51:40
Okay, thank you, Ted. Go ahead, David.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:51:43
Okay, I'll try to make this brief. I know we're short. So the process that will unfold here at the what we call the completion of the planning process is The chapters that have been presented in draft form and working papers have been

updated over time.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:52:04
The forecast was an example where the first draft was presented and then ultimately once FAA comments came in, there were adjustments.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:52:12
But our final report we'll bring forward to current time, all of the chapters from the introduction inventory all the way through and package those into a full document.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:52:25
The airport layout plan set that we've talked about a little bit there's We've only really looked at two sheets. The plan set will have, I don't have the exact count in front of me, but it's somewhere in the area of 15 or so she

[David Miller - Century West] 19:52:40
Includes airspace plan drawings and details about approach surfaces and land use plan drawings and so on. So there's a lot of content there. It'll be pulled together into a draft final report.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:52:53
The submittals to the FAA include the airport layout plan itself, the standalone plan set.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:53:01
Which is in draft form and that goes to the FAA coordinated through the Seattle office and for and then they the Seattle Airport District Office is responsible for coordinating with their different lines of business Including an obstruction evaluation and airspace analysis that OEAA review.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:53:19
The FAA typically allows for about 90 days to complete their lines of business review, but It's a time period that we've seen.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:53:30
Sometimes extend beyond that. It's really dependent on the FAA's workload. At the same point, the draft final report, which will contain the airport layout plan draft.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:53:40
Will go to the FAA for their review and again Given that the information that will be contained in that document isn't new per se because the FAA has participated in the review.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:53:51
Of the alternatives capital improvement program and the preliminary conversation they all plan set, the noise analysis that was presented a couple meetings back They're really going through from beginning to end, just kind of making sure that everything is is the way they recall. There's no formal approval

[David Miller - Century West] 19:54:10
If you will, of the FAA for the master plan document.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:54:14
They do have approval responsibilities for the airport layout plan. So that is the process there. I would point out also that when the draft documents are submitted to the FAA, in full be presented on the project website and the public review period is will

[David Miller - Century West] 19:54:33
Being opened throughout that process. So. One has an opportunity to weigh in.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:54:39
Once the FAA reviews are completed, they will provide feedback to ODAV and to the consultant team.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:54:47
And if there are specific things that need to be adjusted, then those changes can be made.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:54:53
Depending on their comments. And then once the process is completed for FAA review.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:55:01
And everyone between the FAA and ODAV is satisfied that the draft documents meet their requirements.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:55:09
The FAA and ODEV will sign the airport layout plan. So I mentioned earlier adoption. That was probably a poor choice of words. The approval of the ALP is not an adoption by the ODAB board. It's the formal if you will, action required to

[David Miller - Century West] 19:55:24
Close out the grant, essentially a final lp approval Along with the forecast approval that occurred last year. That is really, those are the two action items from the FAA.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:55:38
And then once that is achieved, the project closeout documents and all the various things. I would also point out that the public public participation component of the master plan will be available as an appendix to the report.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:55:54
It'll probably actually even be larger than the report given the volume of comments that have been received over the last four years nearly.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:56:01
Which is fine. And then that last piece touches on your other comments, the ODAB board will have the opportunity on their own time frame to go through the local

adoption process as they typically do.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:56:15
And then I'll leave the coordination between the board and staff as far as coordinating with FAA approval and authorization for ADAF to sign the LP.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:56:24
I'd leave that to them. But this is the local adoption process is not one that the FAA gets involved.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:56:30
So those are the steps. I think the timeframe, as we touched on earlier, we're looking at May, let me go back real quick. Sorry for the Zoom in. So we're looking at zoom in a May submittal for the draft final report.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:56:47
Or I'm sorry, we're in the March to May period. So essentially our goal is within the next month or so.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:56:54
To pull together the components into a complete draft. And then get that in the process here showing with the FAA.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:57:03
If that 90-day timeline ultimately occurs with FAA review.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:57:10
And comment, then we would be in a position of closing out the project at the end of May.

[David Miller - Century West] 19:57:17
Odaf can then on the board side can determine on their own calendar what the adoption period would look like.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 19:57:27
Great. Thanks, David. So I think that is officially all of our presentation.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 19:57:37
I know there were a couple questions. I see Ben has your hand up. So I think we just have a little bit of time left.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 19:57:45
So go ahead, Ben.

[Ben Williams-FOFP] 19:57:48
Yeah, thanks for coming back to me on this, Brandy. So on that last slide.

[Ben Williams-FOFP] 19:57:54
One thing really jumps out to me at 7.14 p.m. In this meeting Tony Beach said.

[Ben Williams-FOFP] 19:58:01
That the airport layout plan is the result of the refined preferred alternative, which in turn was the result of the preferred alternative.

[Ben Williams-FOFP] 19:58:11
In other words, the ALP follows from the master plan And that follows from the master planning process.

[Ben Williams-FOFP] 19:58:19
In other words, and in more technical language, the ALP is the final facility plan.

[Ben Williams-FOFP] 19:58:27
Which followed on the last slide for the first three bullets, and then the two of them got split apart.

[Ben Williams-FOFP] 19:58:33
And instead of the ALP following the master plan, suddenly the ALP was ahead of the master plan.

[Ben Williams-FOFP] 19:58:39
And this is what I was asking about earlier. I put this in my written comments, but I would point you at Oregon Administrative Rule 738-130-0055 The coordination procedures for adopting final master plans.

[Ben Williams-FOFP] 19:58:58
And in parenthetical six it says The Aviation Board shall adopt findings of compatibility with the acknowledged comprehensive plans of affected cities and counties and findings of compliance with applicable statewide planning goals when it adopt the final facility plan.

[Ben Williams-FOFP] 19:59:17
So ODAV lives in two places. It's an Oregon agency. So it lives in Oregon with Oregon laws.

[Ben Williams-FOFP] 19:59:25
And it has to also live in FAA space and comply with FAA regulations So, you know, it's incomprehensible to me that at this stage this This slide is here when this was one of the very things that happened in 2012

[Ben Williams-FOFP] 19:59:43
That the Court of Appeals found the Department of Aviation to be at fault over.

[Ben Williams-FOFP] 19:59:50
Trying to put the ALP ahead of the master plan And somehow at that point, the aviation board defaulting on their responsibility to adopt and approve both and then legitimately delegate authority to sign the ALP to the director of the aviation board.

[Ben Williams-FOFP] 20:00:10
So thanks for the time for noting that.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 20:00:12
Yeah, thanks, Ben.

[David Miller - Century West] 20:00:12
Thank you. And just to clarify, I could just point out that the The intent of the description and the way the schedule was identified is the expectation is that the draft final master plan report And the draft airport layout plan set will be submitted to the FAA simultaneously.

[David Miller - Century West] 20:00:29
And they are, as I said, the report will contain in one of the chapters the same draft final master plan, or I'm sorry, the draft final airport layout plan set. So from our perspective, they are they are they are connected that way. And if there are adjustments made to the airport layout plan as a result of public review.

[David Miller - Century West] 20:00:50
Faa review, those will be made on the full plan set, but that will also be carried forward to the master plan.

[David Miller - Century West] 20:00:56
I see no disconnect at all between that process and ultimately what will be required to do to meet Oregon rules for coordination with local

[Ben Williams-FOFP] 20:01:04
Well, thanks for clarifying that, Dave. Is the implication then that the aviation board will approve and adopt both the master plan and the ALP before it's countersigned by Oregon?

[Tony Beach] 20:01:18
I'm just going to jump in really quick. It is 8.01, but we're going to allow for an additional 15 minutes because I understand we have a couple more questions.

[Tony Beach] 20:01:27
And then we're going to end this meeting at 8.15.

[David Miller - Century West] 20:01:31
Okay.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 20:01:31
But if you do need to leave, we know we've kept you here for three hours. So if you do need to leave.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 20:01:37
Please send your comments before February 25th so that the technical team can get that information. I do see David, Dave Malk. So Ben, any last thoughts or comments there?

[Ben Williams-FOFP] 20:01:50
Nope, that's it. Thanks.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 20:01:52
Okay, thanks, Ben. Okay, Dave.

[David Miller - Century West] 20:01:54
Go ahead.

[Dave Mauk] 20:01:57
Thanks. Can you hear me? Thank you, Brandy. I'd request this is our last meeting.

[David Miller - Century West] 20:02:00
Yeah.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 20:02:00
Yes.

[Dave Mauk] 20:02:05
Consideration and clarification and enforcement, if you would, on mitigating the overflights that have been part of the community which I live in, which is Charbonneau and part of Wilsonville.

[Dave Mauk] 20:02:19
And if there could be another IFR established for takeoffs and landies or approaches, I guess is the technical word for that We'd like that to be considered, please. It's the one thing we've asked from day one and we haven't had any

[Dave Mauk] 20:02:35
Unfortunately hasn't stuck with this plan. And I just would be remiss if I didn't bring it up one more time and be able to try to pokey a little bit and do what you can for your neighbors. We've tried to be very fair and

[Dave Mauk] 20:02:50
With you and we'd ask the same that you do behave that way with us.

[Dave Mauk] 20:02:56
And thanks for that.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 20:02:58
Thanks, Dave.

[Tony Beach] 20:02:59
If I can just jump on that really quick. Dave, appreciate your comments and all the correspondence we've had with Charbonneau and other neighboring communities around the airport noise has been a big topic of discussion throughout this master plan process and we look forward to continuing those discussions

[Tony Beach] 20:03:17
Ongoing.

[David Miller - Century West] 20:03:20

I was also, Brandy, I was just going to add a comment to the earlier question about the coordination between or the authorization of the ODAB board and staff.

[David Miller - Century West] 20:03:30
To submit our approach or method or assumption on this is that we're working with staff who reports to their board and that the clarification or the lines between the board and staff will be determined before documents are submitted to the FAA.

[David Miller - Century West] 20:03:48
There should be no daylight between staff and the board at that point.

[David Miller - Century West] 20:03:54
Sequences kind of as we laid it out.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 20:03:58
Great. Thanks, David. Any other comments or questions from the PAC members?

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 20:04:08
There's been a lot to cover. Thank you all for sticking with us for this three hours. And again, any comments, questions, additional notes that you want to make sure that get to the technical team, to ODAV or to FAA, you know, make sure that you send those to us

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 20:04:31
It will go in the summary of this meeting along with responses, including to any comments or questions that we weren't able to address verbally here in the meeting. We make sure that we provide a comment response to all of those questions. So again, we have posted the presentation materials

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 20:04:52
To the website, we'll be posting the transcript and the video recording as soon as possible, hopefully in the next few days. And then we will, of course, be connecting with you all via email as the project progresses so that you can stay up to date on the process and provide further comment on the final plan.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 20:05:15
Tony and Kenji, is there anything else that you'd like to say?

[Tony Beach] 20:05:20
Yes, and I'm not sure if Kenji is going to be able to make a couple of comments. But I did want to just speak for Kenji and on behalf of all the Department of Aviation staff.

[Tony Beach] 20:05:34
Thank you to every one of our PAC members. Thank you to everyone in the public who has participated.

[Tony Beach] 20:05:40
In this process. We value all of your backgrounds and and speaking for all the organizations that you've been representing throughout this process.

[Tony Beach] 20:05:52
Thanks again for everything that all your time you've contributed through this process.

[Tony Beach] 20:05:58
Really appreciate all the discussion. Whether it's on noise like we just mentioned.

[Tony Beach] 20:06:05
Or on other airport issues, these discussions they don't stop because we're moving forward to next steps on the master plan ODAV is going to continue to work.

[Tony Beach] 20:06:19
On um you know we we're working on all of our state airports, our 28 state airports throughout the state of oregon And how they benefit all of our different communities and user groups.

[Tony Beach] 20:06:32
Throughout the state but uh But those conversations keep going. And so we really look forward to continuing that discussion and And then submitting this master plan to the FAA for their review and then to the board for adoption. So thanks again on behalf of everyone.

[Tony Beach] 20:06:50
Century West, JLA, thank you for all of your hard work throughout this process.

[Tony Beach] 20:06:55
Staff, trainers, everyone's done a fantastic job. And it sounds like, yeah, yeah, come on.

[Kenji Sugahara] 20:06:55
It… Hey, Tony, I'm going to chime in real quick. I got to stay off camera, but I just want to say thank you, everybody, for all the input and all the effort that you've put in.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 20:06:58
There's Kenji.

[Kenji Sugahara] 20:07:08
You know, we might disagree, but when it comes down to it.

[Kenji Sugahara] 20:07:12
I appreciate each and every single one of you because you're very passionate about aviation in your communities. And that makes a difference. And what's important to me is that your herd. And from the agency perspective, we've done as much as we can to be transparent. And if we haven't communicated that or if we haven't done a good job.

[Kenji Sugahara] 20:07:33
We always appreciate the feedback because the way I look at it.

[Kenji Sugahara] 20:07:37
All the feedback that you provide to me, to the agency, those are ways we can improve.

[Kenji Sugahara] 20:07:43
Even after the master cleaning process, please talk to us. I will reach out to you as well and we can chat.

[Kenji Sugahara] 20:07:48
Because I think it's important to have good relationships with everyone, even though we disagree on certain things, which is okay.

[Kenji Sugahara] 20:07:56
That's the Oregon way. So I just want to thank each and every one of you for all the work that you've done. You've taken hours out of your lives And even the staff, even the consultants.

[Kenji Sugahara] 20:08:07
Everybody, thank you, thank you, thank you for everything that you've done. You are appreciated.

[Kenji Sugahara] 20:08:12
See you next time

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 20:08:16
All right. And with that, I guess we will close our meeting. Thank you all.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 20:08:22
And again, I look forward to getting your comments before the 25th.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 20:08:27
And you can also do that through the website. So it all comes to the same place and we distribute that to the technical team. So thank you again.

[Brandy Steffen | JLA] 20:08:35
Thanks for staying a little bit later. We appreciate it and have a good evening.

[David Miller - Century West] 20:08:41
Thanks, everyone.

CHAT

16:57:51 From Brandy Steffen | JLA to Hosts and panelists:
Welcome everyone! PAC members, please update your names as needed by hovering over the three dots.
17:08:32 From Jen Winslow | JLA to Kevin w.WIlsonville ChamberAnd all panelists:
Hi Kevin, thanks for attending. I moved you to attendee since Patrick is

here.
17:11:00 From Jamie Stickel, City of Canby to Brandy Steffen | JLA(direct message):
Thank you for promoting me to panelist. I also sent an email, which you can disregard! Appreciate it!
17:21:46 From Brandy Steffen | JLA to Everyone:
Again, if any PAC member has a clarifying question, please raise your hand or visually raise your hand.
17:22:50 From Brandy Steffen | JLA to Everyone:
For anyone attending from the public, you can always type your questions or comments in the "Q&A" section. We will also have time for verbal comments at the end of the meeting.
17:52:13 From Bruce Bennett to Hosts and panelists:
it sounds like something very technical is being decided anecdotally, regarding the drainfields?
17:52:53 From patrick donaldson Wilsonville Chamber to Brandy Steffen | JLA(direct message):
How do I ‘raise’ my hand to comment on Refined Preferred Alternatives.
17:58:47 From Tony Helbling to Hosts and panelists:
Where in the previous meeting notes are questions from ODAV to anyone regarding of the geo tech fabric information submitted into testimony in the last few months? and why would ODAV only tell us tonight they've not received answers to questions they've asked so they are moving forward with a plan to remove the drainfields?
18:08:10 From Jen Winslow | JLA to Everyone:
This information is under the Meetings tab at the project website: https://publicproject.net/AuroraAirport#
18:09:43 From Brandy Steffen | JLA to Everyone:
I'll circle back with Tony Helbling and Ted Millar about the drainfield information after we address the CIP and ALP.
18:15:32 From Tony Helbling to Hosts and panelists:
For the record - I now understand you are referring to questions discussed in 2021. That entire discussion was tabled by Betty Stansbury on phone call with me because she asked for help gathering data for a Century West survey to ALL the airport users. Now using that thread and the unanswered questions that were tabled to make a based decision on a submittal in the last two months... that is a weak argument and I don't accept it. the submitted study needs to be considered in this master plan process.
18:16:00 From Brian Asher to Hosts and panelists:
Thanks for all the work over the 4 years .
18:22:35 From Tony Helbling to Hosts and panelists:
I have a question....
18:25:53 From Brandy Steffen | JLA to Everyone:
Just a reminder that we'll have time for questions and comments for non-PAC members or alternates around 7 pm.
18:28:41 From Tony Helbling to Hosts and panelists:
identifying land use needs including adjacent property is an FAA requirement!
18:32:22 From Tony Helbling to Hosts and panelists:
that was not my entire question!!! unmute me please.
18:32:49 From Jen Winslow | JLA to Everyone:

Tonight's presentation is now up on the project website under the meetings tab: https://publicproject.net/AuroraAirport#
18:36:36 From Whitney Stewart to Everyone:
OEM does not have anything to add. thank you
18:38:56 From patrick donaldson Wilsonville Chamber to Brandy Steffen | JLA(direct message):
I will have a question.
18:40:17 From Whitney Stewart to Everyone:
I apologize for the go back here. But for the CIP and Master Plan, were any emergency preparedness considerations factored in, such as seismic retrofitting or increasing of overall site resiliency? That may not be within the master plan's scope, so forgive me for my ignorance if it is not.
18:40:43 From Tony Helbling to Hosts and panelists:
question about the airport boundary - if you are showing the aero reserve area on the ALP is to be able to spend FAA $ - that means the FAA will have to accept it as inside the airport boundary... but you aren't showing as inside the boundary. There is significant work under the state law to convert the purple line boundary. Unless the airport boundary includes the property - it won't work!
18:41:06 From Tony Helbling to Hosts and panelists:
How will the FAA pay for the property if it's not in the boundary?
18:44:21 From James Kirby - Century West Engineering to Brandy Steffen | JLA(direct message):
If needed, I can address Tony Helbling's comments when we're able at the end.
18:44:33 From Brandy Steffen | JLA to James Kirby - Century West Engineering(direct message):
sounds good
18:45:56 From Tony Beach to Hosts and panelists:
The state has 140 acres at the Aurora State Airport, as explained on page 2-4 of Draft Working Paper 1.
18:46:38 From Brandy Steffen | JLA to Tony Beach(direct message):
Thanks Tony - can you also include what it will be if all property is acquired?
18:58:22 From Brian Asher to Hosts and panelists:
i will be leaving the meeting for our council meeting
19:11:46 From Brandy Steffen | JLA to Everyone:
We've also posted the presentation to the website, under the meeting page
19:23:46 From Tony Helbling to Hosts and panelists:
please let the record show the presentation was not made available on the web site till 6:32... 1.5 hours into the PAC meeting!!!!!
19:25:45 From Brandy Steffen | JLA to Everyone:
Please raise your hand if you would like to give public comments. I will read the comments collected through the Q&A section.
19:34:33 From patrick donaldson Wilsonville Chamber to Wendie KellingtonAnd all panelists:
Thank you and Senator Johnson for focused and articulate comments. As Gregg Clapper used to say, “Shine a little light on them and see how they scamper.”
19:34:59 From Tony Helbling to Hosts and panelists:
I have another question....
19:41:27 From Tony Helbling to Hosts and panelists:

there is a problem with excluding the thru the fence properties... I'd really like to ask a question about it.
19:43:31 From Brandy Steffen | JLA to Everyone:
Any comments or questions we haven't addressed in the meeting verbally we will include in the meeting summary along with a response. The summary will be added to the website under the meeting page.
20:08:53 From Pam Barlow Lind to Brandy Steffen | JLA(direct message):
Thank you.
20:09:05 From Brandy Steffen | JLA to Pam Barlow Lind(direct message):
Thanks Pam

Q&A

Wendie Kellington 04:57 PM
Test

Jamie Stickel, City of Canby 05:07 PM
Brandy - are you able to move me to the PAC group? I was unable to find the Zoom link. Thanks, Jamie Stickel

Wendie Kellington 05:27 PM
The current draft of the master plan includes "off airport" improvements re Keil Road aquisition area, and the mp designated aeronautical reserve - these are all off airport property and yet are a part of the MP. How is it accurate to say it is a facility plan for the current airport only? It seems more accurate to say that the master plan is a long term plan for the airport and includes all airport related features and development

Jason Paolo 06:01 PM
i find it hard to beleive that the FAA and/or ODAV can spend millins of tax payer dollars without an economic study and impacts to the surrounding public.

Jason Paolo 06:07 PM
why arent these meetings being held in person?

Chris iPhone 06:47 PM
Why can’t these meeting be held in person?

Wendie Kellington 07:01 PM
Brandi, there is more than one person using my computer to participate in this matter. I will speak and then the other person will speak.

Jason Paolo 07:16 PM
At what point does the overwhelming opposition to the Aurora airports plans and planning process have any magnitude with the current "planning operatives"?

Jason Paolo 05:33 PM

What considerations were made for current property owners that would lose their homes and/or property as a result of the latest plan prefered by ODAV.

Wendie Kellington 06:16 PM
I agree with Patrick, well said. There are several problems with the current version of the MP. (1) there is no difference between this version and the last in fact because ODAV condemns the hangars just as thoroughly by taking away the septic drainfield as condemning the hagars directly. They cannot function. This version is wholly illusory. (2) The state absolutely must pay for the taking of the drainfield easement and is responsible to move it to a viable location. It has failed. (3) State is obliged to base its decision on substantial evidence. The assertions that the proposed RSA drainfield improvements are not good enough is not supported by substantial evidnece. There is no evidence ODAV has considered any of the significant testimony and legal authorities and technical data regarding the proposed RSA improvements to the existing drainfield in place. The only evidence in the record is that a G-6 could run over the draifield as it is proposed to be improved. That is hardly inadequate.

George VH 06:18 PM
Do you do any analysis regarding the “bang for the buck” on potential capital improvements? I would think that it would be in the public interest for ODAV to prioritize the potential improvements that can be accomplished most quickly and most cost-effectively in order to provide safety benefits as soon as possible. Does ODAV agree with that strategy?

George VH 06:23 PM
Are the ALP and other slides in tonight’s presentation on your website? If so, please advise us where they can be found. If not, please post them. Thank you.

Jen Winslow | JLA 06:30 PM
Hi George, the presentation is now posted on the website: https://publicproject.net/AuroraAirport# under the Meetings tab. Thanks

George VH 06:36 PM
Isn’t the current runway length itself a non-standard condition? (It is shorter than required for the current airport designation.). Why does ODAV want to delay addressing the one non-standard condition that is the MOST important to all airport users, until it first addresses every other non-standard condition?

Bruce Bergman 07:06 PM
What is the reason to aquire the narrow strip of property at the Wylee area. And how will that affect our drainfield?

George VH 07:29 PM
Is it ODAV’s position that all the areas which ODAV does not own – which btw includes both FBOs, most of the aircraft hangars, and most of the available aircraft ramp space – are NOT included in “the airport”?

Wendie Kellington 07:35 PM
Senator Johnson would like to ask a quesiton about the maintenance of the record

Aurora State Airport
Master Plan Project



Planning Advisory Committee Meeting #9
February 11, 2025

Agenda

Time	Topic
5:00-5:10	Introductions
5:10-5:30	Review the Refined Preferred Alternative (as published 1.6.25)
5:30-6:00	PAC Clarifying Questions
6:00-6:20	Review Draft Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) Review Airport Layout Plan (ALP)
6:20-7:00	PAC Comments & Questions
7:00-7:30	Public Comments
7:30-8:00	Next Steps **https://publicproject.net/AuroraAirport**

Introductions

Oregon Department of Aviation (ODAV)

Kenji Sugahara
Director

Alex Thomas
Policy, Planning & Program Manager

Tony Beach
State Airports Manager

Brandon Pike
Aviation Planner

Project Team

Agency Oversight & Funding

Federal Aviation Administration

Airport Owner (Sponsor)

Oregon Department of Aviation

Planning & Engineering

Century West Engineering

Public Involvement

jla Public Involvement

Cultural Resources

Archaeological Investigations Northwest, Inc.

Environmental Review

ESA

AGIS Survey

Miller Creek Associates

Magyar Land Surveying LLC

Century West Engineering

Project Website Overview

Aurora State Airport Master Plan


Resources & Documents Meetings Contact & Comment What's an AMP? FAQs Public Records

AIRPORT MASTER PLAN

Every airport owner/operator needs to look at the current use of their airport, its relationship to other airports, and expectations for how the airport will need to change in the future. This planning effort takes place every 10-20 years (on average) and helps the airport owner figure out what to study further, what to invest in, and what is crucial to fix for safety and operations.

The Airport Master Plan (AMP) is required by the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) to maintain a safe and efficient airport that is economically, environmentally, and socially sustainable. The Airport Master Plan will also:

- Define the current, short-term and long-term needs of the Airport through a comprehensive evaluation of facilities, conditions and FAA airport planning and design standards.
- Look at what is happening around the airport that could affect the future plans, development and operation of the airport such as land use, transportation, environmental, economic development, etc.



This website was Built with Bolt by JLA Public Involvement 🕶 This site uses cookies. Read our privacy policy.

https://publicproject.net/AuroraAirport

PAC Members & Alternates

Below are the approved committee members; updated 2/7/25.

Organization	Name	Alternate
1000 Friends of Oregon	Roger Kaye	
AABC/TLM Holdings	Ted Millar	Aron Faegre
Atlantic Aviation (formerly Lynx Aviation)	Jon Bickford	
Aurora Air Traffic Control Tower (ATCT)	Raul Suarez	
Aurora Airport Improvement Association	Tony Helbling	
Aurora Butteville Barlow Community Planning Organization	Ken Ivey	
Aurora CTE, Inc	Bill Graupp	
Charbonneau Country Club	Dave Mauk	
City of Aurora	Brian Asher	
City of Canby	Jamie Stickel	Don Hardy
City of Wilsonville	Chris Neamtzu	Councilor Anne Shevlin
Clackamas County	Commissioner Tootie Smith	
Columbia Helicopters	Dave Tibbetts	Matt Nash
Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians	Pam Barlow Lind	
Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde Community of Oregon	Cheryl Pouley	
Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon		

Below are the approved committee members; updated 2/7/25.

Organization	Name	Alternate
Deer Creek Estates HOA	Matt Williams	
Friends of French Prairie	Ben Williams	Wayne Richards
Helicopter Transport Service	Robert Fournier	Aron Faegre
Life Flight Network	Michael Weimer	
Marion County	Alvin Klausen	Matt Lawyer
Marion County Planning Department	Austin Barnes	Brandon Reich
Oregon Dept of Aviation	Tony Beach	
Oregon Dept of Aviation Board	Cathryn Stephens	
Oregon Dept of Transportation	Naomi Zwerdling	
Oregon Dept of Land Conservation and Development	Melissa Ahrens	Matt Crall
Oregon Farm Bureau		
Oregon Department of Emergency Management	Whitney Stewart	
Positive Aurora Airport Management	Bruce Bennett	
Regional Solutions	Beth Wytoski	
Vans Aircraft	Rian Johnson	Greg Hughes
Willamette Aviation	David Waggoner	
Wilsonville Chamber of Commerce	Patrick Donaldson	Kevin Ferrasci O'Malley

PAC Meeting Guidelines

Meetings summaries will **include all comments along with responses/ follow up.**

- Meeting time **for all committee members to speak.** We have added more time for dialogue to be focused on the agenda items in this PAC meeting.

- Questions and comments on **non-agenda items** should be provided in writing.

- Committee members are encouraged to **provide comments on draft work products presented within the allotted review period** provided by the Planning Team.


PAC Meeting Guidelines

As a committee, we agree to **approach this work with honesty, openness, and willingness to work together.**

- This includes building trust and **assuming good intentions in others** and ensuring that our behavior supports a successful process.
- We will work with each other and staff to **address issues as they arise, utilize tools to ensure clear communication and robust participation, and meet the communication needs of members.**
- PAC members represent their organization, please keep your constituents informed of public meetings and project information.
- **We need all PAC members to name/identify themselves.** Duplicates will be removed from the meeting.

Project Schedule

Recap since we started the project




1. Introduce the Project
2. Review Existing Conditions and Preliminary Forecasts
3. Review/address PAC Comments in Relation to the Draft Working
4. Forecast Approval Overview
5. Facility Goals and Requirements
6. Review of Comments and Responses from Facility Requirements & Preliminary
   Review of Comments and Responses from Preliminary Alternatives & Refined
7. Alternatives Review
8. Noise Analysis & Roundtable Discussion
9. CIP and ALP

We are here

Project Schedule

(Updated January 2025)



Review:

Refined Preferred Alternative

Published 1.6.2025

Input received on the Preferred & Refined Preferred Alternative

Opportunities for Feedback:

- PAC Meeting #7- and two-week comment period
- PAC Meeting #8- and two-week comment period
- 1/6/25 Publication of Refined Preferred Alternative and two-week comment period (ending 1/21)

Feedback we've heard:

- A no build alternative should be considered *(note, a no build was presented and discarded as part of the preliminary alternatives)*
- Reduce or eliminate impacts to existing hangars
- A parallel taxilane is not needed
- Depict a vehicle service road on private TTF property *(note, this is a facility plan for on-airport improvements)*
- Improve the drainfield(s) that are in the safety areas to meet standards without requiring relocation
- Shift Hubbard Highway within the ROW to minimize impacts to adjacent properties
- Include the private TTF properties within the airport boundary

Refinements to the Preferred Alternative

Based on input received, ODAV has made the following refinements:


- Removed the Parallel Taxilane
- Removed the Vehicle Service Road (VSR)
  - Eliminates the need to acquire property that would impact existing hangars
  - Aircraft tiedowns and helicopter parking were re-added to the main apron area.
- Reduced required property acquisition to the areas needed to meet FAA ROFA/TOFA and RSA standards
  - Additional property has been identified as “Reserve” and will be included in the ALP to allow for ODAV to use FAA grant funding in the event properties come available for purchase

Refined Preferred Alternative

There was no change in recommendations to the other proposed improvements, including:


- Proposed runway extension to the North
- Removal/relocation of drain fields outside of the RSA/TSA
- Relocation/shift of Hubbard Highway and Keil Road outside of the ROFA
- Relocation of the ASOS and windcone outside of the ROFA
- Reconfigured apron tiedowns to meet standards
- Future depicted hangar sites on state-owned property
- Improve the drainage ditch in the RSA to meet standards

Refined Preferred Alternative - Overview




Refined Preferred Alternative

Phase – Meeting ROFA/RSA/TSA Standards




Refined Preferred Alternative

Phase – North Runway & Parallel Taxiway Extension



Refined Preferred Alternative - Property Acquisition Overview



PAC
Clarifying Questions
on Refined Preferred Alternative

Review:

Capital Improvement Plan (CIP)

Capital Improvement Plan (CIP)

Short-Term Projects (2025-2029)

Project Description	Total Project Costs
Runway Rehabilitation - Construction	$3,247,500
Obstruction Removal - Easement Acquisition	$825,000
Obstruction Removal - Design	$155,000
Obstruction Removal - Construction	$354,000
Total Short-Term	**$4,581,500**

Notes:
Ultimate timing for project implementation will be determined based on available grant funding and coordination with FAA.

Depending on funding availability, several projects may be accomplished during the same project years.

On-going pavement maintenance projects will be completed based on funding, which would cover general crack fill, seal coat, and markings.

* Year shown for easement/property acquisition is reimbursement year. Project originates 1-2 year(s) prior to the year shown.

** Avigation easement costs vary and will be determined at the time of project.


Long-Term Projects (2030-beyond)

Project Description	Total Project Costs
Taxiway Reconstruction and Drainage Ditch Mitigation - Environmental	$756,000
Taxiway Reconstruction and Drainage Ditch Mitigation - Design	$780,000
Taxiway Reconstruction and Drainage Ditch Mitigation - Construction	$14,070,000
Realign Hubbard Highway - Environmental	$1,320,000
Realign Hubbard Highway - Easement/Property Acquisition*	$16,582,000
Realign Hubbard Highway - Design	$1,920,000
Realign Hubbard Highway - Construction	$30,631,000
Realign Keil Road - Environmental	$408,000
Realign Keil Road - Easement/Property Acquisition	$1,184,000
Realign Keil Road - Design	$396,000
Realign Keil Road - Construction	$2,358,000
Reconstruct and Extend Runway/ Extend Taxiway A - Environmental	$636,000
Reconstruct and Extend Runway/ Extend Taxiway A - Design	$876,000
Reconstruct and Extend Runway/ Extend Taxiway A - Construction	$22,185,000
Vehicle Service Road Improvements	$100,000
South Avigation Easement **	-
Airport Master Plan	$1,000,000
New Flight School Apron - Environmental	$342,000
New Flight School Apron - Design	$498,000
New Flight School Apron - Construction	$3,180,000
Total Long-Term	**$99,222,000**

Review:


Airport Layout Plan (ALP)

Airport Layout Plan (ALP)



CENTURY WEST ENGINEERING

Terminal Area Plan



PAC Questions & Comments

on the CIP and ALP

Public Comments

Next Steps

Next Steps

- Prepare the Draft Final Report
- Submit Draft ALP to FAA for Obstruction Evaluation/Airport Airspace Analysis (OE/AAA) review
- Submit Draft Final Report to FAA for review & posted on project website for public information
- Once ALP & report are reviewed and approved, FAA and ODAV will sign ALP
- Project Closeout with FAA
- ODAV Board Adoption Process
  - *Note, this step is beyond the scope of this project and will be completed following the completion of the project.*

Thank You

Alex Thomas – ODAV

Tony Beach – ODAV

Brandy Steffen – JLA Public Involvement

David Miller – Century West Engineering

Project Website: https://publicproject.net/AuroraAirport

Public Open House #1 – March 1, 2022

AURORA STATE AIRPORT

AIRPORT MASTER PLAN
OPEN HOUSE #1 SUMMARY

Overview

The first open house for the Aurora State Airport Master Plan provided an overview of the Airport Master Plan process, as well as an opportunity to collect oral and written comments from the community. About 40 people attended the virtual event, which included 19 Planning Advisory Committee (PAC) members. The event was held virtually on Zoom on Tuesday, March 1, 2022 from 5:00 to 7:00 pm. Additional comments were collected via email before and after the event. *An online survey was also available at the time of this open house, but the results of that survey will be summarized in a separate document when the survey closes on March 25, 2022.*

The open house, as well as the second PAC meeting and online survey, was advertised by the Oregon Department of Aviation (ODAV) in the following ways:

- 01/26/2022 – Project website updated with meeting dates and registration link.
- 01/26/2022 and 02/15/2022 - Email sent to the mailing list of interested individuals and organizations (through GovDelivery).
- 01/27/2022 and 02/24/2022 - Ad placed in Pamplin Media newspapers (including Canby Herald, Wilsonville Spokesman).
- 01/27/2022 and 02/12/2022 - Ad placed in the Statesman Journal.
- 01/28/2022 – Postcard mailed to residents, organizations, and government agencies within 1,000 feet of the airport (state-owned property).
- 01/28/2022 – Flyers posted at the airport and nearby locations.
- 02/22/2022 - Press release was sent to Canby Herald, Wilsonville Spokesman, El Latino and Statesman Journal 02/23/2022 – Article ran in the Canby Herald by Emily Matlock “ODAV seeks public input on Aurora State Airport plan.”

CONTENTS

Overview 1

Open House Content 2


Public Comments 3

In Attendance 17

Open House Content

Brandy Steffen, JLA Public Involvement, welcomed everyone to the meeting and reviewed the agenda and basic Zoom meeting tips. She explained that those in attendance could submit comments in the Q & A section and there would also be time at the end of the presentation for verbal comment. **Sarah Lucas, Oregon Department of Aviation (ODAV),** and **Matt Rogers, Century West,** introduced the **ODAV** staff and the consultant teams. Sarah explained that members of the public could reach out to the project's Planning Advisory Committee (PAC) members with questions or if they wanted representation.

Brandy polled the attendees to see if they had been involved with past planning efforts at the Aurora State Airport. Thirty percent said they had, 20% "sort of" had, and 52% of respondents were not previously involved (19 people responded). The next poll asked how attendees felt about the Airport Master Plan. Forty-one percent were supportive, 21% were interested or wanted to know more, 11% were unsure, and 21% were opposed to the plan (19 people responded).



Aurora Airport: Past, Present, and Future

David Miller, Century West, gave a brief overview of the Aurora Airport Master Plan project. He mentioned the history of the airport and highlighted key improvements throughout the years. The Master Plan is a facility plan that follows the requirements set by the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA). The FAA has funded the project cost in its entirety and the goal is to provide a framework for improvements to airport facilities in response to aviation demands over a 20-year planning horizon (divided into three periods: short-term, intermediate-term and long-term). He gave an existing conditions overview to explain what is currently happening at the airport, followed by forecasted information for the next 20 years. He explained that everything in the forecast category of the working paper document is preliminary pending feedback from the PAC, FAA, and surrounding communities.


The presentation and additional reference materials are available on the project website.

Next Steps

David informed the attendees that the Planning Team and FAA will next adjust and finalize the Draft Working Paper #1 after considering Advisory Committee and public comments. After the reviews are completed, the technical team will work on applying the preferred forecasts to the facility requirements and future goals. This information will be the topic of the next PAC meeting and public open house tentatively scheduled in May 2022.

Brandy explained there would be several PAC meetings and open houses in the future for people to attend and give feedback or ask questions.

She polled the attendees, asking how they feel about the Master Plan now that they have more information. Fifty percent were supportive, 10% were interested but wanted to know more, 10% were unsure, and 30% are opposed to the plan (20 people responded; this is an increase in people supportive and opposed to the plan). She also asked how people heard about the event. Thirty-eight percent received information through the project email, 29% through word of mouth, 24% said “something else”, 10% said social media, 5% saw a project poster, 5% read an article in paper, and 14% saw a project postcard.



Public Comments

Before facilitating the town hall style public comment portion of the meeting, Brandy mentioned other ways attendees could give feedback, which included the website comment form and an online survey which will be available through March 25, 2022. She reiterated the appreciation the project team has for everyone who attended and gave comments, and how important it is to hear everyone’s concerns so the technical team can understand and address these concerns within the planning documents. She reminded the group that any comments not answered live in the meeting would be answered in the meeting summary, which would be posted to the website.

Name	Affiliation	Question/Comment	Response
Cornelia Gibson	Community member	I'd like to know how increased sewer demands will be handled. What type of sewage system is at the airport?	Per Page 2-39 of Working Paper #1 "Sanitary sewer is provided by individual and shared drain field/septic tank systems. There are at least nine individual drain fields located on ODAV owned property that are shared for both aviation related uses on both private and publicly owned land." Septic systems are permitted by Marion County.
Julie Fitzgerald	Mayor, Wilsonville	Will aircraft that currently use the Aurora Airport but are overweight and/or require a longer runway than at this airport be included in the future needs of the airport?	While larger aircraft may be based at or use the airport, the FAA uses the most demanding aircraft that has 500 operations (take-offs or landings) at the airport to set the standards for future planning that apply to elements of the airport including runway length. Larger aircraft that have fewer than 500 operations may be able to use the airport, but the planning decisions will

			not based on accommodating the needs of the larger aircraft.
Anonymous	City of Wilsonville	How will the public find out about that question asked by Julie Fitzgerald?	The meeting summary will include all questions and responses, and will be posted to the project website within a couple weeks.
Eric Hoem	Community member	I appreciate the information, but at this point I do not support expansion, because to me, the negative impacts outweigh any economic benefits. My wife and I live in Charbonneau. We are 2.8 miles from the control tower, and therefore well within the impact zone. We've lived here 15 years and have noted a tremendous increase in airport takeoffs and landings, especially corporate jets. We don't object to the airport's existence; we knew it was here and there are certain aspects of the present airport that we completely support such as life flights. We have friends who work at Columbia Helicopters. But increasing the airport with more business and corporate jet flights isn't something that we can support at all. It's too much noise. It increases the chance of air pollution from the pollutants that are left over from the jet aircraft. This is a farm area. I know we are the final urban community south of the river, but I really support the idea of the rest of the Valley being kept as farmland, and I don't see the development of an elaborate airport that caters to corporate jets as a part of that. At this point I'd like to see more information about how air pollution and noise pollution are being addressed and especially traffic patterns. The roads around here are completely full, and I can't imagine doubling or tripling the traffic as they suggest. Air traffic would increase, and so would the ground traffic. There isn't the infrastructure around the airport to support that. Thank you for taking my comment and I'll continue to stay in contact with the process.	At this point of the project we are evaluating existing conditions, documenting current airport activity, and forecasting future demand over the 20-year planning horizon. In future Task 6, Facility Goals and Requirements, existing conditions will be compared with current FAA standards and identify potential improvements to accommodate forecast demand. That information will be used in the development alternatives to determine how improvements could be accommodated physically on the airport. Public comments will be considered on future draft chapters including the facility requirements and development alternatives. The Airport Master Plan is not an environmental document. Future development projects on the airport are subject to National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requirements and greenhouse gas emissions and noise are impact categories that are required to be reviewed in the environmental process. More information on NEPA is available at: National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Implementing Instructions for Airport Actions – Order 5050.4B (faa.gov) Surface transportation impacts would require additional study if required by Marion County and are beyond the scope of this project.
Cornelia Gibson	Community member	To a large degree, I have to agree with what the gentleman prior (Eric Hoem) said. I am also opposed to any kind of expansion. I know from road expansion that once you have bigger roads you get more traffic, and at the airport it's probably going to be the same.	We have not done the technical analysis required to answer that question. Runway length has not been addressed in any form. These conversations are coming, but we can't speak to them at this moment.

		I am a gardener and feel very strongly that the Willamette Valley is some of the most precious land that we have in the world. In some places the topsoil is 12 feet deep, and it is where we grow our food. It is not where we want to have expansion of businesses, pavement, pollution, and traffic. I think we need to do everything we can to keep the growth north of the Willamette Valley and keep our Willamette Valley farmland. And don't we have that as farm zoning? How can we even talk about expanding an airport when it's farm zoning? Is there an answer to that?	And yes, certainly there are land use processes for the State of Oregon and Marion County that are applicable. The land use requirements will be evaluated and discussed in the materials presented in the development alternatives task.
Julie Fitzgerald	Mayor, Wilsonville	My parents are both private pilots, and as a kid we landed at the Aurora Airport and Troutdale Airport at different times in a Cessna 172. I'm familiar with airports because of my parents. I remember reading that the Troutdale Airport was losing money for the Port of Portland, and it was mainly used for flying lessons. I used to live near the Salem Airport, and I remember reading articles about that airport looking for more revenue sources. I'm going to be watching this process closely. Why does the airport need to expand so much when we are right on the edge of the French prairie, which is one of the most valuable traded sector functions in the state of Oregon? For example, Oregon is the only state in the US that grows blueberries of acceptable quality to the country of South Korea. We have incredible productivity of wine, hazelnuts, and other products. We have Salem airport and many other airports around us, and I want to make sure that we understand why the sacrifice needs to be made here to lengthen the runway. This seems to be the goal when we have many other options. We also have dilapidated country roads and I5 crossings, which cannot accommodate the incredible addition of business development that we've heard about. It seems like this expansion is trying to happen when there are so many other alternatives and I want to make sure that in this process the public can find out about these things and understand why the sacrifices should be made in order to allow this great increase of jets from other places to convert the use of this part of Oregon.	At this point of the planning process airport expansion has not been proposed. We are evaluating existing conditions, documenting current airport activity, and forecasting future demand over the 20-year planning horizon. In future tasks, the facility requirements will look at existing conditions compared with current FAA standards and identify potential improvements to accommodate forecast demand. That information will be used in the development alternatives to determine how improvements could be accommodated physically on the airport. Public comments will be considered on future draft chapters including the facility requirements and development alternatives. Potential funding for future airport projects will come from FAA Airport Improvement Program (AIP) or other airport specific funding sources. AIP funding is derived from airport user fees and can only be used for projects supporting airport improvements. Funding for off-airport transportation facilities is the responsibility of the applicable City, County, or Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) and is beyond the scope of this project.
Lori Loen	Community member	I am a resident of Wilsonville and concerned about the increased air traffic over our homes and the schools. Will the increased traffic,	This was a misunderstanding of a comment from the Planning Advisory Committee on March 1. The comment

		especially with Amazon coming in, be required to avoid populated areas?	was referencing an Amazon facility at the Troutdale Airport. Airport arrival and departure routes are dictated by the Air Traffic Control Tower. ODAV does not have control of how air traffic is routed to and from the airport.
David Waggoner	Willamette Aviation	Is Amazon coming to the airport?	This was a misunderstanding of a comment from the Planning Advisory Committee on March 1. The comment was referencing an Amazon facility at the Troutdale Airport.
Elaine Swyft	Community member	On several occasions, I thought we were experiencing an earthquake. My home shook. It was a plane flying overhead. I pray we consider the impact on the quality of our lives here.	Thank you for the comment and we understand your concern. We will be conducting a noise analysis and evaluate noise generated by the Aurora State Airport as part of the Master Plan. ODAV encourages pilots to reduce noise impacts, which is further explained on our agency's website.
Joanne Linnville	City Councilor, Wilsonville	I appreciate the openness and the process that is being used and the effort to get public input to the technical staff who are assisting with the production of the document. I was pleased to hear during the PAC meeting that both Marion County and Clackamas County are included in the process. In previous planning documents that are related to the Aurora Airport, the northernmost line for the impact air area of the airport was drawn at the county line at Arndt Road. The area beyond that was within Clackamas County and not included. I'm hopeful given what I've heard today that that will not be done in this planning process and a natural radius, regardless of county boundary, will be used as the impact area for the study and the planning of the airport.	The area considered in the planning process is dictated by FAA defined and protected surfaces.
Cornelia Gibson	Community member	I live in Wilsonville, so I'm not in the direct path of the planes, but when we sit on our deck, they fly over relatively low and make unpleasant noise. I'm always concerned about the environmental impact of jet fuel and other pollutants that come out of the planes in and around the airport. I sent a letter about that. I also listened to the work session earlier today and Mr. David Miller mentioned the type of airplanes that will be flying in there. Class C-III, C-II design. Is that correct? Those are high performance business jets which meet the FAA special design. Does this mean these jets and the air travel in and	The airport codes can be confusing. C-II is representative of that category of aircraft that are already operating at the airport today and meet the FAA's threshold. We are expecting the traffic to grow along with the community and overall area. General aviation as a category includes everything from flight training to executive business aircraft. There are many factors in that, including medevac flights. There are a variety of aircraft types such as small jets or

		out of the airport is for businesspeople? Who benefits from the travel and planes that go in and out of the airport? Is it business executives who fly over to Hillsboro or wherever their offices are? The rest of us are stuck in traffic on I-5 for hours because the freeway bridge has not been improved. Is part of the expansion going to include fixing up our freeway bridge? Why should someone else be able to surpass that when we pay the taxes for this? I don't think the farmland area is a good place for an airport. Who does it serve? Does it serve all of us?	higher performance jets. Business travel, charter flights, etc. are all included in this. Business aviation allows companies to do business in areas and communities where they wouldn't otherwise have access to commercial air service. Funding for off-airport transportation facilities is the responsibility of the applicable City, County, or ODOT and is beyond the scope of this project.
Rian Johnson	Vans Aircraft	I was the one who previously made the comment about the Troutdale airport. I'm based there with my personal airplane (I'm not rich and live in Portland). The plan has been delayed, but Amazon is moving into the north side of the runway at Troutdale. That runway has already been shortened because of trees, which has limited the traffic in and out of there. It will be further shortened when Amazon moves in. Everything will be off the runway, including the control tower. The Port of Portland promised to put hangars on the south side, but they haven't done that yet. There may be airplanes displaced because of all of this. If you're coming in for business, you want to be close to a freeway, which leaves Aurora and Hillsboro to serve the city of Portland based on their proximity to these. This isn't just the Wilsonville area. Flying into PDX on a business jet is time consuming and expensive. It's better to fly into a surrounding sub flight airport. Once Troutdale goes through its changes, that leaves 2 locations, and Aurora makes more sense than Salem. I have a business here at the airport. Prior to Covid I had 65 employees, and now I have 130. That is a lot of jobs that were brought to the area. We pay well and are bringing money into the local economy. Relocating south would be difficult for me and my employees. Additionally, as a pilot, I always try to avoid the Charbonneau and Aurora area on my approach. We try to make the least amount of noise coming in. The tower came in and now controls where we go, so I try to approach the airport in a way so they don't route me in those paths. The issue needs to be brought	Thank you for the comment.

		up to the FAA and how they route approaching traffic for noise mitigation. I am also on a committee designing regulations for airplanes like quadcopters, package delivery, etc. This has been lobbied for and we will have different types of airplanes within 10 to 20 years. The noise will be different, but air traffic will increase over time, and nothing is going to change that.	
Julie Fitzgerald	Mayor, Wilsonville	Of all of 218 aircraft, can you please remind us of what percentage are the high-end corporate jets?	The number of current based aircraft is 281. In the working paper, table 3-8 indicates some of those jet aircraft. Appendix 6 has a full listing of all FAA approved aircraft. There are 36 jets; 13% of the 281.
Mary Closson	Community member	I'd like to know the status of expansion at Salem Municipal Airport. I've heard that they would accept improved air traffic It's such a short distance from Aurora so it seems like charter flights, executive flights, etc., could be handled from Salem. I also want to say, for the record, that I'm aware that we're talking about Aurora STATE Airport. OUR tax dollars help cover operational costs of this airport. Bottom line: I oppose expansion of the Aurora State Airport for environmental reasons, traffic reasons, agricultural reasons and traffic safety reasons!	To clarify – funds for airport improvements in the US are derived from the aviation trust fund, which is 100% funded by user fees. For example, taxes on airline tickets are a user fee that contributes to the aviation trust fund. The trust fund provides monies to the airport improvement program for capital projects. Additionally, ODAV does not receive state general funds – no Oregon tax dollars are spent by the agency to support the Aurora State Airport. ODAV operations are sustained wholly on user fees, registration, leases, and other sources that are detailed on the agency's website. The City of Salem recently completed a master plan, and all of their documents should still be online. You can contact them for more information.
Elaine Swyft	Community member	Is there data yet on the environmental impact of lead pollutants? I apologize if this question was already answered. If no data yet, is there a plan to collect this.	The project FAQs have information regarding the NEPA process. It is project specific, and the FAA leads that process.
Mary Closson	Community member	I meant to say that Salem Municipal Airport would accept ADDITIONAL air traffic if they expand. Also, for the record, I live in Wilsonville. Thanks for the info re the Salem airport.	Thank you for the comment.
Julie Fitzgerald	Mayor, Wilsonville	How does the Aurora State Airport currently provide drinking water and sewage treatment	Marion County issues building permits, and would be able to answer

		facilities for the restroom facilities to all of their businesses? As they plan to expand, will they continue to offer the same method of providing water and sewer services to the office buildings planned to be built adjacent to the tarmac?	this question, since those businesses are on private property ODAV doesn't have access to the county requirements for private property. ODAV does have two wells and a septic tank and pump for on-airport property.
Kriss Wright	Community member	What's the GPM [gallons per minute] on the well on site? There was an airplane that landed on one of the houses here. I encourage emergency plans. What is your emergency response plan for potential disasters?	ODAV has two wells for State-owned property. One well only serves the air traffic control tower (ATCT) and has a pump rated for 10gpm. The other well serves other on-airport needs and had a potential yield of 275gpm at the time of installation in 1981. However, the pump is set to 35gpm. Other wells exist on adjacent lands, which have through-the-fence access (TTF) to the Airport but ODAV does not keep those records – they would be recorded with Marion County. The Airport is served by local Fire Districts for on/off airport emergency response.
Bruce Bennett	Aurora Airport Improvement Association	I keep hearing about expansion, but it's clear that the property has been the same for a while and I don't believe there are plans to change it. The runway expansion would be on airport property which is currently an overrun and wouldn't change the type or noise of aircrafts. There has been a lot of misinformation distributed that is worrying people. My family has had property on Aurora airport since 1968. Most flights are emergency or medical flights.	Thank you for the comment.
Nancy CS	Community member	I grew up in Aurora and I work the farm with my dad. It's been so hard to see the developments happening here. The airport has really impacted me in just the last few years. When I'm on the phone for work, it is jarring. It makes it difficult to hear clients. A helicopter flew so close that the house shook. The airport forced my parents to sell some property, so I have built distrust in what may happen at the airport. It used to be agriculture and woods, and now that is gone. The noise is unacceptable, and there have been readings of 105 decibels on several occasions. There have been readings of 70-80 decibels inside my house. They're doing exercises, and fluids are dropping from aircraft onto your fields. I couldn't hear what someone was saying in the PAC meeting	Helicopter Transport Services (HTS) was permitted through Marion County and is independent of Aurora State Airport. ODAV does not control how they operate their aircraft. If you have noise or concerns with impacts to your property you can contact HTS directly or Marion County code enforcement. If you have safety concerns you can also contact the Portland FAA Flight Standards District Office (FSDO) at (503) 615-3200.

		because a jet was taking off. We are agriculture people and were here before the airport.	
Tony Helbling	Positive Aurora Airport Management	I'm the president of Positive Aurora Airport Management. We are made up of airport operators, owners as well as representatives of surrounding communities. We've held events in conjunction to with ODAV to help our neighbors understand what is going on at the airport. There seems to be quite a few questions the MP consultants can't answer. If people would like - as soon as Covid allows, etc... I'd be willing to put together an event that would be open to the neighbors to talk about what's going on at the airport. It seems like there are concerns and questions about what happens on the ground at the airport and septic systems. There are multiple wells, septic systems, and sanitation systems on the property in addition to the state one mentioned. We could put together some outreach to help concerned neighbors come talk to us and dispel rumors.	Thank you for the comment.
Joanne Lindville,	City Councilor, Wilsonville	One of the graphics showed that the Aurora Airport was the 3rd busiest state airport, but busier ones are run by the city or a port. I have great concerns that it is run by ODAV, and is projected to grow while not incorporated into a city. It has well water and a septic tank instead of a sewer. It's on rural roads and has one of the only traffic control towers. It's managed by a state agency which has other responsibilities and we've been fortunate to not have safety issues such as crashes. As this study is being done, I think the projected growth, current usage, and location to surrounding urban areas needs to be looked at regarding management and ownership of the airport itself.	Thank you for your comment. ODAV owns and operates 28 airports of varying sizes and levels of use throughout Oregon, many of which are in rural and urban areas. Current ownership and operation of the airport is addressed in the Existing Conditions chapter.
Benjamin Mello	FAA	Just a couple of comments - The EPA currently plans to issue a proposed endangerment finding in 2022 regarding leaded fuel which will undergo public notice and comment. After evaluating comments on the proposal, they plan to issue any final endangerment finding in 2023. The FAA, together with government and industry stakeholders, is in the early stages of developing a multi-layered transition strategy to reduce and ultimately eliminate lead from aviation gasoline. More information about FAA's programs can be found here: https://www.faa.gov/about/initiatives/avgas/ The Salem Municipal Airport (SLE) is starting	No response needed.

		a new master plan this year. John Paskell, C.M., Airport Manager City of Salem | Salem Municipal Airport 2990 25th Street SE, Salem OR 97302 jpaskell@cityofsalem.net.	
Cornelia Gibson	Community member	Thank you, Councilor Linville. Excellent point.	No response needed.
Nancy CB	Community member	I've also had concerns about septic and water. As more development happened, our water pressure went down, and we were going to have to dig another deeper well.	Thank you for the comment. The only recent improvement on state-owned property was the addition of the 10gpm well for the ATCT in 2015. There have been no other changes since the main well was installed more than 40 years ago. All development is subject to Marion County requirements.
Bruce Bennett	Aurora Airport Improvement Association	Traffic has become a major issue as the area has grown and needs to be addressed. I don't believe the Airport is the cause of it, rather it's victim of it.	Thank you for the comment.

Emailed Public Comment and Testimony

Name	Question/Comment	Response
William A. Wallace	I am reviewing the Aurora State Airport Draft Airport Master Plan of February 2022. What is conspicuously absent in the current draft is any mention of climate change and its potential impact on future operability of the Aurora State Airport. Over the next 20 years and beyond, climate change in this locale is likely to have significant impacts on airport operations and economics. Some of these impacts are described below. Not taking climate change into account makes the Plan deficient. The Environmental Data section on Page 2-19 provides a recitation of the weather and climate conditions at the airport based on historical climate information. However, according to respected scientific organizations such as NASA, NOAA, the National Academies, and the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), the climate is changing significantly. In the past, historical climate conditions were reliable predictors of future climate conditions. That is no longer true. Thus, the elements of the Plan that are based on historical climate conditions are not reliable. There is now irrefutable scientific evidence that the climate is changing and that the change is human caused. Since the beginning of the industrial age, the Earth has warmed by about 1.1℃ (2℉) caused primarily by the burning of fossil fuels for heat and power. Carbon dioxide (CO2) and other heat-trapping gases released into the atmosphere have disrupted the Earth's climate regulating systems. This increase in thermal energy has not only produced warmer temperatures but more frequent and extreme weather events. Furthermore, climate scientists have told us that unless the warming is kept below 1.5℃ (2.7℉), extreme weather events will get markedly worse. Some changes are likely irreversible. While the Northwestern U.S. may not be affected as much as other U.S. locations, the Aurora Airport locale has already experienced the impacts of climate change. Last February's exceptional ice storm and the unprecedented	There are ongoing nationwide efforts that the FAA, in coordination with EPA, is undertaking to address greenhouse gas emissions related to aviation and also emissions from jet exhaust. The purpose of these efforts is to investigate fuel alternatives to reduce emissions. More information is available at: https://www.faa.gov/airports/environmental/air_quality Opportunities to mitigate these issues are not within the scope of the Airport Master Plan project. However, future development projects on the airport are subject to National Environmental Policy Act requirements and greenhouse gas emissions is one of the impact categories identified to be reviewed. More information is available at: National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Implementing

	110+°F heat wave in June of 2021 are recent examples and harbingers of things to come. Extreme heat events and extreme storms will affect the ability of aircraft to land and take off safely and disrupt airport operations. In response to such events, civil infrastructure assets including airports need to become more climate resilient, able to withstand or recover from extreme climate and weather events. Yet the resilience plan for the Aurora State Airport only deals with seismic resilience. While cities and counties across the country are developing plans to make their communities climate resilient, the Airport Plan makes no mention of climate resilience. The latest draft IPCC report issued this week concludes that the window for action is closing rapidly and is urging the U.S. and other countries to reduce carbon emissions to net zero by 2050 and be half way there by 2030, less than 8 years from now. Efforts are now underway to reduce carbon emissions, and the transportation sector one of the largest carbon emitters. While aviation accounted for 2.4 percent of the total CO2 emissions, other aircraft engine emissions such as nitrous gases, water vapor, soot, sulphates and particulate matter pushed their warming contribution to 3.5 percent. In response, auto manufacturers have committed to stop production of gas-powered cars, selling only zero emission vehicles by 2040. For aircraft manufacturers, zero emissions power is not a feasible option. Continuing to operate fossil fuel powered aircraft will become an economic and regulatory burden on aircraft and airport owners and operators as countries including the U.S. seek to reduce their carbon footprint. Some kind of carbon tax or regulations requiring the reduction of carbon emissions is inevitable. Yet, there is no discussion of carbon emissions and its impact in the Plan. In reviewing the Scope of Work for the Aurora State Airport Master Plan Update, climate is mentioned briefly (page 16) and not in the context of changing climate conditions. I encourage the Oregon Department of Aviation and the consultant, Century West Engineering, to study this issue in more depth and incorporate the potential impacts into the plan.	Instructions for Airport Actions – Order 5050.4B (faa.gov)
Cornelia Gibson	We live in the Willamette Valley, -a valley which is considered among the best farmland in the world with several feet of topsoil! It is common knowledge that airports create significant environmental cost and hugely impact the locality where they are built. In addition to noise pollution, emissions from aircraft in the air and at ground level degrade air quality severely and thereby directly impact human health. Additionally ground support equipment increases the air pollution and pollutant runoff into our nearby waterways, the Willamette river. Whether piston engine planes or jets which use AV fuel, the contaminants are harmful for the farmland of the Willamette valley, our rivers and our local food supply. Why would we want an expanded airport with all its negative side effects of increased airport waste, on this valuable farm land ? What and whose interest is best served that it warrants increased airport waste in our local food supply? The general public? The farmers nearby?	There are ongoing nationwide efforts that the FAA, in coordination with EPA, is undertaking to address greenhouse gas emissions related to aviation and also emissions from jet exhaust. The purpose of these efforts is to investigate fuel alternatives to reduce emissions. More information is available at: https://www.faa.gov/airports/environmental/air_quality Opportunities to mitigate these issues are not within the scope of the Airport Master Plan project. However, future development projects on the

	Or is it some select investors, airplane owners and executives who can fly to their offices instead of driving across our single freeway bridge? Growth of an airport should not be at the cost of negative impacts on the environment and the people who live nearby! Much less on the best farmland in the world. There are several other airports in the area. Please do not condemn this best farmland in the world to airport pollution.	airport are subject to National Environmental Policy Act requirements and greenhouse gas emissions is one of the impact categories identified to be reviewed. More information is available at: National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Implementing Instructions for Airport Actions – Order 5050.4B (faa.gov)
Klaus Gibson	In the past 25 years that we have lived in Wilsonville we have seen enormous change in the community. The I-5 Corridor has become more and more the major commercial arterial between Canada and Mexico. Wilsonville Road under the I-5 underpass was a 2 Lane road. Travel north and south on I-5 was very accessible and efficient. Today, Wilsonville Road is heavily traveled and five lanes. Today between 3:30 PM and 6:30 PM we avoid going across town because traffic is backed up on the west side most of the time all the way to Brown Road because of the bottleneck on the southbound I-5 Willamette River bridge. Now traveling south on I-5, traffic begins to jam up during that time in Tigard and homeward bound we need to exit the North Wilsonville exit because all lanes are standing still with traffic snarled because of the bottleneck at the I-5 bridge. I-5 northbound south of the Willamette River Bridge, too becomes often congested with traffic slowing to between 25 and 35 mph until northbound across the bridge. The area north of the I-5 bridge has had tremendous population and commercial expansion. The truck traffic is ever increasing, vehicle traffic is ever increasing, yet across the Willamette River no major projects have been accomplished since its construction virtually 70 years ago in 1954. The River Crossing is totally archaic. The proposed expansion of the aurora airport undoubtedly will compound this bottleneck. Proponents of the expansion minimize the impact. We need to be visionary, we need to think of the area and the surrounds in 20 to 40 years from now. Will this recently small provincial airport basically serving piston small plane enthusiasts incrementally become a major regional air freight hub? Sounds outrageously alarmist? Really? There will be continued population and commercial expansion in Canby, Aurora and Woodburn area. To accommodate that expansion in the next 20 to 40 years another I-5 freeway bridge is an absolute must to maintain the livability and economic vitality of the area. Before the expansion of the airport let's talk about paying for, and constructing an additional I-5 bridge.	There are no known plans to create a freight hub at Aurora State Airport. Funding for off-airport transportation facilities is the responsibility of the applicable City, County, or ODOT and is beyond the scope of this project.
Mary Closson	I've been a Wilsonville resident since 2010 and an Oregon resident since 1990. I'm writing today because I'm deeply concerned about the proposed expansion of the Aurora State Airport. I bolded the word "State" because I'm aware that my tax dollars support the Aurora State Airport and the ODA. Over the past few years, I have made it a priority to understand the history of this airport and the efforts that have taken place to expand it, specifically by lengthening the main runway, but also	At this point of the planning process airport expansion has not been proposed. We are evaluating existing conditions, documenting current airport activity, and forecasting future demand throughout the 20-year planning horizon. In future tasks, the facility requirements

	through placing more commercial buildings in and around the airport. Included in my research is the ruling given by the Oregon Court of Appeals (June 16, 2021) which stated that your organization misapplied state land-use laws in approving the contentious 2012 Aurora State Airport Master Plan. I support the City of Wilsonville and the City of Aurora's stance on the Aurora State Airport Master Plan. I am against the expansion of this airport (runway expansion, additional buildings on the land surrounding the airport, etc.) based on my awareness of infrastructure limitations (water/sewer among them), environmental impacts and increased traffic congestion. In terms of environmental impacts, I support the Friends of French Prairie and their work to preserve the valuable rich farmlands that would be severely impacted as a result of airport expansion. I also support the many residents of Charbonneau, Aurora and Wilsonville (north of the river), who have voiced concerns about the severe noise impacts from increasing jet and airplane traffic. Along with the noise, we are troubled by the health issues resulting from emissions from aircraft in the air and at ground level. I have also been made aware of increased traffic on I-5 and the roads in and around Aurora, Wilsonville, Charbonneau and Canby should this airport be expanded. I have read reports that document a surge in traffic accidents and related injuries/fatalities as a result of the current high volume of traffic on I-5 and on the roads connecting I-5 and the airport. We already have a major problem with the Boone Bridge/I-5 bottleneck and it would surely be made worse should the airport be allowed to expand. It is also my understanding that the Salem Municipal Airport is open to expansion that would include more small jet traffic. With its close proximity to Wilsonville/Charbonneau, Aurora and Canby, why is your agency not giving more attention to the Salem Municipal Airport? We residents/taxpayers deserve to live in communities that are safe from airport pollution and from the hazards of increased traffic on our already burdened roads and freeways. We also need to recognize and place a priority on the unique agricultural value of the farmland surrounding the Aurora State Airport. I urge you to focus your time and attention on the win/win scenario offered by expanding services at the Salem Municipal Airport.	will look at existing conditions compared with current FAA standards and identify potential improvements to accommodate forecast demand. That information will be used in the development alternatives to determine how improvements could be accommodated physically on the airport. Public comments will be considered on future draft chapters including the facility requirements and development alternatives. Potential funding for future airport projects will come from FAA Airport Improvement Program (AIP) or other airport specific funding sources. AIP funding is derived from airport user fees and can only be used for projects supporting airport improvements. Funding for off-airport transportation facilities is the responsibility of the applicable City, County, or ODOT and is beyond the scope of this project. To clarify – funds for airport improvements in the US are derived from the aviation trust fund, which is 100% funded by user fees. For example, taxes on airline tickets are a user fee that contributes to the aviation trust fund. The trust fund provides monies to the airport improvement program for capital projects. Additionally, ODAV does not receive state general funds – no Oregon tax dollars are spent by the agency for the Aurora State Airport. ODAV operations are sustained wholly on user fees, registration, leases, and other sources that are detailed on the agency's website.
Gerald (Gerry) Tunstall	I am a private pilot with approximately 1000 hours of pilot time and 3200 hours as a C-130E Hercules transport navigator/flight instuctor/flight examiner. Originally from Portland, Oregon, I live in	Thank you for your comments and perspective as a user of the airport.

	Tualatin, Oregon. After my military service (USAF), which included VietNam, Cambodia, Africa, Europe, and the Pacific, bought a fractional ownership in a Cessna 172, and we rent a hangar at Aurora Airport. I am a member of the Columbia Aviation Assn., which is a social and professional organization based at the airport. Thanks to the efforts of this club, I maintain FAA proficiency and currency requirements and it is a vehicle for numerous professional lectures, fly-outs to regional destinations, and for developing connections for aircraft maintenance. Why do I love flying and why do I believe in the future of the Aurora Airport? After years of military flying, recreational flying provides an activity that puts the fun back into flying. I enjoy taking passengers to educate them on what a gorgeous state that we live in, from a completely different perspective. I try to encourage young people to consider an aviation related career. I enjoy aerial photography. When flying over noise sensitive areas, I follow the rules and voluntarily throttle back to minimize engine noise over residential areas, at my own risk. My professional and educational background includes urban planning. I think that I have a long term and local perspective on what can happen if the airport becomes threatened by human urban activity. Many airports in this area have been removed in the past 50 years: Evergreen, Troh's (twice), Bernards, etc. Pearson Airpark in Vancouver was almost lost. If Aurora Airport becomes threatened, it would heavily affect airport maintenance and manufacturing facilities, and would have an economic consequence with local businesses including restaurants and service oriented activities.	
Lee Barckmann	The planning of the Airport needs to be tightly meshed with the "quality of life" concerns of the surrounding area. This quality of life can be measured by looking very closely at the concerns of people living adjacent to or near the airport. The continual attempts of aviation business interests to override or minimize those concerns should be closely examined. Who will benefit from the airport expansion? Aurora Airport is a state owned facility, owned by all of us. A poorly conceived Master Plan, or one that does not take into consideration the views of people who live nearby will have wide ranging and long term negative consequences for the area. It will deed millions of dollars worth of public value to local aviation "oligarchs". I use that word "oligarch" perhaps too loosely, but in light of recent international events perhaps it is appropriate. Allowing wealthy individuals to corruptly leverage uncontrolled economic access to publicly owned facilities for their own benefit is one definition of an oligarch, and it is how Putin's cronies got so rich. Many in the area feel that this is what is happening or might happen. The word "Quality" was Governor Tom McCall's watchword, along with "Progress". So perhaps instead of "growth" you need to think of "Quality creates Progress", as the theme for creating the new master plan for the Aurora State Airport. Regardless of the size and number of hangars built in anticipation of expansion, control of the facility remains in State hands and should be administered with the interests of the citizens of the	Thank you for your comments. Future development projects on the airport are subject to NEPA requirements. The environmental study to satisfy NEPA requires a review of cumulative impacts of development projects at the airport.

	state put first and foremost. The desires of the private aviation industry to expand the runway and taxiways should be examined with open eyes. Please look at the negative impacts that the airport is creating now, and realistically extrapolate what those impacts would be when running bigger and bigger planes in and out at a very increased rate of landing and takeoff. Regardless of what the airport business community says are their near-term operational intentions, once the facility is built, past promises will become meaningless. The Master Plan Advisory Committee will undoubtedly receive many comments regarding the threats the airport poses to our environmental quality from the loss of farmland, from more leaded airplane fuel and exhaust being sprayed on us, along with the possibility of spills and pollution of our groundwater. I am sure many will talk about the sometimes incessant noise over adjacent neighborhoods and communities, and the very real threat to home values in the region. I concur with all of them, and so do many of my neighbors along “the Canyon Creek corridor” in Wilsonville north of the Willamette River. However, in addition to those very real threats, most of which are affecting us today, I think the Advisory Committee needs to also keep a wider focus on both our past (how we got here) and our future (where we are going). Re-engage with the original reasons why this committee exists in the first place. Our past is the legacy that Tom McCall left us. Over the last fifty years Oregon has taken a different path from that of most of the western states. McCall wanted the state to remain as pristine as possible, and he created a system, via land use laws that you in the Master Plan Advisory Committee will help to shape and administer. You must ensure we carry that vision into the future. That is your overriding mission, and I hope you remember it. This was not a partisan issue, at least not in the past. McCall, as you know, was a Republican, and his vision of economic development was that this effort to keep Oregon clean would attract like minded people from all over the world to come to the state, who would bring money and skills to grow the economy in a manner that would blend with the natural ecology of our wonderful state. And, in spite of a few hiccups here and there, he was right, that is what has happened. In addition to cleaning up the Willamette River, McCall saw the corridor between Portland and Salem as the prime region to show how Oregon can keep from becoming overdeveloped, or worse, poorly developed. For the most part, up to now, this section of the state has remained mostly farmland. It has not been paved with asphalt as has happened with so many communities. Have you ever landed in Houston’s “George Bush Airport " and then driven the 10-12 miles to the city center? It is mile after mile of semi-abandoned strip malls, with huge pot-holed paved parking lots, abandoned cars, and toxic waste sites in the making. The paving amplifies the summer heat, does nothing to clean the carbon dioxide from the air and is generally ugly and unlivable, almost post-apocalyptic. McCall saw that possible future and dedicated his political life to making sure it did not happen to Oregon. That is why so many people came to Oregon over the last fifty years. That is why those people invested their lives here. We	

	have done well with this plan. But once you lose your quality, whether old growth timber, or farmland, or groundwater, you never get it back. Every acre of land you save now is an acre we leave to our children. It is not wasted by staying the way we found it. Every limit you put on unchecked expansion will pay off with dividends for our children. When McCall pushed through the famous Senate Bill 100 in 1973, it was a prescient clarion call, not just to the nation but to the world that we can keep our QUALITY, that we will not let the profit motive be the only rule that guides PROGRESS. And we think Progress means protecting the land. That we create spaces where people can live with the amenities of civilization, but without the worst of its debilitating effects. I urge you as neighbors and fellow Oregonians to take seriously the concerns of those of us who live near the Aurora Airport. Don't create the conditions that will add to the sprawl that will blight our children's future.	

In Attendance

Agency Representatives

Betty Stansbury, *ODAV*
Heather Peck, *ODAV*
Anthony Beach, *ODAV*
Sarah Lucas, *ODAV*
Seth Thompson, *ODAV*
Benjamin Mello, *FAA*
Kate Key, *FAA*

Staff and Consultants

Matt Rogers, *Century West*
David Miller, *Century West*
Mike Dane, *Century West*
Samantha Peterson, *Century West*
Mark Steele, *Century West*
Brandy Steffen, *JLA Public Involvement*
Ariella Frishberg, *JLA Public Involvement*
Jen Winslow, *JLA Public Involvement*

Aurora State Airport
Airport Master Plan



Public Open House
Online Meeting
March 1st, 2022
5:00pm-7:00pm


Virtual Meeting Tips

You will be muted during the presentation.

Raise your hand virtually (reaction button) or physically.

Press *9 to raise your hand over the phone.

You can use the Q/A area to send questions or comments and see what other attendees are saying.



Meeting Process & Agenda

Time	Topic
5:00-5:10	Introductions
5:10-5:30	Past, Present, and Future Existing Conditions Aviation Activity Forecasts
5:30-7:00	Public Comments https://publicproject.net/AuroraAirport

Introductions

Oregon Department of Aviation (ODAV)

Betty Stansbury

Director

Heather Peck

Planning & Project Manager

Tony Beach

Deputy Director, State Airports Manager

Sarah Lucas

Aviation Planner / AMP Project Contact

John Wilson

Operations Specialist

Seth Thompson

Aviation Planner, State Aviation and Land Use Coordination

Project Team

Agency Oversight & Funding

Airport Owner (Sponsor)

Planning & Engineering

Public Involvement

Cultural Resources

Archaeological Investigations Northwest, Inc.

Environmental Review

AGIS Survey

PAC Members

- Airport Users/Businesses/Organizations
- Airport Neighbors
- Local Municipalities
- Tribal Organizations
- State Agencies
- Local and Regional Non-Profit Groups
- Environmental / Land Use Groups

Organization	Name	Alternate
1000 Friends of Oregon	Roger Kaye	
AABC/TLM Holdings	Ted Millar	
Atlantic Aviation (formerly Lynx Aviation)	Bob Hala	
Aurora Air Traffic Control	Raul Suarez	
Aurora Airport Improvement Association	Bruce Bennett	
Aurora Butteville Barlow Community Planning Organization	Ken Ivey	
Aurora CTE, Inc	Bill Graupp	
Charbonneau Country Club	Steven P. Switzer	
City of Aurora	Brian Asher	
City of Canby	Scott Archer	
City of Wilsonville	Charlotte Lehan	Chris Neamtzu
Clackamas County	Commissioner Tootie Smith	
Columbia Helicopters	Rob Roedts	Bob Buchanan
Confederated Tribes of Siltez Indians	Robert Kentta	
Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde Community of Oregon	Cheryl Pouley	
Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon	Christian Nauer	
Deer Creek Estates HOA	Matt Williams	
Friends of French Prairie	Ben Williams	Wayne Richards
Helicopter Transport Service	Robert Fournier	
Life Flight Network	Ben Clayton	
Marion County	Commissioner Danielle Bethell	
Marion County Planning Department	Austin Barnes	Brandon Reich
Oregon Dept of Aviation	Tony Beach	
Oregon Dept of Aviation Board	Cathryn Stephens	
Oregon Dept of Land Conservation and Development	Matt Crall	Nicole Mardell
Oregon Dept of Transportation	Naomi Zwerdling	
Oregon Farm Bureau	Mary Anne Cooper	
Oregon Office of Emergency Management	Bill Martin	Sarah Puls
Positive Aurora Airport Management	Tony Helbling	
Regional Solutions	Jody Christensen	
Vans Aircraft	Rian Johnson	Greg Hughes
Willamette Aviation	David Waggoner	
Wilsonville Chamber of Commerce	Patrick Donaldson	Kevin O'Malley

Poll Questions



Past, Present, and Future

Aurora State Airport (UAO) History

1943	Airport was established & managed by United States Bureau of Public Roads
1953	Transferred airport to State of Oregon's Highway Division
1973	State of Oregon's Highway Division transferred ownership to Aeronautics Division
1976	First Airport Master Plan was completed
1978	Parallel Taxiway, Rotating Beacon, Runway Reconstruction, Drainage, Lighting, and Apron Projects
1979	Property Acquisition (22 Acres)
1986	Property Acquisition (10 Acres, including tiedown apron)
1988	Airport Master Plan
1995	Runway Extension Project (from 4,104' to 5,004')
2004	Runway Reconstruction Project
2009	Parallel Taxiway Shift Project
2012	Airport Master Plan
2015	Air Traffic Control Tower Constructed
2019	Runway Justification Study



FAA Airport Master Plan Overview

FAA Airport Master Plans have a 20-year planning horizon that is divided into three periods:




- Short-term (0-5 years)
- Intermediate-term (6-10 years)
- Long-term (11-20 years)

FAA has review and approval authority of the following work products:

- Aviation Forecasts
- Runway Object Free Area Modification of Standards Analysis
- Runway Protection Zone Analysis
- Airport Layout Plan

Airport Master Plan Introduction



Existing Conditions

Aurora Airport Property – ODAV Owned




Land Use Summary


The Airport and its adjacent off-airport (known as through-the-fence) development are in unincorporated Marion County. All land use actions require Marion County approval.

The Airport and through-the-fence areas are zoned **Public (blue)**

Other areas nearby are:

- Exclusive Farm Use (green)
- Agriculture/Residential (yellow)
- Residential (beige/tan)





Current - Based Aircraft & Operations

	Based Aircraft	Operations
Total	**281**	**76,028**

Source: Based Aircraft Data - National Based Aircraft Inventory – January 2022
Operations Data - Historic ATCT Data (Adjusted) – Calendar Year 2021

Aviation Activity Forecasts


Forecast - Based Aircraft & Operations

	CAGR	2021	2026	2031	2036	2041
Based Aircraft Forecast - Recommended						
Federal Contract Tower (Oregon) TAF Model	**1.1%**	**281**	**300**	**317**	**333**	**350**
Operations Forecast - Recommended						
TFMSC Historic Trend (20-Year)	**2.3%**	**76,028**	**85,201**	**95,480**	**107,000**	**119,909**

Source: Century West Engineering
CAGR: Compound Annual Growth Rate

Next Steps

- Review PAC comments received
- FAA review of Working Paper 1
- After reviews are complete, a preferred forecast will be confirmed.
- Prepare the Facility Goals and Requirements
- Next PAC meeting & public open house May 3rd (tentatively)



AMP schedule updated February 2022

Please visit the project website for ongoing schedule updates

Poll Questions



Public Comments

Public comments

1. **If you would like to speak, you have 2 minutes:**
   - Please “raise your hand”
   - Press *9 for callers



2. **Type comments/questions in the Q/A area in Zoom**



3. **Website comment form**
4. **Online survey (through March 25)**

All comments will be responded to in the meeting summary.



publicproject.net/AuroraAirport

Thank You

Heather Peck – ODAV

Sarah Lucas – ODAV

Brandy Steffen – JLA Public Involvement

David Miller – Century West Engineering

Project Website: https://publicproject.net/AuroraAirport

Public Open House #2 – June 13, 2024

Aurora State Airport
AIRPORT MASTER PLAN

NOTICE OF A MEETING

Notice is hereby given that the Oregon Department of Aviation (ODAV) will hold a Planning Advisory Committee (PAC) Meeting on June 11 and Open House on June 13.

PAC Meeting #6: Tuesday, June 11

5:00pm – 8:00pm (Zoom Meeting)

Open House: Thursday, June 13

drop by between 4:00pm – 7:00pm

North Marion High School, Commons

20167 Grim Rd NE, Aurora, OR 97002

Light refreshments provided; children welcome

Tendremos interpretación en español en la reunión.

We will have Spanish interpretation at the meeting.

For Additional Information, Please Contact:

Alex Thomas
Planning & Programs Manager
Oregon Department of Aviation
Alex.R.Thomas@odav.oregon.gov

Special accommodations are available upon request (with 48 hours notice)

The PAC meeting will review the preliminary alternative concepts. Airport planning work products and registration links for the virtual PAC Meeting at: https://publicproject.net/AuroraAirport

PUBLIC MEETING

Aurora State Airport

Airport Master Plan

AURORA STATE AIRPORT

PRELIMINARY ALTERNATIVES PUBLIC OUTREACH SUMMARY

Prepared for

Oregon Department of Aviation

Prepared by

JLA Public Involvement

July 18, 2024

CONTENTS

Preliminary Alternatives Public Outreach Summary 1
Overview 2
Open House 3
Advertising 3
Event Format 3
Verbal Comments 4
Survey and Other Feedback 5
Survey Responses 5
Dots at Open House 7
Emails 7
Appendix 1: Advertising 8
Appendix 2: Open House Materials 11
Appendix 3: Presentation and Display Boards 14
Appendix 4: Open House Staff in Attendance 20
Appendix 5: Public Survey Responses 21
Optional Demographic Information 30
Appendix 6: Dots at Open House 31
Appendix 7: Emailed Comments 32
Appendix 8: Scanned Open House Comment Forms 37

Overview

The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) requires airports to periodically update their Airport Master Plan to determine the facility's needs and ensure the airport's safety, efficiency, and sustainability while considering economic, environmental, and social considerations. The Airport Master Plan assesses the airport's current and future needs, while also considering external factors like land use, transportation, and economic development that may impact future plans and operations.

The project is currently in Phase 2: Explore Solutions. During this phase, the technical team and ODAV developed a range of preliminary alternatives that were reviewed and approved as feasible by FAA. These preliminary alternatives were shared with the Planning Advisory Committee (PAC) and community at a public event and through an online survey. Feedback from the PAC and community members will help the technical team and ODAV to refine the alternatives for a final decision on what is included in the Master Plan.

Below is a summary of the outreach completed during this phase, as well as the comments collected. The full set of comments are included in the Appendices.

Open House

The second Open House for the Aurora Airport Master Plan project was held in-person on June 13, 2024 at North Marion High School in Aurora, Oregon. The event ran from 4:00 pm – 7:00 pm, and approximately 120 people participated, including several PAC members (although not every attendee signed in).



Advertising

The event was advertised electronically to PAC members through email to distribute to the organizations, community groups, and government agencies that they represent, as well as through ODAV's email list serve. Postcards were mailed to 276 airport users, neighbors, and stakeholders located in Aurora, Wilsonville, Canby, Portland and other surrounding communities, and three newspaper articles were published in June 2024 in the Wilsonville Spokesman which advertised/discussed the event. Additionally, the City of Wilsonville mailed their own postcards advertising the meeting. See Appendix 1 for full information.

Event Format

The event provided an opportunity to collect verbal and written comments from the community, as well as share the preliminary alternatives and answer questions. Attendees dropped in throughout the three-hour event.



Aurora State Airport
AIRPORT MASTER PLAN

OREGON DEPARTMENT OF AVIATION

NOTICE OF A MEETING

Notice is hereby given that the Oregon Department of Aviation (ODAV) will hold a Planning Advisory Committee (PAC) Meeting on June 11 and Open House on June 13.

PAC Meeting #6: Tuesday, June 11
5:00pm – 8:00pm (Zoom Meeting)

Open House: Thursday, June 13
drop by between 4:00pm – 7:00pm
North Marion High School, Commons
20167 Grim Rd NE, Aurora, OR 97002
Light refreshments provided; children welcome
Tendremos interpretación en español en la reunión.
We will have Spanish interpretation at the meeting.

For Additional Information, Please Contact:
Alex Thomas
Planning & Programs Manager
Oregon Department of Aviation
Alex.R.Thomas@odav.oregon.gov

Special accommodations are available upon request (with 48 hours notice)

The PAC meeting will review the preliminary alternative concepts. Airport planning work products and registration links for the virtual PAC Meeting at: https://publicproject.net/AuroraAirport

The event was organized as follows:

- Upon arrival, staff at the welcome table informed attendees of the event logistics, asked them to sign-in, and provided a handout with the preliminary alternatives and a printed comment form with space to record comments/questions. See Appendix 2 for comment form and handout.
    - Staff also explained other ways to submit comments, including the online survey, email (Tony Beach, ODAV left a stack of business cards at the table), verbal comments to any staff that were present, on flipcharts stationed around the room, or through the project website.
- A presentation about the project played in a loop near the welcome table for attendees to view while they waited. See Appendix 3 for displays.
- After a small group of attendees had gathered, they were guided through a series of informational displays to allow participants to hear the information and ask specific, detailed questions about the project and preliminary alternatives.

- There were three stations which covered: Background and Context; Landside Alternatives; and Airside Alternatives. See Appendix 3 for displays.
    - Each station had two to four associated display boards that visually showed information and graphics about the project.
    - Staff from ODAV and Century West were stationed at the display boards to explain the project, answer questions, and address concerns. See Appendix 4 for staff list.
- Attendees were encouraged to complete a printed comment form or submit their comments through the online survey using the two electronic tablets at the comment table or with the QR code posted around the room; the same questions were asked in these formats. Snacks were also provided in this area. See Appendices 5-8 for comments collected.



Approximately 75 attendees arrived within thirty minutes of the event opening. Because of this, some participants stated that they felt rushed through the stations. Based on this feedback, staff shifted the format to accommodate more groups of attendees.

The project team ran out of printed surveys at the end of the open house (100 were printed/distributed at the event and 33 were submitted back to the project team at the event and 10 were returned by mail), but staff assisted several attendees in taking the survey using the electronic tablets that were provided. A few attendees didn't feel comfortable taking the electronic survey, so staff set up a dot exercise to collect comments; flip charts were also positioned around the room for staff to write down comments from attendees throughout the event. See Appendices 5-8 for comments collected.

Verbal Comments

Overall, most respondents were not in favor of key elements of the preliminary alternatives. A minority of participants were airport users, airport tenants, or local businesses who were supportive of the project.

- **Property Acquisition:** The majority of respondents were strongly against acquiring property for additional hangars and parking, with only a small number strongly supportive, somewhat supportive or undecided.
- **Runway Shifting:** Most respondents felt that neither shifting the runway east nor west would work well. Some preferred shifting the runway east, shifting Hubbard Highway west, or were unsure or needed more information.

- **Runway Extension:** A significant majority were strongly against extending the runway up to 497 feet, while a smaller group were strongly supportive.
- **Runway Extension Direction:** Most respondents felt that neither extending the runway north nor south would work well. While some preferred extending it south or north.

Several attendees were angry about the project and many expressed frustrations that the FAA had ruled out several alternatives[1]. Others were frustrated that the event ran out of printed surveys and some did not feel that they were given enough time to fill out the survey during the event.

Survey and Other Feedback

The public survey was open from June 12 through June 25, 2024 through the following venues:


- **Total survey responses:** 75 (Appendix 5)
    - **Paper surveys during the open house:** 33 (Appendix 8)
    - **Mailed surveys:** 10 (Appendix 8)
    - **Electronic survey responses:** 32
- **Dots on a large easel pad during the open house:** 10 (Appendix 6)
- **Emails:** 16 (Appendix 7)

This survey was conducted with self-selected members of the community and does not qualify as a scientifically valid survey that is representative of the community. Additionally, there were no restrictions on the submission of commenting in multiple ways (printed surveys, online surveys, or emailed comments).

Survey Responses

Not all questions were answered, so there is not a consistent number of responses for each question.

The majority of respondents (64) do not use the airport, while eleven people stated that they did.



The majority of respondents (47) were strongly unsupportive of property acquisition for additional hangars and parking. Ten responses were strongly supportive of property acquisition for this purpose, nine were somewhat supportive, four felt unsure or had no opinion, and three were somewhat supportive.


Most respondents (35) did not feel that either option would work well for realigning the Hubbard Highway to the west or the runway to the east. Sixteen felt that shifting the runway to the east was their preference, and fifteen felt that shifting Hubbard Highway to the west was a better solution. Eight respondents were unsure or felt they needed more information.

[1] A total of eight alternatives were posted to the project website on June 11, 2024. After additional consideration, the FAA determined that three alternatives were not feasible because they did not adequately address compliance with standards for current operations at the airport. These non-feasible alternatives were not presented at the June 13, 2024 event but remained posted to the website with an explanation of the change.

Most respondents (50) felt strongly unsupportive of extending the runway up to 497 feet. Fifteen respondents were strongly supportive of extending the runway to meet safety requirements. Four people felt both somewhat supportive and somewhat unsupportive, and one person was unsure or had no opinion.

Most respondents (42) felt that neither option for a runway extension (to the north or south) would work well. Twenty felt that extending the runway south was the best option while six felt north was best, and one was unsure or needed more information.

The high-level themes from the open-ended comments (Appendix 5 and Appendix 8) include:



Operational

- Extend the Aurora Control Tower operational hours longer through the night or 24 hours a day for better monitoring.
- Implement IFR-only approaches and departures.

Infrastructure and Expansion Concerns

- No additional hangar space is needed.
- Mixed opinions, but most were not in favor of extending the existing runway by approximately 500 feet or adding a new primary East/West runway.
    - Questions and concerns about the necessity and impact of expanding the runway.
    - Concerns about larger aircraft usage and increased traffic.
- Consideration of utilizing underused airports like McMinnville and Salem before expanding Aurora.

Noise Abatement and Environmental Impact

- Strong emphasis on enforcing current noise abatement rules on all departures and approaches.
    - Create robust noise abatement district. Use Orange County/John Wayne Airport as an example if needed.
- Concerns about increased noise levels affecting residential areas, especially Charbonneau and Wilsonville.
- Environmental considerations and concerns, including impacts on local wildlife and pollution.

Community and Economic Impact

- Suggestion of equalizing airport fees across multiple airports in the region.
- Addressing how expansion impacts the surrounding communities, public health, and local wildlife.
- Mixed community responses with some supporting expansion for economic growth and others opposing due to noise and traffic concerns.
- Importance of public engagement and clear communication regarding the project.

Safety and Regulation Compliance

- Concerns about the necessity of the runway extension.
- Addressing compliance with FAA regulations and monitoring pilot adherence to noise abatement and flight path guidelines.
- Concerns about the airport's impact on local traffic and infrastructure and how that would negatively affect the surrounding community.
- Ensuring the safety of current operations with potential runway extensions for better aircraft performance.

Public Involvement and Transparency

- Calls for extending the public comment period.
- Need for clear information on project timelines, costs, and the overall impact on local communities.
- Transparency in decision-making processes and consideration of community feedback in planning and implementation.

Dots at Open House

- Overall, nine people felt very unsupportive of ODAV buying property when at capacity for additional hangars and aircraft parking, and one person was strongly supportive.
- Nine people also felt that neither runway option would work well for Aurora Airport, with one person preferring shifting Hubbard Highway to the west.
- Nine were strongly unsupportive of extending the runway up to 497 feet to meet safety regulations, with one person strongly supportive of the extension.
- Nine also felt that neither runway extension option would work, with one person showing that they were unsure.

Emails

The majority of emails were unsupportive of changes to the airport or the preliminary alternatives.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1: ADVERTISING

The project team and ODAV announced the open house and survey in the following ways.

Date	Method	Content
05/10/24	Postcard mailed to 276 airport neighbors, users, and members of adjacent communities	Notice is hereby given that the Oregon Department of Aviation (ODAV) will hold an in-person Public Open House. **When**: June 13, 2024; drop in from 4 – 7 p.m. **Where**: In person event; North Marion High School, Commons (20167 Grim Rd NE, Aurora, OR 97002) This meeting will provide an opportunity for the community, neighbors, and interested parties to learn about the Airport Master Plan preliminary alternatives. For copies of the airport planning work documents, please visit: https://publicproject.net/AuroraAirport **Accessible Meeting Information** Special accommodations are available upon advanced request. Please contact Alex Thomas at least 48 hours prior to the event to discuss specific needs. For airport questions or project information, please contact Alex Thomas, ODAV Aviation Planner, through the following means: **Email**: Alex.R.THOMAS@odav.oregon.gov
05/09/24	Planning Advisory Committee (PAC) email	As representatives on the PAC, we encourage you to share this information with your members or wider community. We would like to have as many people as possible there to discuss the preliminary alternatives for the Aurora State Airport. We hope to see you there. Thursday, June 13, 2024 Drop by between 4:00-7:00 pm North Marion High School, Commons (20167 Grim Rd NE, Aurora, OR 97002) Light refreshments provided; children welcome Tendremos interpretación en español en la reunión. We will have Spanish interpretation at the meeting. This meeting will provide an opportunity for the neighbors, PAC members, and other interested community members to learn about the Airport Master Plan project. This meeting will present the preliminary alternatives for the Aurora State Airport Master Plan. All written and verbal comments collected during the open house will be included in the event Summary.
06/07/24	PAC email	Hello PAC members – We hope that you will share this with your community or group that you represent. We've also included a poster and postcard that you can share. Please reach out if you have any questions. We'd also greatly appreciate you sharing on any social media platforms that you have. Thank you! --- The Aurora State Airport Master Plan will host an open house to show preliminary design alternatives and hear feedback on what the future Aurora State Airport could look like in the future. This Open House will be held in

		person on Thursday, June 13, 2024, between 4:00-7:00 pm in the Commons of North Marion High School, (20167 Grim Rd NE, Aurora, OR 97002) Please share this information with your friends and neighbors! We would like to talk with as many people as possible and hear community feedback on the preliminary alternatives. If you can't make the event, don't worry! We'll post all the information on the website and have an online survey for you to provide your thoughts on the draft alternatives (open from June 11-21): https://publicproject.net/AuroraAirport
05/13/24	ODAV list serve email sent to 1,910 recipients (with an 8% *bounce rate*, for a total of 1,762 delivered)	NOTICE OF AN OPEN HOUSE FOR THE AURORA STATE AIRPORT Airport Master Plan Project We want to announce and invite you to our next public open house, which will be held in-person. We hope to see you there. Thursday, June 13, 2024 Drop by between 4:00-7:00 pm North Marion High School, Commons (20167 Grim Rd NE, Aurora, OR 97002) Light refreshments will be provided; children are welcome. Tendremos interpretación en español en la reunión. We will have Spanish interpretation at the meeting. This open house provides an opportunity for the neighbors, PAC members, and other interested community members to learn about the project, including the preliminary alternatives for the Aurora State Airport Master Plan. All written and verbal comments collected during the open house will be included in the event Summary. Thank you again for your continued interest in, and participation with, the Aurora State Airport Master Plan project.
	Project Website	05/07/24; event details posted on "meetings" page 05/28/24; updated with postcard on "meetings" page 06/7/24; updated with handout on "meetings" page 06/10/24; updated with survey link on "home" page and on "meetings" page

The following news articles were published before and after the event which referenced the public event.

Date	Media Outlet	Author	Headline/Sub-Header
03/20/24	Wilsonville Spokesman	Krista Kroiss	Public meetings for the Aurora Airport master plan are back The first Planning Advisory Committee meeting in over a year was held recently and highlighted the airport's aviation forecast.

06/07/24	Wilsonville Spokesman	Krista Kroiss	Oregon Department of Aviation to hold two Aurora Airport meetings Next week, the Oregon Department of Aviation will hold an advisory committee meeting and open house for the Aurora State Airport Master Plan.
06/13/24	Wilsonville Spokesman	Krista Kroiss	What could adjustments to the Aurora State Airport look like? Various preliminary alternatives for the airport were presented to an advisory committee for its next 20 year master plan.
06/14/24	Wilsonville Spokesman	Krista Kroiss	What are the concerns over the proposed Aurora Airport adjustments? At an open house, community members learned and expressed concerns about preliminary options for the Aurora State Airport

APPENDIX 2: OPEN HOUSE MATERIALS

Aurora Airport Master Plan – Public Feedback Survey

Development Alternatives Review

1. Do you use the Aurora State Airport? (circle one)

- Yes
- No

2. If yes, please explain how you use the Aurora State Airport:

_____

Do you agree or disagree with these statements? (Circle/check one)

3. How supportive are you of the Oregon Department of Aviation (ODAV) buying property to handle hangars or aircraft parking if the existing airport property is at capacity?

- Strongly support property acquisition for future hangars and aircraft parking needs.
- Somewhat supportive
- Unsure/No opinion
- Somewhat unsupportive
- Strongly unsupportive of property acquisition for additional hangars and parking.

4. There will be tradeoffs for any decision that ODAV makes in order to meet current Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) standards. One of the tradeoffs with the alternatives includes either realigning the Hubbard Highway to the west or shifting the runway to the east, which impacts the use of hangars, loss of apron space, and relocates the Air Traffic Control Tower (ATCT). If you had to choose between these two options, which do you feel would work best for the Aurora State Airport?

- Shifting Hubbard to the west
- Shifting the runway to the east
- Unsure/Need more information
- Do not think that either option would work well

5. One of the other things that ODAV needs to consider with the Airport Master Plan is meeting the current safety regulations (set by the FAA). Currently the Aurora Airport runway doesn't meet the justified runway length. How supportive are you of extending the runway up to 497 feet to meet the justified runway length?

- Strong Supportive of extending the runway to meet safety requirements
- Somewhat supportive
- Unsure/No opinion
- Somewhat unsupportive
- Strongly unsupportive of extending the runway to meet safety requirements

More on back →

Return this survey during the event or mail back to JLA / Attention Aurora Airport Master Plan / 123 NE 3rd Ave #210, Portland, OR 97232 before June 24, 2024.

6. As mentioned above, there are tradeoffs with the different alternatives. If you support a runway extension, would you prefer it be extended it to the north or south?

- North
- South
- Unsure/need more information
- Do not think that either option would work well

7. Please provide any additional feedback to help ODAV as they review the preliminary alternatives:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Optional demographic questions (not tied to survey responses)

8. What is your race/ethnicity? (check all that apply)

- African American/Black
- American Indian or Alaska Native
- Asian/Asian American
- Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish
- Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
- White
- Other (please explain):

_____


9. What is your zip code? _____

11. Would you like to join our email mailing list to get updates on this project? Yes or No

Name: _____ Phone: _____

Email: _____

Return this survey during the event or mail back to JLA / Attention Aurora Airport Master Plan / 123 NE 3rd Ave #210, Portland, OR 97232 before June 24, 2024.



Comments:

Primary Components:

- Commercial development with ADG II taxilane access, large FBO hangar, and vehicle access and parking.
- The apron adjacent to the ATCT is reconfigured to include two drive through large aircraft parking positions on the south end of the apron.
  - » Approximately three feet of the south edge of the taxilane object free area (TLOFA) for the drive through parking encroaches upon private property to the south. Coordination with adjacent property owner and/or an easement may be necessary for development .
- Remaining ATCT apron is reconfigured to provide small aircraft tiedown parking with ADG I wingtip spacing.
- Realigned taxilane west of current Aurora Flight School facility to allow additional small aircraft tiedown parking.
- Proposed apron reconfiguration to meet FAA standards results in a net decrease of five tiedowns compared to the current aircraft parking configuration.
- Two large helicopter (35-foot rotor) parking positions and one small helicopter (25-foot rotor) parking positions are added.
- Storage building east of Aurora Flight School is removed to accommodate additional hangars on north side of existing ADG I hangar taxilane.
- One multi-unit T-hangar is replaced with small condo-style box hangars.
- Reconfigured fence and vehicle access road (outside the fence access provided to Aurora Flight School facility).
- Additional hangars infill is proposed for all available lots on the Airport.
- Approximately 145,000 square feet of additional hangar space is proposed.
  - » Includes removal of 15,000 square feet of existing space and construction of 160,000 square feet of new space.
- Storm water retention area is identified east of ATCT apron.

Aurora State Airport


AIRPORT MASTER PLAN PRELIMINARY ALTERNATIVES

The preliminary alternatives were developed to facilitate discussions surrounding the "big questions" that will guide the Oregon Department of Aviation (ODAV) on how best to meet the facility requirements for Aurora State Airport in the 20-year planning period.

https://publicproject.net/auroraairport#



Airside Alternative 1 — Maintain C-II, Realign Hubbard Highway and Extend Runway North



Comments:


Primary Components:
- Realigns Hubbard Highway outside of Runway Object Free Area (ROFA). As proposed, the highway is shifted approximately 30 to 35 feet west, within existing ODOT-owned highway right-of-way.
  - Note: The roadway alignment depicted is for illustration only. Further study and coordination with ODOT will be required to identify final roadway alignment needed to clear/control ROFA.
- Maintains 100 feet runway width (C-II standard).
- Extends runway 497 feet to the north resulting in a total length of 5,500 feet.
- Extends parallel taxiway (Taxiway A) to the north with runway.
- Property acquisition is required to accommodate east sections of ROFA (northeast and southeast).
- Keil Road is realigned to the outside of the ROFA.
- Reconfigure/relocate existing TTF access taxiway connection at current north end of Taxiway A to remove direct runway access at that location.
  - Realigned TTF access to be coordinated with adjacent property owner.
- Install painted islands between Taxiway A and the adjacent southern TTF properties to address direct runway access and V/PD issues.

Issues Addressed by Alternative:
- Extends runway to justified length of 5,500 feet.
- Clears ROFA of existing public roads.
- Airport control of ROFA achieved through property acquisition.
- Addresses direct runway access and V/PD issues through pavement removal and painted islands.

Other Issues to be Addressed:
- Septic drainfield remains in south end of RSA.
  - Further study is required to relocate drainfield out of RSA.
- Wind cone and weather equipment (ASOS) remain in RSA and ROFA.
  - Further study is required to identify new locations for equipment.
- Existing incompatible land uses (Hubbard Highway, Keil Road, Boones Ferry Road and residential areas) remain in RPZs.

New Issues:
- New incompatible land use (Arndt Road) in Runway 17 RPZ.
- Septic drainfield located in north end of extended RSA.
  - Further study is required to relocate drainfield out of future RSA.


Landside Alternative 1B — Commercial Hangar and FBO Development with Reconfigured Flight School Apron and Vehicle Service Road



Comments:

Primary Components:
- Identical to Landside Alternative 1A with the following exceptions:
  - A north/south vehicle service road (VSR) is proposed to provide dedicated vehicle access from the north boundary of the landside area to the south boundary of the landside area.
  - The proposed five tiedowns west of Aurora Flight School, the three proposed helicopter parking positions, and six proposed tiedowns on the ATCT apron are omitted to create space for VSR.
  - Two additional tiedowns are proposed west of the large FBO hangar, on the west side of the VSR.
  - This configuration results in a net decrease of 13 tiedowns compared to the existing aircraft parking configuration.

Airside Alternative 3 — Maintain C-II, Shift Runway East, and Extend Runway North



Comments:


Primary Components:
- Shifts runway 84 feet east to bring west edge of ROFA onto Airport property.
- All runway and parallel taxiway surfaces (ROFA, RSA, OFZ, RPZ, etc.) are shifted east based on the shifted runway centerline location.
- ATCT and other aviation use facilities (fuel, helicopter parking, etc.) to be relocated outside of ROFA.
  - Further study is required to determine new locations.
- Maintains 100-foot runway width (C-II standard).
- Extends runway 497 feet to the north resulting in a total length of 5,500 feet.
- Extends parallel taxiway (Taxiway A) to the north with runway.
- All property within the shifted/extended ROFA not owned by the Airport to be acquired.
- Keil Road is realigned to the outside of the ROFA.
- Reconfigure/relocate existing TTF access taxiway connection at current north end of Taxiway A to remove direct runway access at that location.
  - Realigned TTF access to be coordinated with adjacent property owner.
- Install painted islands between shifted Taxiway A and the adjacent southern TTF properties, where feasible to address direct runway access and V/PD issues.

Issues Addressed by Alternative:
- Extends runway to justified length of 5,500 feet.
- Clears ROFA of existing public roads.
- Airport control of ROFA achieved through property acquisition.
- Direct runway access and V/PD issues to be addressed in redesign of Taxiway A.
- Wind cone and ASOS are no longer in ROFA or RSA.

Other Issues to be Addressed:
- Septic drainfield remains in south end of RSA.
  - Further study required to relocate drainfield out of RSA.
- Existing incompatible land uses (Hubbard Highway, Keil Road, Boones Ferry Road and residential areas) remain in RPZs; some mitigated by runway shift.

New Issues:
- ATCT must be relocated/reconstructed outside of ROFA.
- Atlantic Aviation fuel equipment to be relocated outside of ROFA.
- ROFA directly abuts hangar doors for south TTF properties.
- The septic drainfield is located in the north end of (extended) RSA.
  - Further study required to relocate drainfield out of future RSA.
- New incompatible land use (Arndt Road) in Runway 17 RPZ.
- Requires relocation/replacement or decommissioning of localizer navigational aid.

Airside Alternative 4 — Maintain C-II, Shift Runway East, and Extend Runway South



Comments:


Primary Components:
- Shift runway 84 feet east to bring west edge of ROFA onto Airport property.
- Extends runway 497 feet to the south resulting in a total length of 5,500 feet.
- Maintains 100-foot runway width (C-II standard).
- Extends parallel taxiway (Taxiway A) to the south with runway.
- All runway and parallel taxiway surfaces (ROFA, RSA, OFZ, RPZ, etc.) are shifted east with shifted runway centerline.
- ATCT and other aviation use facilities (fuel, helicopter parking, etc.) to be relocated outside of ROFA.
  - Further study is required to determine new locations.
- All property within the shifted/extended ROFA not owned by the Airport to be acquired.
- Keil Road is realigned to the outside of the existing and future ROFA.
- Reconfigure/relocate existing TTF access taxiway connection at current north end of Taxiway A to remove direct runway access at that location.
  - Realigned TTF access to be coordinated with adjacent property owner.
- Install painted islands between shifted Taxiway A and the adjacent southern TTF properties, where feasible to address direct runway access and V/PD issues.

Issues Addressed by Alternative:
- Extends runway to justified length of 5,500 feet.
- Clears ROFA of existing public roads.
- Airport control of ROFA achieved through property acquisition.
- Direct runway access and V/PD issues to be addressed in redesign of Taxiway A.
- Wind cone and ASOS are no longer in ROFA or RSA.

Other Issues to be Addressed:
- Septic drainfield remains in south end of RSA.
  - Further study required to relocate drainfield out of RSA.
- Existing incompatible land uses (Hubbard Highway, Keil Road, Boones Ferry Road and residential areas) remain in RPZs; some mitigated by runway shift.

New Issues:
- ATCT must be relocated/reconstructed outside of ROFA.
- Atlantic Aviation fuel equipment to be relocated outside of ROFA.
- ROFA directly abuts hangar doors for south TTF properties.
- Additional incompatible land uses (residential properties, and realigned Keil Road) enter Runway 35 RPZ.
- Requires relocation/replacement or decommissioning of localizer navigational aid (located at Runway 35 end).

Landside Alternative 1A — Commercial Hangar and FBO Development with Reconfigured Flight School Apron




Comments:

Primary Components:

- Commercial hangar development with ADG II taxilane access, large FBO hangar, vehicle access and parking.
- The existing apron south of proposed FBO hangar proposed as tenant lease in conjunction with main ADG II access taxilane shift.
- Reconfigured small airplane tiedown apron adjacent to ATCT to provide appropriate wingtip and meet ADG I taxilane object free area (TOFA) clearances.
- Proposed apron reconfiguration to meet FAA standards results in a net decrease of four small airplane tiedowns and one large aircraft drive through parking position compared to the current aircraft parking configuration.
- Two large helicopter (35-foot rotor) parking positions and one small helicopter (25-foot rotor) parking positions are added.
- Realigned taxilane west of current Aurora Flight School facility to accommodate five additional small airplane tiedowns.
- New apron at current flight school area.
- Reconfigured fence and vehicle access road (outside the fence access provided to Aurora Flight School facility).
- Additional hangar infill is proposed for all available lots on the Airport.
- Approximately 154,000 square feet of additional hangar space, as depicted.
- Storm water retention area is identified east of ATCT apron.

Airside Alternative 2 — Maintain C-II, Realign Hubbard Highway and Extend Runway South



Comments:

Primary Components:

- Realigns Hubbard Highway outside of Runway Object Free Area (ROFA). As proposed, the highway is shifted approximately 30 to 35 feet west, within existing ODOT-owned highway right-of-way.
  - Note: The roadway alignment depicted is for illustration only. Further study and coordination with ODOT will be required to identify the final roadway alignment needed to clear/control ROFA.
- Maintains 100-foot runway width (C-II standard).
- Extends runway 497 feet to the south resulting in a total length of 5,500 feet.
- Extends parallel taxiway (Taxiway A) to the south with runway.
- Property acquisition is required to accommodate east sections of ROFA (northeast and southeast).
- Keil Road is realigned to the outside of the existing and future ROFA.
- Reconfigure/relocate existing TTF access taxiway connection at current north end of Taxiway A to remove direct runway access at that location.
  - Realigned TTF access to be coordinated with adjacent property owner.
- Install painted islands between Taxiway A and the adjacent southern TTF properties to address direct runway access and V/PD issues.

Issues Addressed by Alternative:

- Extends runway to justified length of 5,500 feet.
- Clears ROFA of existing public roads.
- Airport control of ROFA achieved through property acquisition.
- Addresses direct runway access and V/PD issues through pavement removal and painted islands.

Other Issues to be Addressed:

- Septic drainfield remains in south end of RSA.
  - Further study is required to relocate drainfield out of RSA.
- Wind cone and weather equipment (ASOS) remain in RSA and ROFA.
  - Further study is required to identify new locations for equipment.
- Existing incompatible land uses (Hubbard Highway, Keil Road, Boones Ferry Road and residential areas) remain in RPZs.

New Issues:

- Additional incompatible land uses (residential properties, and realigned Keil Road) enter Runway 35 RPZ.
- Requires relocation/replacement or decommissioning of localizer navigational aid (located at Runway 35 end).

APPENDIX 3: PRESENTATION AND DISPLAY BOARDS

Hello
&WELCOME

Aurora State Airport
Airport Master Plan Project Open House





https://publicproject.net/auroraairport#

What is an
Airport Master Plan?

The Airport Master Plan (AMP) is required by the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) to maintain a safe and efficient airport that is economically, environmentally, and socially sustainable. The Airport Master Plan will also:

- Define the current, short-term and long-term needs of the Airport through a comprehensive evaluation of facilities, conditions and FAA airport planning and design standards.
- Look at what is happening around the airport that could affect the future plans, development and operation of the airport such as land use, transportation, environmental, economic development, etc.

Aurora State Airport (ODAV Property)



What exactly is (and isn't) an AMP?


The AMP is a plan for the future of the airport and it:

- Is developed or updated every 10-20 years (on average)
- Is used to review existing airport conditions and facilities
- Includes forecasts that determine future aviation and non-aviation needs
- Provides a "road map" for development while remaining adaptable to changing aviation industry conditions and requirements
- Guides airport improvements that are economically, environmentally, and socially sustainable
- Includes a planning-level budget for facility improvements
- Results in a visual representation (ALP) of proposed facility improvements

An Airport Master Plan is NOT a:

- Design/construction project
- Guarantee of a proposed project
- Environmental analysis
- County land use plan/action
- County transportation system plan (TSP)
- Mandated expansion of the Airport


Project Schedule



Preliminary Alternatives

AIRSIDE ALTERNATIVE 1

Maintain C-II, Realign Hubbard Highway and Extend Runway North



Issues Addressed by Alternative:

- Extends runway to justified length of 5,500 feet.
- Clears ROFA of existing public roads.
- Airport control of ROFA achieved through property acquisition.
- Addresses direct runway access and V/PD issues through pavement removal and painted islands.

Other Issues to be Addressed:


- Septic drainfield remains in south end of RSA.
  - Further study is required to relocate drainfield out of RSA.
- Wind cone and weather equipment (ASOS) remain in RSA and ROFA.
  - Further study is required to identify new locations for equipment.
- Existing incompatible land uses (Hubbard Highway, Keil Road, Boones Ferry Road and residential areas) remain in RPZs.

New Issues:

- New incompatible land use (Arndt Road) in Runway 17 RPZ.
- Septic drainfield located in north end of extended RSA.
  - Further study is required to relocate drainfield out of future RSA.

AIRSIDE ALTERNATIVE 2

Maintain C-II, Realign Hubbard Highway and Extend Runway South



Issues Addressed by Alternative:

- Extends runway to justified length of 5,500 feet.
- Clears ROFA of existing public roads.
- Airport control of ROFA achieved through property acquisition.
- Addresses direct runway access and V/PD issues through pavement removal and painted islands.

Other Issues to be Addressed:


- Septic drainfield remains in south end of RSA.
  - Further study is required to relocate drainfield out of RSA.
- Wind cone and weather equipment (ASOS) remain in RSA and ROFA.
  - Further study is required to identify new locations for equipment.
- Existing incompatible land uses (Hubbard Highway, Keil Road, Boones Ferry Road and residential areas) remain in RPZs.

New Issues:

- Additional incompatible land uses (residential properties, and realigned Keil Road) enter Runway 35 RPZ.
- Requires relocation/replacement or decommissioning of localizer navigational aid (located at Runway 35 end).

AIRSIDE ALTERNATIVE 4

Maintain C-II, Shift Runway East, and Extend Runway South



Issues Addressed by Alternative:

- Extends runway to justified length of 5,500 feet.
- Clears ROFA of existing public roads.
- Airport control of ROFA achieved through property acquisition.
- Direct runway access and V/PD issues to be addressed in redesign of Taxiway A.
- Wind cone and ASOS are no longer in ROFA or RSA.

Other Issues to be Addressed:


- Septic drainfield remains in south end of RSA.
  - Further study required to relocate drainfield out of RSA.
- Existing incompatible land uses (Hubbard Highway, Keil Road, Boones Ferry Road and residential areas) remain in RPZs; some mitigated by runway shift.

New Issues:

- ATCT must be relocated/reconstructed outside of ROFA.
- Atlantic Aviation fuel equipment to be relocated outside of ROFA.
- ROFA directly abuts hangar doors for south TTF properties.
- Additional incompatible land uses (residential properties, and realigned Keil Road) enter Runway 35 RPZ.
- Requires relocation/replacement or decommissioning of localizer navigational aid (located at Runway 35 end).

AIRSIDE ALTERNATIVE 3

Maintain C-II, Shift Runway East, and Extend Runway North



Issues Addressed by Alternative:

- Extends runway to justified length of 5,500 feet.
- Clears ROFA of existing public roads.
- Airport control of ROFA achieved through property acquisition.
- Direct runway access and V/PD issues to be addressed in redesign of Taxiway A.
- Wind cone and ASOS are no longer in ROFA or RSA.

Other Issues to be Addressed:


- Septic drainfield remains in south end of RSA.
  - Further study required to relocate drainfield out of RSA.
- Existing incompatible land uses (Hubbard Highway, Keil Road, Boones Ferry Road and residential areas) remain in RPZs; some mitigated by runway shift.

New Issues:

- ATCT must be relocated/reconstructed outside of ROFA.
- Atlantic Aviation fuel equipment to be relocated outside of ROFA.
- ROFA directly abuts hangar doors for south TTF properties.
- The septic drainfield is located in the north end of (extended) RSA.
  - Further study required to relocate drainfield out of future RSA.
- New incompatible land use (Arndt Road) in Runway 17 RPZ.
- Requires relocation/replacement or decommissioning of localizer navigational aid.

LANDSIDE ALTERNATIVE 1A

Commercial Hangar and FBO Development with Reconfigured Flight School Apron



Primary Components:

- Commercial hangar development with ADG II taxilane access, large FBO hangar, vehicle access and parking.
- The existing apron south of proposed FBO hangar proposed as tenant lease in conjunction with main ADG II access taxilane shift.
- Reconfigured small airplane tiedown apron adjacent to ATCT to provide appropriate wingtip and meet ADG I taxilane object free area (TOFA) clearances.
- Proposed apron reconfiguration to meet FAA standards results in a net decrease of four small airplane tiedowns and one large aircraft drive through parking position compared to the current aircraft parking configuration.
- Two large helicopter (35-foot rotor) parking positions and one small helicopter (25-foot rotor) parking positions are added.
- Realigned taxilane west of current Aurora Flight School facility to accommodate five additional small airplane tiedowns.
- New apron at current flight school area.
- Reconfigured fence and vehicle access road (outside the fence access provided to Aurora Flight School facility).
- Additional hangar infill is proposed for all available lots on the Airport.
- Approximately 154,000 square feet of additional hangar space, as depicted.
- Storm water retention area is identified east of ATCT apron.

LANDSIDE ALTERNATIVE 1B

Commercial Hangar and FBO Development with Reconfigured Flight School Apron and Vehicle Service Road




Primary Components:

- Identical to Landside Alternative 1A with the following exceptions:
  - A north/south vehicle service road (VSR) is proposed to provide dedicated vehicle access from the north boundary of the landside area to the south boundary of the landside area.
  - The proposed five tiedowns west of Aurora Flight School, the three proposed helicopter parking positions, and six proposed tiedowns on the ATCT apron are omitted to create space for VSR.
  - Two additional tiedowns are proposed west of the large FBO hangar, on the west side of the VSR.
  - This configuration results in a net decrease of 13 tiedowns compared to the existing aircraft parking configuration.

LANDSIDE ALTERNATIVE 2

Commercial Hangar and FBO Development with Reconfigured Flight School Apron and Vehicle Service Road



Primary Components:

- Commercial development with ADG II taxilane access, large FBO hangar, and vehicle access and parking.
- The apron adjacent to the ATCT is reconfigured to include two drive through large aircraft parking positions on the south end of the apron.
  - Approximately three feet of the south edge of the taxilane object free area (TLOFA) for the drive through parking encroaches upon private property to the south. Coordination with adjacent property owner and/or an easement may be necessary for development.
- Remaining ATCT apron is reconfigured to provide small aircraft tiedown parking with ADG I wingtip spacing.
- Realigned taxilane west of current Aurora Flight School facility to allow additional small aircraft tiedown parking.
- Proposed apron reconfiguration to meet FAA standards results in a net decrease of five tiedowns compared to the current aircraft parking configuration.
- Two large helicopter (35-foot rotor) parking positions and one small helicopter (25-foot rotor) parking positions are added.
- Storage building east of Aurora Flight School is removed to accommodate additional hangars on north side of existing ADG I hangar taxilane.
- One multi-unit T-hangar is replaced with small condo-style box hangars.
- Reconfigured fence and vehicle access road (outside the fence access provided to Aurora Flight School facility).
- Additional hangars infill is proposed for all available lots on the Airport.
- Approximately 145,000 square feet of additional hangar space is proposed.
  - Includes removal of 15,000 square feet of existing space and construction of 160,000 square feet of new space.
- Storm water retention area is identified east of ATCT apron.

Thank You

PLEASE TAKE A MOMENT AND SUBMIT A PUBLIC FEEDBACK FORM BY JUNE 23,2024

Project Website: https://publicproject.net/AuroraAirport

APPENDIX 4: OPEN HOUSE STAFF IN ATTENDANCE

Agency Representatives
Anthony Beach*, ODAV*
Brandon Pike*, ODAV*
Alex Thomas, *ODAV*
Tim House, *FAA*


Staff and Consultants
Matt Rogers, *Century West*
David Miller, *Century West*
Samantha Peterson, *Century West*
James Kirby*, Century West*
Mark Steele, *Century West*
Brandy Steffen*, JLA Public Involvement*
Stacy Zurcher*, JLA Public Involvement*
Tuyen Ta, *JLA Public Involvement*
Ashley Balsom, *JLA Public Involvement*

APPENDIX 5: PUBLIC SURVEY RESPONSES

The following data includes all surveys submitted electronically, through paper surveys at the open house, or returned by mail through June 23, 2024.

1. Do you use the Aurora State Airport?

There were **75 responses** to this question. The majority of respondents (64) do not use the airport, while eleven (11) people stated that they did.




2. Please explain how you use the Aurora State Airport.

The eleven (11) responses explaining how people used the airport included:

- Fly some business jets that are based at UAO
- Manage Aircraft
- Pilot, aircraft hangar renter
- Keep A/C at Willamette Aviation
- We own two hangars at Aurora
- We own several hangars at KUAO that we rent out
- Family flies in from Seattle on small plane
- As a base for an Embraer Phenom 300 business Aircraft I manage and crew
- Corporate jet lease/rental
- Flying in and out. Property owner
- SEACAP tenant


3. How supportive are you of the Oregon Department of Aviation (ODAV) buying property to handle hangars or aircraft parking if the existing airport property is at capacity?

There were seventy-three (73) total responses to this question. The majority of respondents (47) were strongly unsupportive of property acquisition for additional hangars and parking. Ten (10) responses were strongly supportive of property acquisition for this purpose, nine (9) were somewhat supportive, four (4) felt unsure or had no opinion, and three (3) were somewhat supportive.




4. There will be tradeoffs for any decision that ODAV makes in order to meet current Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) standards. One of the tradeoffs with the alternatives includes either realigning the Hubbard Highway to the west or shifting the runway to the east, which impacts the use of hangars, loss of apron space, and relocates the Air Traffic Control Tower (ATCT). If you had to choose between these two options, which do you feel would work best for the Aurora State Airport?

Of the seventy-four (74) responses to this question, most (35) did not feel that either option would work well. Sixteen (16) felt that shifting the runway to the east was their preference, and fifteen (15) felt that shifting Hubbard Highway to the west was a better solution. Eight (8) respondents were unsure or felt they needed more information.




5. One of the other things that ODAV needs to consider with the Airport Master Plan is meeting the current safety regulations (set by the FAA). Currently the Aurora Airport runway doesn't meet the justified runway length. How supportive are you of extending the runway up to 497 feet to meet the justified runway length?

There were seventy- four (74) responses to this question. Most respondents (50) felt strongly unsupportive of extending the runway up to 497 feet. Fifteen (15) respondents were strongly supportive of extending the runway to meet safety requirements. Four (4) people felt both somewhat supportive and somewhat unsupportive, and one (1) person was unsure or had no opinion.



6. As mentioned above, there are tradeoffs with the different alternatives. If you support a runway extension, would you prefer it be extended it to the north or south?

Of the sixty-nine (69) responses to this question, forty-two (42) people felt that neither option would work well. Twenty (20) felt that extending the runway south was the best option. Six (6) people felt north was best, and one (1) person was unsure or needed more information.



7. Please provide any additional feedback to help ODAV as they review the preliminary alternatives.

There were 62 total responses to this open-ended question. *Full responses are in the table below. Photos of handwritten comments from paper surveys are also available in Appendix 8, but are also included in this table for readability.*

SC #[2]	Comment
SC.1	1) Staff ATC and Aurora Tower 24/7 2) IFR only approaches and departures 3) No additional hangar space 4) Noise abatement protocols mandatory on all departures and approaches (see Orange County/John Wayne Airport) 5) Equalize all airport fees for Portland, Hillsboro, and Salem Eugene Corvallis, and Aurora *6) Add an East/West runway as PRIMARY
SC.2	A) Believe option to extend BOTH ends of the existing runway for extra 500' should be considered. B) Believe ODAV needs to consider how underused, under-capacity McMinnville and Salem Airports can be better utilized before expanding Aurora. C) A more robust noise abatement policy must be considered for surrounding residential neighborhoods.
SC.3	Current laws and regulations are not being abided by the FAA tower both on takeoff and arrival of aircraft; currently there is no monitoring of compliance with the tower's instructions. The tower closes too early and pilot are on UFR. They are not monitored and fly too low over Charbonneau, the neighboring homes, and Wilsonville.

[2] Survey Comment Number

	Extended hours on existing Tower should be made. A NOISE ABATEMENT district should be enacted. OC Airport has a policy that works!
SC.4	Noise from planes doesn't seem to follow guidelines. Greater activity will make that noise levels more difficult for homeowners and residents.
SC.5	The current noise abatement rules should be followed. Extend hours for traffic controllers.
SC.6	We hear planes at all hours of the day and night. No more hangars, no larger runway either!! No (runway extension), keep Aurora a small airport. Marked South, Unsure/need more information, and do north think either option would work well for runway extension. Smaller, commercial airplanes are constantly flying over our houses in Charbonneau at all hours of the day and night. Life flight and helicopters don't bother me much. Please don't enlarge the runway cuz that means more traffic over our house. PDX can easily handle more air traffic using the Columbia River.
SC.7	Don't use the airport but hear all the planes, at all hours of the night. More hangars mean more planes and more noise. Absolutely not under any circumstance (referencing runway extension). Marked south, unsure/need more information, and do not think either option would work for runway extension. Aurora Airport does not (need) to be enlarged in any capacity. The current # of small (probably commercial) planes are constantly flying over the Charbonneau neighborhood, which I was told was illegal. PDX is a much bigger airport and can handle all the air travel going up and out over the Columbia River. Please let us enjoy retirement in peace!!!
SC.8	The noise abatement rules are not now being followed. Insure that constant compliance is supported especially after midnight. These planes are only supporting a few and are adversely affecting thousands.
SC.9	Extending the runway for larger planes? ODAV should create a noise abatement plane particularly for planes flying (take-offs and landing) into residential areas at night and early morning.
SC.10	I am not in favor of any expansion. We already have planes flying over Charbonneau daily that don't follow the noise abatement guidelines. If current traffic can't be managed - no more traffic!! Controllers should ensure this. Controllers should be added to midnight. Charbonneau has about 2,100 residents - if you must extend do NOT go east or north.
SC.11	The runway is too short for the super midsize jets during winter when wet. I wouldn't be shocked if somebody finally screwed up and landed long, and plowed right across the road on the north side of the field.
SC.12	No need to expand the airport
SC.13	Aurora airport is a necessary aviation link in the overall Oregon growth and service plan for the Willamette Valley. As international businesses are drawn to the expanding metro area it is necessary to provide these businesses with the transportation system that best suits them. It's painfully obvious that ODOT has dropped the ball on surface transportation, let's not do the same to air transportation.

	I would like to see ODA extend the comment period by 14 days to allow me to better prepare my argument in favor of airport expansion.
SC.14	I support Aurora Airport expansion and would like to see it accomplished soon.
SC.15	The first question on the comment page makes no sense do I use the aurora state airport. Can the public get in? I drive by the airport everyday never seen a welcome sign for the public. I have seen that the sign by the traffic lights is broken someone should probably fix that. Provide information on how the expansion can impact public health. Information of how the expansion impacts wildlife health and environment hopefully provided by certified wildlife biologist. How would the expansion benefit surrounding communities. How much profit will the airport and other partnerships be making from this expansion? Will this profit be shared with surrounding communities that will be impacted by the expansion. How will the traffic look during the expansion. The airport is surrounded by small/big communities we already hear the aircrafts at all times. If the small aircrafts make a lot of noise how will the big ones differ? Why can't the bigger aircrafts go to another airport that is equipped with the safety standards.
SC.16	There has been a steady decline in small Portland area runways over the years, since I was young and used to fly small planes. Now is the time to build an extended runway, while there is still inexpensive farmland nearby and Portland METRO hasn't taken over. It is good for the local economy combined with some high teck companies already located in Wilsonville.
SC.17	I am against any type of expansion of the Aurora Airport. Not only will it cause noise pollution but it will also cause more traffic which the roads in and around Aurora and surrounding cities can't handle.
SC.18	I am a 10 year Charbonneau resident. Som people have wanted more commercial opportunities in the area e.g. golf course sells property to Amazon, thus needing larger aircraft. City of Wilsonville tells residents the airport wants a longer runway to accommodate size/weight class no currently used. Who is correct?
SC.19	Regarding #5, how is "justified runway length" defined? No option shows a north end run-up apron. I will vote against any "option" that does not include a north end run-up area.
SC.20	No expansion!
SC.21	The airport should return to light A/C use. This "meeting" has lots of info available to take in however we were told 2x to move along. I had questions and was told to come back when it was less crowded - the line up of people was backing up. One "worker" commented to another that too many people showed up. I feel like I could have learned something but didn't. Was this just an exercise to say you had a meeting but w/o caring that the public was pushed through and left feeling our comments don't matter? I asked if survey has been done on traffic increase on Airport Road and was told "I have no idea." No options I saw included a N runup area but wasn't able to ask about it as line had to keep moving. As an Aurora citizen I am concerned about water/sewer needs of additional buildings and how it will impact our

	system. I overheard one "worker" tell a lady lengthening the runway will make it safer but will not increase the number of A/C takeoffs/landings at all - so not true!
SC.22	Do not want at all. No big planes coming in.
SC.23	Airport should its closest size and operation. No Aurora Airport expansion.
SC.24	I support moving the runway either into the existing space to realign the highway - although I'm not sure what re-aligning the highway will do to existing development. I strongly oppose extending the length of the runway. it will increase use and noise, and air pollution.
SC.25	Because of noise pollution and the added traffic, I'm completely against this.
SC.26	Timeline no clear. Costs to accomplish what?
SC.27	I am against any expansion that facilitates or allows more or larger aircraft to land or take off. My home is in the flight path, and we are VERY concerned with any increase in flight traffic, noise, pollution, etc.
SC.28	Want the Aurora Airport closed. Want C-II designation removed. No extension. Remove C-11 designation and go to only small general aviation...OR terminate license and eliminate airport!!
SC.29	Keep it with small planes! Don't want big ones flying over my house. Just illuminate airport and that takes care of problem. People in the area needed to have more say in this!
SC.30	Currently jets coming in all hours low is very disruptive. Air traffic has increased 10 fold since moving here 5 years ago.
SC.31	How many accidents have been caused by the runway being too short? How is vehicular traffic affected. Noise levels around airport continue to increase.
SC.32	Why was the airport "stay the way it is" taken off the menu? Why don't you punish the ones who violate the rules? What difference does (being involved) make when money decides everything?
SC.33	Count the actual number of planes daily using the runway. DO not use projections. Make the Aurora Airport tower a 24 hour tower. Reduce C-II planes flying into Aurora. Have pilots adhere to the FAA rules and regulations to NOT fly over housing developments, to not buzz houses and trees that are 3+ miles from the airport, with polluted exhaust. Fly over I-5 and not Airport Way.
SC.34	Do not support a runway extension. We are frustrated with the lack of participation of the "volunteer noise abatement." We can only imagine what it would be like when larger planes start landing at Aurora.
SC.35	NO EXPANSION PERIOD! Any of your proposals DO NOT! include noise abatement. The volunteer program is not working/we need designated noise sensitive zones! Period. We want to plead for Alternative #7 be recommended. No others are acceptable.
SC.36	Add to question 5 - Airport should be limited to comply with current safety regulations.
SC.37	Question 5 is backward; Aircraft use should be limited to safety standards applicable to the existing runway and facility.
SC.38	Let us have a regional airline at Aurora.

SC.39	The noise abatement policy is poorly attended to. Who holds pilots accountable if the could safely divert to the east or west rather than fly over Charbonneau, and they don't? Would like to be a good neighbor and support your airport business, but there has been no evidence from airport management that they will also be a good neighbor!
SC.40	Resident in Charbonneau. Noise abatement procedures are ignored by the majority of the pilots. I have two grown children who are pilots - I reviewed the issues with them to get their input. They both laughed and said that if the runway is expended that then the pilots with larger planes will just come in and lane - landing light on fuel if needed. Documenting larger aircraft will simply result in a need to increase the classification again. We want to be good neighbors but don't see evidence of that effort on the part of the airport management group. It's all about increasing fuel sales and hangar spaces to rent. This does nothing positive for the area except to increase profit to a small number of people. It also increases traffic congestion in the already vulnerable area that has increasing car accidents. If the only safe alternative is to expand the runway then I would support the expansion to the south.
SC.41	It's fine the way it is (the runway)! I am concerned with pollution and the extension of the airport to support larger planes, like jets. I would rather keep it as a small for private propeller planes as it always has been. I don't want it to be a regional airport for passenger planes, like Hillsboro or something like that. I live very near the airport and I am concerned with a possible airplane crash or the pollution That airplanes put out when taking off or landing. AV gas has lead in it, and most all small places use it.
SC.42	Use the Salem Airport - leave Aurora as is. We support the safety improvements but not the extension of the runway that would support larger aircraft using the airport. It is unclear what tax burden this would have on residential property. Current traffic and noise level is high and we are concerned the noise level will increase. Why is there a "no runway extension" alternative presented? We believe there is an unstated objective of increasing traffic and larger aircraft - we strongly disagree with an objective of increasing the airport to support larger aircraft!
SC.43	We live in Charbonneau. Already experiencing many low flyovers. Do not support runway extension - increased # of flights of larger aircraft. Traffic congestion on small roads around airport. Airport Rd. and Miley Rd. not safe currently worried about appropriating agriculture land to expand the airport. Concerned about environmental impact.
SC.44	I do not support making changes to the airport.
SC.45	I live in the southwest corner of Charbonneau and the large planes are very loud - we have to pause our conversations until the noise is over. I'm not against airports but I don't see the benefit of the large planes. Does the airport have any benefit to locals? All I hear is the noise, potential crash, or dumping of fuel. Nothing positive,
SC.46	Airplanes and jet noise is to loud right now. Do not need bigger jet louder noises from in and out bound planes and jets. Noise level is to loud right now. Pilots have no respect for residents. Fly to low over homes. If this change is enforce on the residents. Then we who live around it should be compensated.
SC.47	We live at Charbonneau. Extending to the South is the only alternative we would like.
SC.48	I live close to the airport. Larger aircraft and/or more frequents would be very disruptive to my quiet living space.

SC.49	I do not agree that a longer runway is needed. I have not seen enough evidence to even come close to justifying the extremely high investment of public funds at this airport.
SC.50	I have airplanes jets and helicopters flying over my house at all hours of the day and night. How will increasing air traffic benefit me and my neighbors who do not own private aircraft and who do not fly out of this airport?
SC.51	I believe the runway length increase is critical (and should be to 6000 ft as planned since 1976) but that the direction decision should be based on whichever works the best considering cost, feasibility, and land footprint. ODAV acquiring the acre abutting the Southwest corner of their landside parcel would make a significant improvement in ODAV ramp space, as well as largely benefiting Aircraft and vehicle access and movement.
SC.52	In discussion with Mr. Bishop and with FAA personnel at the meeting June 13th I was told that a detached threshold at either or both ends of the existing runway was not going to be an alternative. The effective lengthening of the runway for take off and departure abort would make the airport safer for aircraft of current size and weight and have a positive effect on noise over private property as aircraft would achieve a higher altitude quicker upon departure. I was told by FAA personnel that the detached thresholds would not meet FAA standards and no further clarification was available. If The Object Free Zone must be addressed then the moving of the highway would bring the airport into compliance. No additional extension, moving, widening, or hardening of the runway would be required. I believe this alternative would enhance airport safety, move further towards compliance with FAA requirements, not require moving the recently installed tower, and not compromise the area directly adjacent to the new, large hangars on private property. At the same time reducing the noise from departure aircraft over the community. This alternative deserves discussion and serious consideration, unless the ultimate goal is further lengthening, widening, and hardening of the runway expressly to accommodate yet larger, wider, and heavier commercial aircraft into our small community. The residents are firmly opposed to that type of illegal expansion considering the EFU designation of the adjacent land and current level of noise and pollution we experience daily.
SC.53	Enduring aircraft safety is of primary concern. Living in Wilsonville the amount of audible air traffic above is limited and does not affect day to day life.
SC.54	Concerned about water drainage from the extension if it happens. There is a little creek that goes from the field to the South of Keil. It goes under the highway and goes under Boones Ferry Rd. It could flood and ruin property at the West of Boones Ferry Rd. Murray Rd. goes over the culvert to 2 Homes. Flooding could wash out the culvert. Cause damage to peoples homes.
SC.55	Where are the other plans, specifically #7, and why were they suddenly dropped without notice?
SC.56	Wilsonville residents will be most affected by expanding the airport, how do Wilsonville citizens benefit from this enlargement? It is quite obvious that they don't. Deep pockets and greed should not be allowed to ruin our community. I will never stop fighting against this recklessness.
SC.57	There is not a good reason to expand the airport. IF the runway is not long enough how can they be flying airplanes out?

	It seems that you are more concerned with a money making fuel station than you are for any of the surrounding communities.
SC.58	I prefer no airport expansion.
SC.59	Nothing presented here seems like a win for the community as a whole.
SC.60	We are opposed to expanding the airport. We live in Wilsonville, and are concerned about additional noise and pollution. Based on the city of Wilsonville's analysis, the expansions are not needed. Please don't degrade our quality of life.
SC.61	This safety extension needs to be completed soon.
SC.62	Comment about the fleet mix: Did anyone take into consideration the number of aircraft that cannot use the airport due to the weight restrictions of the runway (Gulfstreams/Globals)? The runway weight was reduced to extend it's life, effectively eliminating any larger aircraft from using the airport which would skew the fleet mix. ODAV must have data on waiver requests over the years - approved, not approved or not responded to. Considering the aircraft that cannot use the airport, along with waiver request data, the fleet mix would show a higher number of larger aircraft using the airport which would possibly support a 6,000 foot runway rather than 5,500.

Below: Comments from City of Wilsonville.

Of the original draft set of seven Master Plan "airside alternatives," only Alternative 7 maintains most of the Airport's current layout and footprint:

WILSONVILLE OREGON

■ **Retains current runway length (5,003 feet)** and existing vast majority B-II class of aircraft standards rather than planning for a longer, strengthened runway that accommodates larger, heavier C-I, C-II and larger class of aircraft.

■ **Protects the important local agricultural economy:** Keil Road, a key access for local farmers, is not impacted by Alternative 7. Additionally, by restraining Airport expansion, speculative real-estate pressures that increase farmland rental costs are reduced, and help to keep farming economical in Oregon's bread-basket of French Prairie.

■ **Reduces land-use conflicts:** Existing Airport septic drain fields, wind cones, and weather equipment do not conflict with layout. Wilsonville-Hubbard Highway 551, Keil Road, Boones Ferry Road and nearby residential areas do not conflict with the Runway Protection Zone (RPZ). Alternatives 1-4 all propose Airport expansion that negatively impacts ag operations.

■ **Increases safety** by limiting runway access for pedestrians and vehicles and preventing over-weight/over-sized aircraft that can hold more fuel.

HOWEVER, Neither Alternative 7 nor any of the other draft alternatives in the draft Master Plan address any land-use, surface transportation, pollution and other issues of concern to area constituents:

• **Poor quality roads** in the Airport area vicinity are unimproved county roads with no shoulders or sidewalks, narrow lanes and deep ditches – no improvements are proposed by the Master Plan.

• **Negative impacts to the farming-based agricultural economy** due to Airport expansion and speculative real-estate deals near the Airport are not addressed.

• **No mitigation methods for low-flying overflights and loud aircraft noise** that negatively impact homeowner real-estate values and area residents' quality-of-life are presented in the Master Plan.

• **Pollution from fuel, sewage, stormwater and PFAS forever chemicals** generated by Airport users is disregarded, as are negative impacts to salmon-bearing streams near Airport.

• **Impacts from increasing Climate Change greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions** due to money-making Oregon Department of Aviation fuel sales at Aurora State Airport are disregarded.

• **Oregon Department of Geology and Mineral Industries (DOGAMI) data shows that the Aurora State Airport is located in an area subject to major potential damage in a projected 9.0 Cascadia Subduction Zone Earthquake.** Airport area soils are prone to shaking and liquefaction during major earthquake, resulting in runway broken-apart into many sections and unserviceable for a long period of time. Only helicopters, which don't need a runway, will be able to operate for months or years after the Big One.

For more information: www.ci.wilsonville.or.us/asa

FAA tells public three Alternatives that maintain current layout of Airport accommodating majority of Airport users "Will Not Be Considered Further":

WILSONVILLE OREGON



Change to B-II, Shift Runway North, and Maintain Current Length


The 'System of Airports' around Aurora State Airport

How does the Aurora State Airport fit in with other airports in the area? Does it make sense to spend millions on expanding Aurora, when so many other airports are operating far below past levels? The Master Plan makes no attempt to conduct an analysis. In the interest of safety, should we keep larger private jets with heavy fuel loads at the safest possible airport, PDX, where highest level fire services are provided 24/7 on-airport?

Airport	Direction & Distance from KUAO	Runway dimensions (largest)	Weight Capacity (single gear)	Fire & Rescue	TAF data avg daily Total Ops (peak year)	ATADS data 2019: avg daily Total Ops	ATADS data 2023: avg daily Total Ops	ATADS data % local Ops	ATADS data 2023 vs peak year
Aurora (KUAO)	–	5,003ft x 100ft	30,000 lbs	no ARFF Index	286 (2013)	172	173	46%	-40%
Portland International (KPDX)	22nm NNE	11,000ft x 200ft	200,000 lbs	ARFF Index E	898 (1997)	653	521	1%	-42%
Hillsboro (KHIO)	19nm NW	6,600ft x 150ft	50,000 lbs	no ARFF Index	714 (2008)	422	503	64%	-30%
Salem (KSLE)	23nm SW	5,811ft x 150ft	105,000 lbs	ARFF Index B	272 (2007)	108	121	41%	-56%
McMinnville (KMMV)	16nm W	5,420ft x 100ft	40,000 lbs	no ARFF Index	213 (2007)	noATC, no count	noATC, no count	??	
Troutdale (KTTD)	24nm NE	5,399ft x 150ft	19,000 lbs	no ARFF Index	367 (2018)	267	287	72%	-22%
Eugene (KEUG)	70nm SSW	8,009ft x 150ft	120,000 lbs	ARFF Index C	443 (1991)	172	159	32%	-64%

ARFF: Aircraft Rescue & Fire Fighting Index ranges from 'A' to 'E'; PDX has the highest ARFF Index, to handle accidents for the largest aircraft.
ATADS & TAF are two FAA databases; ATADS provides precise operational counts for each of 500+ U.S. airports with ATC (air traffic control tower); TAF is Terminal Area Forecast and provides past annual operations totals and future projected ops levels for each of nearly 4,000 U.S. airports.
Weight Bearing Capacity is an important metric, to define which aircraft can safely and sustainably use a runway. When an airport authority allows uses by larger and overweight aircraft, the runway surface is rapidly degraded, which reduces safety.

For more information: www.ci.wilsonville.or.us/asa



ASA MP Operations Data Analysis by Type of Aircraft

TABLE 3-7: AURORA STATE AIRPORT INSTRUMENT FLIGHT OPERATIONS

	TFMSC IFR Operations by AAC/ADG - Calendar Year Data									Average Annual Operations		
AAC/ADG	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021		
A-I	2,372	2,638	2,414	2,482	2,750	2,750	3,428	2,458	2,162	2,330	2,578	28.0%
A-II	410	494	1,108	1,554	1,814	1,966	1,844	1,158	930	1,398	1,268	13.8%
A-III	14	6	2	4	4	10	6	2	0	4	5	0.1%
A-IV	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
B-I	1,498	1,368	1,422	1,194	1,198	1,126	1,134	1,190	1,024	1,154	1,231	13.4%
B-II	2,222	2,232	2,214	2,620	3,270	3,110	3,152	3,798	3,448	4,182	3,025	32.8%
B-III	0	0	0	2	0	2	4	8	2	0	2	0.0%
B-IV	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
C-I	360	374	514	440	340	306	274	286	170	274	334	3.6%
C-II	348	378	294	208	316	370	358	226	242	264	300	3.3%
C-III	18	10	4	8	0	14	50	54	10	0	17	0.2%
C-IV	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
C-V	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
D-I	2	8	16	0	4	6	8	4	0	12	6	0.1%
D-II	4	0	4	0	2	6	2	8	26	84	14	0.2%
D-III	6	10	4	2	6	8	4	0	4	6	5	0.1%
D-IV	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
D-V	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Unknown	446	390	380	388	504	376	366	472	442	572	434	4.7%
Total	7,700	7,908	8,376	8,902	10,208	10,050	10,630	9,644	8,460	10,280	9,218	100.0%
Operations by AAC C and D Aircraft	738	780	836	658	668	710	696	578	452	680	676	
Operations by ADG II and Larger	3,022	3,130	3,630	4,398	5,412	5,486	5,420	5,254	4,662	5,938	4,635	

87.9%

7.3%

Source: FAA TFMSC Report - 4/04/2022 (Aurora State Airport)

Comparing the latest 2021 Operations data with the 10-year Average Annual Operations data reveals the following:


- The most active class of aircraft accounting for largest share of operations at 33%, B-II aircraft totaled 2,066 ops in 2021, *45% over the average.*
- The second most active group, C-I aircraft, totaled 252 ops in 2021, *23% below the average.*
- The third most active group, C-II aircraft, totaled 218 ops in 2021, *52% below the average.*
- The fastest growing group, D-II aircraft, totaled 80 ops in 2021, *515% above the average.* These flights were mostly Gulfstream IV (GLF4) jets, topping out at ~74,000 pounds.

CONCLUSION: Aurora State Airport is a B-II dominated airport with C-I and C-II declining, but D-II use exploding. However, the FAA and ODAV insist that Airport is classified as C-II.

The data also shows that B-II and smaller aircraft compose 87.9% of Airport's Average Annual Operations, while C-I and larger aircraft make-up just 7.3% of all operations.

It appears the 'tail is wagging the dog': the smallest portion of Aircraft (7.3%) that are the largest size are dictating to the vast majority 87.9% of Airport users that the Airport should be expanded.

This data also indicates that airport authority Oregon Dept. of Aviation (ODAV) is willing to allow use of the Aurora State Airport runway by larger and overweight aircraft (C-I and larger), with a tradeoff that these aircraft generate huge fuel flowage revenues to ODAV due to aircraft large fuel capacities. However, public safety is jeopardized and Airport runway maintenance costs increased when larger Aircraft are allowed to use Airport that is currently violating FAA safety requirements.



We like the Aurora State Airport the way it is!

Let's keep it that way with No expansion!

WILSONVILLE OREGON

Oregon Department of Aviation's 6 of 7 Preliminary Alternatives for new Draft Aurora State Airport Master Plan propose to:

■ **Expand the Airport's direct impact on neighboring communities** with a longer runway for bigger airplanes, taking private property. *The Master Plan ignores significant problems with low-flying overflights and noise, increased traffic, sewage, pollution, climate change, farm impacts, underground fuel storage, uncertain firefighting capacity and earthquake-prone soils.*

■ **Extend the Airport runway by approximately 500 feet to 5,500 feet to allow larger, heavier aircraft to land and take-off with more fuel.** *The main revenue source for Oregon Department of Aviation is a tax on aviation fuel; so more fuel sales means more $ money $ for government agency, despite negative impacts to residents, farmers, environment and climate change.*

■ **Ignore 9 years' worth of actual Airport control tower flight operations data to project future Airport growth**. Rather than use actual Airport operations data or the standard "FAA Oregon Federal Contract Tower Terminal Area Forecast (TAF) Model," the Draft Master Plan uses inflated population growth projections of Clackamas and Marion Counties to determine future Airport growth. *Oregon Department of Aviation is using a dubious methodology that inexplicably equates population growth with increasing flights at Airport — a false correlation between general population growth of counties and Airport without passenger air service.*

The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA)-approved Oregon Department of Aviation's Airport Operations Forecast is 50% greater than the standard FAA Oregon contract tower forecast. The "Marion and Clackamas County Combined Population Growth Model" projects annual operations to increase by 0.9% per year, whereas the "Oregon Federal Contract Tower TAF Model" estimates 0.6% annual growth rate.

■ **Deprive citizens of the right to appeal the FAA Airport Operations Forecast that calls for expansion**. Oregon Department of Aviation asserts that the Airport Operations Forecast is not appealable. *By preventing public challenge, federal and state aviation agencies appear to do as they please without being answerable to citizens.*

■ **FAA is now telling the public that a "No Action" Alternative is Not allowable and only Airport expansion can occur since Airport is violating too many air safety requirements.** *Without an apparent basis in law, federal agency now appears to have put the fix in for larger Airport and to disregard public feedback.*

■ **FAA and Oregon Department of Aviation disregard Airport operations data that shows decrease over time in larger, heavier C-I and C-II aircraft, and that smaller, lighter B-II and smaller aircraft are the vast majority of Airport users.** *Government agencies appear to collude on backroom deals that provide wealthy developers with more tax-payer funded subsidies.*

■ **Disregard that other nearby airports** (Hillsboro, PDX, Salem, McMinnville) **with over 5,000-foot runways are underutilized** and would welcome additional based aircraft and operations.

For more information: www.ci.wilsonville.or.us/asa

Optional Demographic Information

This information was optional and used to see who was heard from in the community, and who the project team still needs to reach out to. It was not tied to names or survey responses.

8. What is your race/ethnicity? (check all that apply)

There were fifty-three (53) responses to this question. The overwhelming **majority identified as white (91%).** Two people chose "other", with one person questioning why this question mattered. One person each identified as American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian/Asian American, and Hispanic/Latino/Spanish.

9. What is your age?


There were 30 responses to this question. This question was left off the paper surveys, so responses are only from those who chose to answer electronically. Of those who answered, 47% were aged 65 or older (14 responses), 30% were aged 45 – 64 (9 responses), and 23% were aged 25 – 44 (7 responses).


9. What is your ZIP code?

- 97070 (Wilsonville) – 49
- 97002 (Aurora) – 12
- 97071 (Woodburn) – 2
- 97140 (Sherwood) – 2
- 97132 (Newberg) – 1
- 97062 (Tualatin) – 1
- 97032 (Hubbard) – 1

APPENDIX 6: DOTS AT OPEN HOUSE

Ten community members who attended the in-person Open House also answered survey questions on easel paper by placing dots on their preferences when no more comment forms were available.





APPENDIX 7: EMAILED COMMENTS

Comments that were received by email or through the website by July 1, 2024 are below.

Date	Question/Comment
06/10/24	We are writing to express our strong objection to lengthening runways and increasing size of aircraft at Aurora Airport. Planes from this airport already take off and land over densely populated areas and this proposal will seriously adversely affect communities in and near the flight path both in terms of noise and quality of life, and also in terms of safety. In addition, the Boone Bridge section of I-5 is already a traffic nightmare and adding traffic to and from the airport is not tenable. We have a more than adequate airport in Portland and the studies do not support the need for this expansion any time in the near future Please take citizens and neighbors concerns into consideration and stop any expansion of Aurora Airport.
06/11/24	Attached is an outline of the property parcel that I showed to Tony & Kenji and that is available to ODAV. As we discussed this Aurora ramp space would facilitate a huge improvement in Aircraft and vehicle movement at UAO. This property transfer would go along with ODAV's 1995 plans to own & control ramp space as well as the FAA's 1985 directive for ODAV to increase their UAO ownership percentage Please add this to the master plan record and contact me with any questions.
06/12/24	I am opposed to the expansion of the Aurora Airport. As a resident in Wilsonville, OR, I already see far too many large and small planes above my house. The noise is awful and scares the wildlife. The small is also terrible and has notably affected our health.
06/12/24	For too long Charlotte Lehan, Tim Knapp, Greg Leo and the current Wilsonville City Council have stood in the way of much needed progress of bringing the airport up to date. In fact, I would argue the City makes a big show of fighting the airport expansion to secure NIMBY (not-in-my-backyard) votes to distract from the major issues it is dealing with. These include major traffic, congestion and parking issues that have been eroding public support for current council urban renewal projects like gutting Town Center with thousands of people. It is long passed time that the airport be upgraded and expanded.
06/13/24	We are local residents in Butteville and we totally support the planned growth of the Aurora State airport, adding 500ft to one end of the runway to increase safety margins for larger aircraft and develop the land mid-field with hangars. UAO is a fantastic airport that has so many businesses, employing many locals.
06/13/24	Good Day! I am writing of support for the Aurora airport runway extension.

	This airport is so critically important to our area, providing over 1200 jobs, providing fire fighting equipment and expertise (Columbia Helicopter/HTC) and life saving services (Lifeflight/ organ transport services). Adding 500' to the runway will make the airport safer as any pilot can attest. Having lost a best friend in an airplane accident at Coos Bay/South Bend off the end of the runway, I know this is a life or death solution. Please support this extension which has been part of the master plan since the 70's for safety reasons. This is also ground zero for subduction earthquake disaster relief. ODART is doing a simulation soon in support of this. Look at the big picture. Airplanes fly over every corner of the United States- (except military restricted zones). They use navigational way points to travel. People near those way points are just as equally affected by airplanes as those near an airport and do they send you their complaints? I recently sold a $2,000,000 home across the street from the Newberg VOR on Chehalem Mountain. They were not concerned in the least about aircraft traffic.
06/13/24	I won't be able to attend the North Marion High meeting tonight to discuss the Airport Master Plan. I would like to itemize the problems or issues with the plan from my perspective as a home owner. -I live in Charbonneau and have for the last 15 years. Over the last 4-5 years the number of aircrafts and the overflight noise has increased greatly which makes it very difficult to hear when sitting on my porch when the planes fly so close over Charbonneau. It sometimes feels like the plane is going to crash. The noise level is much more obvious at Charbonneau than downtown Wilsonville because the flight plans go straight over Charbonneau. -to extend the airport runway will allow larger aircrafts to use it and increase even more the noise level. The infra structure to support increase usage is not mentioned in any of the master plans I have read. Why is that? Traffic on I-5 is already horrendous and the rural roads around the airport cannot handle more cars/trucks. -if only the flight plans to depart and arrive would be vectored away from Charbonneau. I can see the aircraft markings from my porch so they are sometimes not very high in the sky….. For example why can't the planes fly over I-5 or over the many acres of forest and farm land to access the runway. Take the planes away from the populated areas of Wilsonville. Think of options which will accomplish what both the locals and the airport want…a compromise so one side isn't the loser. -I fear the interests of our neighborhoods have taken a back seat for financial gain of the airport businesses and the ODA. The methods that the ODA has taken to push this master plan in the past is evidence of my concern.

	-Bigger doesn't mean better nor changing what has worked for this small airport. Put the interest of local residents as the reason to NOT implement the master plan. Consider the future of the communities who have to live around the airport.
06/14/24	**Aurora Airport Expansion** **Noise Mitigation** Request that if the airport is allowed to lengthen the runway for larger aircraft, that those flights be limited to the I-5 freeway corridor. That steeper take-off angles be mandated. And that Wilsonville OR be designated a Noise Abatement Zone. Today, Helicopter Transport fly directly over our home in Wilsonville. Sometimes at low altitude but always in the late and early morning hours. Our windows shake and dogs bark in the neighborhood. To be fair, you have already addressed this issue by requiring pilots of business jets to gain altitude quickly but still present noise pollution upon take-off and landing over town.. along with helicopter "red-eye" service. The I-5 corridor won't eliminate noise but will help.
06/15/24	Please record that we strongly oppose this expansion. There are multiple alternative airports in the greater Portland/Salem area to use for larger, heavier aircraft.
06/16/24	My wife and I are residents of Charbonneau (Wilsonville). We wish to register our strong opposition to any proposed airport expansion. Expansion of the airport, especially the lengthening of the runway, will encourage increased air traffic and enable and encourage larger jets that will further increase overflight noise. The increased air traffic will also lead to increased local road traffic in the vicinity of the airport and on I-5. The city of Wilsonville has registered opposition to the airport expansion and listed many reasons that the expansion is ill advised and unnecessary. We join with the City in opposition to airport expansion. Another factor in our opposition to airport expansion is that other property owners in the vicinity of the airport will seek exceptions to the land use restrictions outside the urban development zone. Langdon Farms has already sought an exception to the land use regulations to build a truck depot. If the airport were to be expanded, that would provide more justification for Langdon Farms and other property owners to convert from recreational use and farmland to industrial uses in support of the expanded airport. We have lived in Charbonneau for twelve years and have enjoyed the relative quiet of the area and lived with the current level of noise from jet overflights. Increase in the level of aircraft noise and road traffic through expansion of the airport would degrade the area irreparably. Please do not expand the airport and especially do not lengthen the runway to enable larger jets to land and take off from the Aurora State Airport. I was disappointed that I was unable to speak to a senior member of the Oregon Department of Aviation at the June 13 meeting.

06/17/24	I request that the one-acre ramp parcel that I own abutting the SW corner of ODAV's landside parcel be considered as potential additional ODAV ramp for short term Aircraft parking and as a taxi lane to allow aircraft and vehicle access to the ODAV parcel from taxiway A. This small parcel could open up access for the tower, Pacific Coast Avionics, the CAA, and the entire ODAV ramp.
06/17/24	As a PAC member, I strongly discourage any plan to move the runway due to the existing ramp constraints with a "one sided" (due to hwy 551) Airport and due to the giant cost, complexity, destruction of existing businesses, and unknowable time schedule. Thank you.
06/23/24	As a local resident, I am highly concern on this project. My daily work and personal life depend on traveling through the Arndt Rd into Canby and to access the Freeway through Portland-Hubbard Hwy, just like many others that live in my community at Century Meadows. This project would impact greatly our commute, specially when taking kids into school. Making the airport accessible to larger aircraft would raise hazard concerns driving near by any of those aircraft. Which also includes the higher levels of pollution. Specially for the existing area, since there are many water bodies in the area, the increase of jet fuel could affect the environment as well as the health of people and animals that live in the surrounding areas. Increased of noise of large aircraft can also impact people's health affecting sleep patterns and kids' ability to study.
06/27/24	Upon a review of Figure 11, page 13, from the Preliminary Alternatives Summary, an important feature of the Hot Spot mitigation plan was omitted. The intent of the modification is to eliminate Hot Spot 1 and mitigate the traffic congestion on the Alpha Taxiway when runway 17 is in use. To eliminate the Hot Spot aircraft taxing would need to make two ninety turns to enter the runway as depicted. Does the ALP need modification to allow access from the TTF property just north of the airport property at A1? The second element is to reduce the traffic congestion that bottlenecks taxiway A. This is accomplished by establishing an exit only lane from the movement area. See the attached diagram and FAA 7460-1. The aircraft traffic flow on the TTF, non-movement area will be controlled by signage, pavement markings and reflectors. Please let me know if you have any questions.
06/28/24	The residents of Sunset Estates are against expansion of the Aurora Airport, are concerns are water, air and noise pollution!!!!Also the Highways in the area cannot handle more traffic, especially with the conditions the roads and the lack of turning lanes on 551!!!!
07/01/24	I wholeheartedly support continued aviation operations at the Aurora State Airport. I am a private pilot who earned my pilot certificate thanks to the existence of the airport and Fixed Based Operators (FBO's) like Willamette Aviation and Aurora Aviation at a location that was convenient for me with instruction and aircraft rentals that were affordable to me. I am an active member of the Columbia Aviation Association, an aviation community of pilots

	based at KUAO that are united by a passion for aviation. Our mission includes fostering aviation safety, education, mentoring and outreach, and we provide opportunities to expand our members' aviation expertise. I am proud to now own and operate an aircraft that runs on unleaded gasoline ("MOGAS"). I support maintaining the existing runway, taxiways and control tower such that any future plans do not interrupt airport operations. As a safety professional, I support the promotion of safety improvements for ground and air operations. I also recommend connecting the south end operations with the midfield operations via a vehicle access behind the old church property as well as connecting the ramp in front of the Columbia Aviation Association's clubhouse directly to the taxiway toward runway 35. I do NOT support the annexation of KUAO into the City of Aurora. I believe it would increase our taxes and provide no tangible benefit to airport users like me. Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

APPENDIX 8: SCANNED OPEN HOUSE COMMENT FORMS

The following scans show the 38 completed open-ended comments collected during the open house or mailed back to the project team (not all comment forms included answers to this open-ended question). All information from these printed forms was included in Appendix 5; these scans are listed below for reference.

7. Please provide any additional feedback to help ODAV as they review the preliminary alternatives:

① staff ATC & aurora tower 24/7
② IFR only approaches & departures
③ no additional hangar space
④ noise abatement protocols mandatory on all departures and approaches (see Orange County/ John Wayne airport
⑤ equalize all airport fees for Portland, Hillsboro, & Salem Eugene, Corvallis, & Aurora
*⑥ Add a East/West runway as primary

Optional demographic questions (not tied to survey responses)

7. Please provide any additional feedback to help ODAV as they review the preliminary alternatives:

A) BELIEVE OPTION TO EXTEND BOTH ENDS OF EXISTING RUNWAY FOR EXTRA 500' SHOULD BE CONSIDERED.
B) BELIEVE ODAV NEEDS TO CONSIDER HOW UNDER-USED, UNDER-CAPACITY MCMINNVILLE & SALEM AIRPORTS CAN BE BETTER UTILIZED BEFORE EXPANDING AURORA.
C) A MORE ROBUST NOISE ABATEMENT POLICY MUST BE CONSIDERED FOR SURROUNDING RESIDENTIAL NEIGHBORHOODS

7. Please provide any additional feedback to help ODAV as they review the preliminary alternatives:

- Current laws and regulations are not being abided by the FAA Tower, both on take-off and arrival of aircraft; currently there is no monitoring of compliance with the Tower's instructions.
- The tower closes too early and pilots are on VFR. They are not monitored once fly too low over Chardonneau, the neighboring homes and Wilsonville
- Extended hours on existing Tower should be made
- A NOISE ABATEMENT district should be enacted. OC airport has a policy that works!

Optional demographic questions (not tied to survey responses)

7. Please provide any additional feedback to help ODAV as they review the preliminary alternatives:

Noise from planes doesn't seem to follow guidelines. Greater activity will make that noise levels more difficult for homeowners & residents.

7. Please provide any additional feedback to help ODAV as they review the preliminary alternatives:

The current noise abatement rules should be followed.
Extend hours for traffic controllers.

7. Please provide any additional feedback to help ODAV as they review the preliminary alternatives:

Smaller, commercial airplanes are constantly flying over our houses in Charbonneau at all hours of the day & night!! Life flight & helicopters don't bother me much. Please dont enlarge the runway cuz that means more traffic over our houses. Pdx can easily handled more air traffic using the Columbia river.

7. Please provide any additional feedback to help ODAV as they review the preliminary alternatives:

Aurora Airport does not to be enlarged in any ~~capacity~~ capacity. The current # of small (probably commercial planes) are constantly flying over the Charbonneau neighborhood, which I was told is illegal. Pdx is a much bigger airport and can handle all the air travel going up and out over the Columbia River. Please let us enjoy are retirement in peace.!!

7. Please provide any additional feedback to help ODAV as they review the preliminary alternatives:

The noise abatment rules are not now being followed. I am sure that constant compliance is supported especially after midnight.

These planes are only supporting a few and are adversely affecting thousands.

7. Please provide any additional feedback to help ODAV as they review the preliminary alternatives:

ODAV should create a noise abatement Plan particularly for planes flying (take-offs and landing) into residential areas at night and early morning.

7. Please provide any additional feedback to help ODAV as they review the preliminary alternatives:

I am not in favor of any expansion. We already have planes flying over Charbonneau daily that don't follow the noise abatement guidelines. If arrent traffic can't be managed - no more traffic!! Controllers should ensure this. Controllers should be added to midnight. Charbonneau has about 2,100 residents - if you must extend do NOT go east or north.

7. Please provide any additional feedback to help ODAV as they review the preliminary alternatives:

REGARDING # 5. HOW IS "JUSTIFIED RUNWAY LENGTH" DEFINED"?

NO OPTION SHOWS A NORTH END RUN-UP APRON. I WILL VOTE AGAINST ANY "OPTION" THAT DOES NOT INCLUDE A NORTH END RUN-UP AREA.

7. Please provide any additional feedback to help ODAV as they review the preliminary alternatives:

NO EXPANSION

7. Please provide any additional feedback to help ODAV as they review the preliminary alternatives:

this "meeting" has lots of info available to take in however we were told 2x to move along. I had questions + was told to come back when it was less crowded - the line up of people was backing up. One "worker" commented to another that too many people showed up. I feel like I could have learned something but didn't. Was this just an exercise to say you held a meeting but w/o caring that the public was pushed through and left feeling our comments don't matter?

Optional demographic questions (not tied to survey responses)

[redacted]

No options I saw included a N runup area but wasn't able to ask about it as line had to keep

I asked if survey has seen done on traffic increase on Airport Road and was told "I have no idea"

one: _____

I overheard one "worker" tell a lady lengthening runway will make it safer but will not increase # of A/C takeoffs / landings at all → so not true!

/ Attention Aurora Airport Master Plan / 123
2024.

as an Aurora citizen I am concerned about water | sewer needs of additional buildings how will impact our system

7. Please provide any additional feedback to help ODAV as they review the preliminary alternatives:

Do not want at all.
NO big Planes coming IN

7. Please provide any additional feedback to help ODAV as they review the preliminary alternatives:

Airport should it's current size and operation

NO
AURORA AIRPORT
EXPANSION

Optional demographic questio... ...ises)

7. Please provide any additional feedback to help ODAV as they review the preliminary alternatives:

I support moving the runway either into the existing space or to re-align the highway - although I'm not sure what re-aligning the highway will do to existing development. I strongly oppose extending the length of the ~~highway~~ runway. It will increase use & noise, & air ~~& no~~ pollution

7. Please provide any additional feedback to help ODAV as they review the preliminary alternatives:

Because of Noise, Pollution, and the added traffic I'm completely against this.

7. Please provide any additional feedback to help ODAV as they review the preliminary alternatives:

Timeline not clear

Costs to Accomplish what?

7. Please provide any additional feedback to help ODAV as they review the preliminary alternatives:

I AM AGAINST ANY EXPANSION THAT FACILITATES OR ALLOWS MORE OR LARGER AIRCRAFT TO LAND OR TAKE OFF. MY HOME IS IN THE FLIGHT PATH, AND WE ARE VERY CONCERNED WITH ANY INCREASE IN FLIGHT TRAFFIC, NOISE, POLLUTION, ETC.

7. Please provide any additional feedback to help ODAV as they review the preliminary alternatives:

Remove C-11 designation and go to only small general AVIATION..... OR TERMINATE License and eliminate AIRPORT!

7. Please provide any additional feedback to help ODAV as they review the preliminary alternatives:

Keep it with small planes! Don't want big ones flying over my house. Just eliminate airport & that takes care of problem. People in the area needed to have more say on this!

7. Please provide any additional feedback to help ODAV as they review the preliminary alternatives:

Currently jets coming in all hours low is very disruptive. Air traffic has increased 10 fold since moving here 5 yrs ago.

7. Please provide any additional feedback to help ODAV as they review the preliminary alternatives:

How many accidents have been caused by the runway being too short?

How is vehicular traffic affected

Noise levels around airport continue to increase.

7. Please provide any additional feedback to help ODAV as they review the preliminary alternatives:

Why was the AIRPORT "STAY THE WAY IT IS" taken off the menu?

Why don't you punish the ones who violate the rules?

7. Please provide any additional feedback to help ODAV as they review the preliminary alternatives: - Count the actual number of planes daily using the runway
- Do Not Use Projections
- Make the Aurora Airport tower a 24 hour tower.
- Reduce C-11 plans flying into Aurora.
- Have pilots adhere to the FAA rules & regulations to not fly over housing developments &, to not buzz houses & trees that are 3+ miles from the airport, with polluted exhaust.
- Fly over I-5 and not Airport Way.

Optional demographic questions (not tied to survey responses)

8. What is your race/ethnicity? (check all that apply)

7. Please provide any additional feedback to help ODAV as they review the preliminary alternatives:

We are very frustrated with the lack of participation of the "Volunteer noise abatement". We can only imagine what it would be like when larger planes start landing at Aurora.

South
Unsure/need more information
Do not think that either option would work well

NO EXPANSION PERIOD

7. Please provide any additional feedback to help ODAV as they review the preliminary alternatives:

ANY OF YOUR PROPOSALS DO NOT! INCLUDE NOISE ABATEMENT. THE VOLUNTEER PROGRAM IS NOT WORKING / WE NEED DESIGNATED NOISE SENSITIVE ZONE'S ! PERIOD

WE WANT TO PLEDGE FOR ALTERNATIVE # 7 BE RECOMMENDED NO OTHERS ARE ACCEPTABLE

7. Please provide any additional feedback to help ODAV as they review the preliminary alternatives:

LET US HAVE A REGIONAL AIRLINE AT AVL!!2

7. Please provide any additional feedback to help ODAV as they review the preliminary alternatives:

The noise abatement policy is poorly attended to. Who holds pilots accountable if they could safely divert to the east or west Rather than fly over Charbonneau, and they don't? We would like to be a good neighbor and support your airport business, but there has been no evidence from airport management that they will also be a good neighbor!

Optional demographic questions (not tied to survey responses)

8. What is your race/ethnicity? (check all

7. Please provide any additional feedback to help ODAV as they review the preliminary alternatives:

Resident in Charbonneau. Noise abatement procedures are ignored by the majority of the pilots. I have two grown children who are pilots. I reviewed the issues with them to get their input. They both laughed and said that if the runway is expanded that then pilots with larger planes will just come in + land — landing light on full if needed. Documenting larger aircraft will simply result in a need to increase the classification again. We want to be good neighbors but don't see evidence of that effort on the part of the airport management group. It's all about increasing fuel sales + hangar spaces to rent. This does nothing positive for the area except to increase profit to a small number of people. It also increases traffic congestion in an already vulnerable area that has increasing car accidents.
If the only safe alternative is to expand the runway then I would support the expansion to the south.

Optional demographic questions (not tied to survey responses)

7. Please provide any additional feedback to help ODAV as they review the preliminary alternatives:

I am concerned with pollution and the extension of the airport to support larger planes, like jets. I would rather keep it as a small for private propeller planes as it always has been. I don't want it to be a regional airport for passenger planes, like Hillsboro or something like that. I live very near the airport and I am concerned with a possible airplane crash or the pollution that airplanes put out when taking off or landing. AV gas has lead in it, and most all small planes use it

Optional demographic questions (not tied to survey responses)

8. What is your race/ethnicity? (check all that apply)

- African American/Black
- American Indian or Alaska Native
- Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
- White

7. Please provide any additional feedback to help ODAV as they review the preliminary alternatives: Use the Salem airport — leave Aurora Airport as is.

We support the ~~safety~~ improvements but not the extension of runway that would support larger aircraft using the ~~runway~~ airport. ** It is unclear what tax burden this would have on residential property. Current traffic noise level is high and we are concerned the noise level will increase. Why is there a "no runway extension" alternative presented? We believe there is an unstated objective of increasing traffic and larger aircraft. → We strongly disagree with an objective of increasing the ~~city~~ airport to support larger aircraft!

Optional demographic questions (not tied to survey responses)

7. Please provide any additional feedback to help ODAV as they review the preliminary alternatives:

We live in Charbonneau. Already experiencing many low flyovers. Do not support runway extention — increase # of flights of larger aircraft, traffic congestion on small roads around airport. Airport Rd & Miley Rd. not safe currently. Worried about appropriating agriculture land to expand Airport. Concerned about environmental impact.

7. Please provide any additional feedback to help ODAV as they review the preliminary alternatives:

I LIVE IN THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF CHARBONNEAU AND THE LARGE PLANES ARE VERY LOUD. WE HAVE TO PAUSE OUR CONVERSATIONS UNTIL THE NOISE IS OVER.

IM NOT AGAINST AIRPORTS BUT I DON'T SEE THE BENEFIT OF THE LARGE PLANES. DOES THE AIRPORT HAVE ANY BENEFIT TO LOCALS? ALL I HEAR IS THE NOISE, POTENTIAL CRASH OR DUMPING OF FUEL — NOTHING POSITIVE

Optional demographic questions (not tied to survey responses)

7. Please provide any additional feedback to help ODAV as they review the preliminary alternatives:

Airplans and jet Noise is To Loud right now Do not Need bigger Jet Nouder noises From in and out bound planes and Jets Noise level is To Loud right now. pilots have no repeet For residents. Fly To Low over homes. IF This change is enForce on The residents. Thenwe who live around it should be compensated For problem

7. Please provide any additional feedback to help ODAV as they review the preliminary alternatives:


We live at Cherbourneau. Extending to the South is the only alternative we would like

7. Please provide any additional feedback to help ODAV as they review the preliminary alternatives:

I live close to the airport. Larger aircraft and/or more frequents would be very disruptive to my quiet living space

Landside Alternative 2

Commercial Hangar and FBO Development with In-fill Hangar Development



Comments:

Primary Components:

- Commercial development with ADG II taxilane access, large FBO hangar, and vehicle access and parking.
- The apron adjacent to the ATCT is reconfigured to include two drive through large aircraft parking positions on the south end of the apron.
  - » Approximately three feet of the south edge of the taxilane object free area (TLOFA) for the drive through parking encroaches upon private property to the south. Coordination with adjacent property owner and/or an easement may be necessary for development .
- Remaining ATCT apron is reconfigured to provide small aircraft tiedown parking with ADG I wingtip spacing.
- Realigned taxilane west of current Aurora Flight School facility to allow additional small aircraft tiedown parking.
- Proposed apron reconfiguration to meet FAA standards results in a net decrease of five tiedowns compared to the current aircraft parking configuration.
- Two large helicopter (35-foot rotor) parking positions and one small helicopter (25-foot rotor) parking positions are added.
- Storage building east of Aurora Flight School is removed to accommodate additional hangars on north side of existing ADG I hangar taxilane.
- One multi-unit T-hangar is replaced with small condo-style box hangars.
- Reconfigured fence and vehicle access road (outside the fence access provided to Aurora Flight School facility).
- Additional hangars infill is proposed for all available lots on the Airport.
- Approximately 145,000 square feet of additional hangar space is proposed.
  - » Includes removal of 15,000 square feet of existing space and construction of 160,000 square feet of new space.
- Storm water retention area is identified east of ATCT apron.

OREGON DEPARTMENT OF AVIATION

Aurora State Airport

AIRPORT MASTER PLAN
PRELIMINARY ALTERNATIVES

CENTURY WEST ENGINEERING


The preliminary alternatives were developed to facilitate discussions surrounding the “big questions” that will guide the Oregon Department of Aviation (ODAV) on how best to meet the facility requirements for Aurora State Airport in the 20-year planning period.

https://publicproject.net/auroraairport#



Airside Alternative 1

Maintain C-II, Realign Hubbard Highway and Extend Runway North



Comments:

Primary Components:

- Realigns Hubbard Highway outside of Runway Object Free Area (ROFA). As proposed, the highway is shifted approximately 30 to 35 feet west, within existing ODOT-owned highway right-of-way.
  - » Note: The roadway alignment depicted is for illustration only. Further study and coordination with ODOT will be required to identify final roadway alignment needed to clear/control ROFA.
- Maintains 100 feet runway width (C-II standard).
- Extends runway 497 feet to the north resulting in a total length of 5,500 feet.
- Extends parallel taxiway (Taxiway A) to the north with runway.
- Property acquisition is required to accommodate east sections of ROFA (northeast and southeast).
- Keil Road is realigned to the outside of the ROFA.
- Reconfigure/relocate existing TTF access taxiway connection at current north end of Taxiway A to remove direct runway access at that location.
  - » Realigned TTF access to be coordinated with adjacent property owner.
- Install painted islands between Taxiway A and the adjacent southern TTF properties to address direct runway access and V/PD issues.

Issues Addressed by Alternative:

- Extends runway to justified length of 5,500 feet.
- Clears ROFA of existing public roads.
- Airport control of ROFA achieved through property acquisition.
- Addresses direct runway access and V/PD issues through pavement removal and painted islands.

Other Issues to be Addressed:


- Septic drainfield remains in south end of RSA.
  - » Further study is required to relocate drainfield out of RSA.
- Wind cone and weather equipment (ASOS) remain in RSA and ROFA.
  - » Further study is required to identify new locations for equipment.
- Existing incompatible land uses (Hubbard Highway, Keil Road, Boones Ferry Road and residential areas) remain in RPZs.

New Issues:

- New incompatible land use (Arndt Road) in Runway 17 RPZ.
- Septic drainfield located in north end of extended RSA.
  - » Further study is required to relocate drainfield out of future RSA.

Landside Alternative 1B

Commercial Hangar and FBO Development with Reconfigured Flight School Apron and Vehicle Service Road




Comments:

Primary Components:

- Identical to Landside Alternative 1A with the following exceptions:
  - » A north/south vehicle service road (VSR) is proposed to provide dedicated vehicle access from the north boundary of the landside area to the south boundary of the landside area.
  - » The proposed five tiedowns west of Aurora Flight School, the three proposed helicopter parking positions, and six proposed tiedowns on the ATCT apron are omitted to create space for VSR.
  - » Two additional tiedowns are proposed west of the large FBO hangar, on the west side of the VSR.
  - » This configuration results in a net decrease of 13 tiedowns compared to the existing aircraft parking configuration.

Airside Alternative 3

Maintain C-II, Shift Runway East, and Extend Runway North



Comments:

Primary Components:

- Shifts runway 84 feet east to bring west edge of ROFA onto Airport property.
- All runway and parallel taxiway surfaces (ROFA, RSA, OFZ, RPZ, etc.) are shifted east based on the shifted runway centerline location.
- ATCT and other aviation use facilities (fuel, helicopter parking, etc.) to be relocated outside of ROFA.
  - » Further study is required to determine new locations.
- Maintains 100-foot runway width (C-II standard).
- Extends runway 497 feet to the north resulting in a total length of 5,500 feet.
- Extends parallel taxiway (Taxiway A) to the north with runway.
- All property within the shifted/extended ROFA not owned by the Airport to be acquired.
- Keil Road is realigned to the outside of the ROFA.
- Reconfigure/relocate existing TTF access taxiway connection at current north end of Taxiway A to remove direct runway access at that location.
  - » Realigned TTF access to be coordinated with adjacent property owner.
- Install painted islands between shifted Taxiway A and the adjacent southern TTF properties, where feasible to address direct runway access and V/PD issues.

Issues Addressed by Alternative:

- Extends runway to justified length of 5,500 feet.
- Clears ROFA of existing public roads.
- Airport control of ROFA achieved through property acquisition.
- Direct runway access and V/PD issues to be addressed in redesign of Taxiway A.
- Wind cone and ASOS are no longer in ROFA or RSA.

Other Issues to be Addressed:


- Septic drainfield remains in south end of RSA.
  - » Further study required to relocate drainfield out of RSA.
- Existing incompatible land uses (Hubbard Highway, Keil Road, Boones Ferry Road and residential areas) remain in RPZs; some mitigated by runway shift.

New Issues:

- ATCT must be relocated/reconstructed outside of ROFA.
- Atlantic Aviation fuel equipment to be relocated outside of ROFA.
- ROFA directly abuts hangar doors for south TTF properties.
- The septic drainfield is located in the north end of (extended) RSA.
  - » Further study required to relocate drainfield out of future RSA.
- New incompatible land use (Arndt Road) in Runway 17 RPZ.
- Requires relocation/replacement or decommissioning of localizer navigational aid.

Airside Alternative 4

Maintain C-II, Shift Runway East, and Extend Runway South



Comments:

Primary Components:

- Shift runway 84 feet east to bring west edge of ROFA onto Airport property.
- Extends runway 497 feet to the south resulting in a total length of 5,500 feet.
- Maintains 100-foot runway width (C-II standard).
- Extends parallel taxiway (Taxiway A) to the south with runway.
- All runway and parallel taxiway surfaces (ROFA, RSA, OFZ, RPZ, etc.) are shifted east with shifted runway centerline.
- ATCT and other aviation use facilities (fuel, helicopter parking, etc.) to be relocated outside of ROFA.
  - » Further study is required to determine new locations.
- All property within the shifted/extended ROFA not owned by the Airport to be acquired.
- Keil Road is realigned to the outside of the existing and future ROFA.
- Reconfigure/relocate existing TTF access taxiway connection at current north end of Taxiway A to remove direct runway access at that location.
  - » Realigned TTF access to be coordinated with adjacent property owner.
- Install painted islands between shifted Taxiway A and the adjacent southern TTF properties, where feasible to address direct runway access and V/PD issues.

Issues Addressed by Alternative:

- Extends runway to justified length of 5,500 feet.
- Clears ROFA of existing public roads.
- Airport control of ROFA achieved through property acquisition.
- Direct runway access and V/PD issues to be addressed in redesign of Taxiway A.
- Wind cone and ASOS are no longer in ROFA or RSA.

Other Issues to be Addressed:


- Septic drainfield remains in south end of RSA.
  - » Further study required to relocate drainfield out of RSA.
- Existing incompatible land uses (Hubbard Highway, Keil Road, Boones Ferry Road and residential areas) remain in RPZs; some mitigated by runway shift.

New Issues:

- ATCT must be relocated/reconstructed outside of ROFA.
- Atlantic Aviation fuel equipment to be relocated outside of ROFA.
- ROFA directly abuts hangar doors for south TTF properties.
- Additional incompatible land uses (residential properties, and realigned Keil Road) enter Runway 35 RPZ.
- Requires relocation/replacement or decommissioning of localizer navigational aid (located at Runway 35 end).

Landside Alternative 1A

Commercial Hangar and FBO Development with Reconfigured Flight School Apron




Comments:

Primary Components:

- Commercial hangar development with ADG II taxilane access, large FBO hangar, vehicle access and parking.
- The existing apron south of proposed FBO hangar proposed as tenant lease in conjunction with main ADG II access taxilane shift .
- Reconfigured small airplane tiedown apron adjacent to ATCT to provide appropriate wingtip and meet ADG I taxilane object free area (TOFA) clearances.
- Proposed apron reconfiguration to meet FAA standards results in a net decrease of four small airplane tiedowns and one large aircraft drive through parking position compared to the current aircraft parking configuration.
- Two large helicopter (35-foot rotor) parking positions and one small helicopter (25-foot rotor) parking positions are added.
- Realigned taxilane west of current Aurora Flight School facility to accommodate five additional small airplane tiedowns.
- New apron at current flight school area.
- Reconfigured fence and vehicle access road (outside the fence access provided to Aurora Flight School facility).
- Additional hangar infill is proposed for all available lots on the Airport.
- Approximately 154,000 square feet of additional hangar space, as depicted.
- Storm water retention area is identified east of ATCT apron.

Airside Alternative 2

Maintain C-II, Realign Hubbard Highway and Extend Runway South



Comments:

Primary Components:

- Realigns Hubbard Highway outside of Runway Object Free Area (ROFA). As proposed, the highway is shifted approximately 30 to 35 feet west, within existing ODOT-owned highway right-of-way.
  - » Note: The roadway alignment depicted is for illustration only. Further study and coordination with ODOT will be required to identify the final roadway alignment needed to clear/control ROFA.
- Maintains 100-foot runway width (C-II standard).
- Extends runway 497 feet to the south resulting in a total length of 5,500 feet.
- Extends parallel taxiway (Taxiway A) to the south with runway.
- Property acquisition is required to accommodate east sections of ROFA (northeast and southeast).
- Keil Road is realigned to the outside of the existing and future ROFA.
- Reconfigure/relocate existing TTF access taxiway connection at current north end of Taxiway A to remove direct runway access at that location.
  - » Realigned TTF access to be coordinated with adjacent property owner.
- Install painted islands between Taxiway A and the adjacent southern TTF properties to address direct runway access and V/PD issues.

Issues Addressed by Alternative:

- Extends runway to justified length of 5,500 feet.
- Clears ROFA of existing public roads.
- Airport control of ROFA achieved through property acquisition.
- Addresses direct runway access and V/PD issues through pavement removal and painted islands.

Other Issues to be Addressed:

- Septic drainfield remains in south end of RSA.
  - » Further study is required to relocate drainfield out of RSA.
- Wind cone and weather equipment (ASOS) remain in RSA and ROFA.
  - » Further study is required to identify new locations for equipment.
- Existing incompatible land uses (Hubbard Highway, Keil Road, Boones Ferry Road and residential areas) remain in RPZs.

New Issues:

- Additional incompatible land uses (residential properties, and realigned Keil Road) enter Runway 35 RPZ.
- Requires relocation/replacement or decommissioning of localizer navigational aid (located at Runway 35 end).

Public Survey #1 (February 23, 2022 to March 25, 2022)

AURORA AIRPORT MASTER PLAN

PROJECT SURVEY #1 SUMMARY

Overview

In February and March of 2022, as a part of the Aurora Airport Master Plan, the Oregon Department of Aviation (ODAV)conducted an online survey with the purpose of collecting input on the current and future needs of the Aurora Airport. Specifically, the survey responses helped the project team understand the community's values and desires for the airport's future plans, development, and operations by asking about land use, transportation, economic, and environmental impacts. Resources and documents related to the Airport Master Plan were available to the community for viewing while the survey was open.

The survey was open from February 23, 2022 to March 28, 2022. During this time, 467 respondents started the survey, with a nearly 84% completion rate.

A survey is a data collection method made up of a list of questions, designed to help gather information. The survey results are not statistically significant, nor can they be extrapolated to the larger community.

Outreach Methods

The project team publicized the survey in the following ways:

- 01/26/2022 – Project website updated with meeting dates and registration link.
- 01/26/2022 and 02/15/2022 - Email sent to the mailing list of interested individuals and organizations (through GovDelivery); as well as a direct ask to the Planning Advisory Committee (PAC) at the same time to share with their constituents.
- 01/27/2022 and 02/24/2022 - Ad placed in Pamplin Media newspapers (including Canby Herald, Wilsonville Spokesman).
- 01/27/2022 and 02/12/2022 - Ad placed in the Statesman Journal.
- 01/28/2022 – Postcard mailed to residents, organizations, and government agencies within 1,000 feet of the airport (state-owned property).
- 01/28/2022 – Flyers posted at the airport and nearby locations.
- 02/22/2022 - Press release was sent to Canby Herald, Wilsonville Spokesman, El Latino and Statesman Journal
- 02/23/2022 – Article ran in the Canby Herald by Emily Matlock "ODAV seeks public input on Aurora State Airport plan."
- 03/03/2022 – Article ran in the Canby Herald by Corey Buchanan "Aurora Airport operations have increased precipitously, according to paper."

Survey respondents also shared that they heard about the project through:

- A friend, neighbor, or family member (33%)
- Social Media (32%)
- Homeowner's Association (HOA) or neighborhood group (18%)
- Article in local paper (15%)
- Employer or local business (8%)
- Local elected official (7%)
- Planning Advisory Committee (PAC) meeting (7%)
- Project website (5%)
- Other (18%)

Of those who selected "other", responses included emails, Foundations for a Better Oregon (FBO), Aurora Flight Training, Friends of French Prairie, Nextdoor, and word of mouth.

Themes and Takeaways

Several themes arose from the more than **450 survey responses,** both in favor and opposed to potential airport updates or expansion. The majority of the early respondents were concerned about updates having a negative impact on the surrounding community (mostly from self-identified residents), but responses that came in later were more in favor of updates due to safety and positive economic impacts for the community (mostly from self-identified pilots and other airport users).

The following are themes from the open-ended comment sections:

- Residents in nearby communities were concerned about noise and pollution. They feared that any airport expansion would create more issues. Some residents lived directly under flight paths and asked for no-fly hours and noise abatements to be enforced.
- Some residents felt that runway expansion would cause more flights and jets to fly in the region, creating greater noise and traffic in the area.
- Many respondents felt the Aurora Airport had a positive impact on the local economy and new restrictions may negatively impact this.
- Several respondents felt that airport modernization and potential runway expansion would allow for safer operations.
- Some were concerned about ODAV not following land use laws or being transparent.
- Others were concerned about impacts to farmland and stressed how important agriculture is to the region.
- Some respondents felt that a few communities in the region were vocal anti-airport proponents, and most people wanted the benefits of an updated airport for the local community and economy.


The survey was formatted to allow for analysis of each stakeholder's category (based on self-identification) following a few values questions answered by everyone. If a respondent selected that they were not directly affiliated with the airport and its operations, they were directed to the end of the survey to offer open-ended comments and answer demographic questions. Those who selected airport affiliation answered additional questions related to airport operations.

Individual Survey Question Responses

Please note that respondents did not answer every question. Duplicate responses from individuals were removed during data analysis.


What is your relationship with the Aurora State Airport (select the most relevant)?

There were **467 responses** to this question. The majority were **local neighbors (50%),** followed by **local pilots (25%).** Of those who answered "other", responses included neighboring farmers, visiting pilots, retired pilots, former neighbors, airport employees, flight instructors, and a member of the FAA Safety Team.



Over the next 20 years, what role based on the defined roles in the Oregon Aviation Plan (OAP) will the Aurora State Airport serve (within the Willamette Valley and/or Portland Metro area)?

467 respondents answered this question. The majority of respondents chose **Category II – Urban General Aviation Airports (52%).** This was followed Category III – Regional General Aviation Airports (24%) and Category IV – Local General Aviation Airports (15%).



Answer choices were divided into the following categories:

- **Category I - Commercial Service Airports -** These airports support some level of scheduled commercial airline service in addition to supporting a full range of general aviation aircraft activities. Commercial service includes both domestic and international destinations.
- **Category II - Urban General Aviation Airports -** These airports support all general aviation aircraft and accommodate corporate aviation activity, including piston and turbine engine aircraft, business jets, helicopters, gliders, and other general aviation activity. The most demanding user requirements are

business-related. These airports service a large/multi-state geographic region, or experience high levels of general aviation activity.


- **Category III - Regional General Aviation Airports -** These airports support most twin and single-engine aircraft and may accommodate occasional business jets. These airports support regional transportation needs with a large and often sparsely populated service area.
- **Category IV - Local General Aviation Airports -** These airports support primarily single-engine general aviation aircraft but are capable of accommodating smaller twin-engine general aviation aircraft. These airports support local air transportation needs and special use aviation activities.
- **Category V - Remote Access/Emergency Service Airports -** These airports support primarily single-engine general aviation aircraft, special-use aviation activities, access to remote areas, or provide emergency service access

When planning for the future of the Airport, which three topics do you believe are the most important for the planning team to consider?

462 respondents answered this question. Major concerns included the **airport's impact on the rural environment (50%)**, followed by a **runway extension that would remove operational constraints for the Airport's critical aircraft (44%)** and **impacts on nearby roads and highways which may cause traffic and other issues (43%)**.

Area land uses (converting farmland to commercial or business operations reliant on the airport) (38%) and a lack of available hangar space (32%) were also concerns. Several of those who responded with "other" expressed a desire for a longer runway for safety or for consideration about flight paths over residential areas due to noise.

Those who were not affiliated with the operations of Aurora Airport skipped the following questions to the last open-ended question before the optional demographic questions.



Do you rent/own a tiedown, hangar, or own/operate a business at the Aurora State Airport?

Of those who **responded to this question (161),** 10% rent a hangar, 8% own a hangar, 9% own or operate a business at the airport, and 2.5% rent a tiedown. Others mentioned renting a portion of a hangar, considering renting or buying a hangar, being a pilot in training, or having to relocate due to lack of space. **63% responded with "none of the above".**

Those who responded to renting or owning a hangar reported square footage ranging from 200 square feet to 32,000 square feet, with most reporting between 2,000 and 6,000 square feet. Those who rent a tiedown reported a number between one and twelve, with most renting one or seven.

Respondents who owned or operated businesses at Aurora Airport answered with the following organizations:


- Aeros Jet Aviation
- Atlantic Aviation
- Aurora Aircraft, LLC
- Aurora Flight Training
- Blue Sky Aurora, LLC
- Centrex
- Columbia Aviation Association
- Peregrine Air, LLC
- Vans Aircraft
- Willamette Aviation

Where is your hangar, tiedown, or business located?

Of the **161 responses** to this question, 20% answered that they were on privately-owned property (TTF), followed by 10% on Oregon Department of Aviation (ODAV) property. 9% replied with "other", **61.5% answered "N/A",** and 2.5% were unsure. Of those who answered "other", responses included County owned, out of state, Aurora Flight Training, Port KHIO, Lenhardts Airpark, Twin Oaks, Salem Airport, off site, Troutdale, Independence, and a private address.

What are your reasons for basing at Aurora State Airport?

Most reported **convenience being the reason for basing at Aurora (31%)**, followed by 19% responding with "none of the above or N/A". 18% replied that they based at Aurora Airport because of the facilities and services provided. Those who responded with "other" reported airport amenities and services such as fuel, the flight tower, and flight training as reasons for basing there.



What do you do with any solid waste/garbage you produce while at the Airport?

There were **156 responses** to this question, with **37% saying none of the answers applied, 31% replying that it is placed in appropriate on-airport recycling waste bins,** 21% replying that a private company provides waste removal services, and 19% personally hauling it away and mixing with their personal residential use.

What landside improvements are needed at the Airport to enhance your operation?

There were **161 responses** to this question with most divided between being unsure or needing few to no improvements, except hangar upgrades/additions which needed a lot of improvements:

- **Expanded/improved emergency medical services (EMS)** - Most were unsure (38%) or felt this did not need improvements (31%).
- **Local utility extensions** - Most were unsure if this needed improvement (45%), followed by needing a few improvements (31%).
- **Airport perimeter/security fencing** - Most felt this did not need improvements (38%) or needed a few improvements (35%).
- **Aircraft wash facilities** - Answers were split between being unsure (32%) or feeling this needs a few improvements (32%).
- **Airport surface road access improvements** - Almost half (49%) felt this needs a few improvements.
- **Car and truck parking improvements** - Almost half (47%) feel this needs a few improvements.
- **Hangar upgrades or additions** - Answers were split between needing a few improvements (39%) and needing a lot of improvements (38%).
- Those who answered “other” asked for more hangar space and one respondent wanted a restaurant.

What airside improvements are needed at the Airport to enhance your operation?

There were **161 responses** to this question with most divided between not needing improvements or needing only a few improvements, except Runway 17-35 which needed a lot of improvements:

- **Airfield signage** – Over half felt this did not need improvements (53%).
- **Weather reporting** – Over half felt this did not need improvements (63%).
- **NAVAIDS** – Over half felt this did not need improvements (53%).
- **Runway 17-35 pavement condition** – Over half felt this did not need improvements (52%).
- **Airfield marking** – Most felt this did not need improvements (48%) or needs a few improvements (38%).
- **Airfield lighting** – Most felt this did not need improvements (43%) or needs a few improvements (36.5%).
- **Taxiways and taxi lanes** – Most felt this needs a few improvements (44%), followed by not needing improvements (36%).
- **Fuel tanks and fueling facilities/services** – Answers were split between needing a few improvements (36.5%) and not needing improvements (36%).
- **Apron/tiedowns/aircraft parking** – Most felt this needs a few improvements (57%).

- **Runway 17-35 length** – Answers were split between needing a few improvements (32%) and needing a lot of improvements (30%), however, 27% replied that it did not need improvements.
- Those who responded with "other" noted runway strengthening and limits, better tower visibility, response times, de-icing capabilities, and Runway 17 needing improvements.

Understanding that most general aviation services are provided by private service providers (FBOs), what general aviation services do you feel need improvement at the Airport?

Most of the **161 respondents** cited **food and refreshment services, restrooms, aircraft parking and maintenance, and access to wireless networks as needing the most improvements.** Aircraft rental, apron/tiedowns, avionic repair services, ground transportation services, fuel sales and services, security, signage, and vehicle access and parking need a few updates.

Please list the aircraft type/s (make and model) you currently, or plan to, fly or base at the Airport and is your aircraft equipped with ADS-B out (meaning your aircraft transmits location signals to other aircraft with ADS-B receivers)?

There were **139 responses** to this question. Aircraft makes and models were listed as follows:

- 1931 Pietenpol
- 1946 Globe Swift
- 31
- 36 Bonanza
- 4 place SEL Cessna, Piper, and Mooney
- A36
- ACA 8GCBC Super Scout
- Aeronca 7AC Champ
- American Champion 8KCAB
- BE-124
- Beechcraft Sierra, Musketeer, Bonanza
- Bell 505
- Carbon Cub
- CE525, 650
- Cessna 140, 150, 152, 172, 172P, 175, 177, 180, 182, 185, 205, 206, P210, T210, 310, 414A, CE565, Diamond
- Cessna Citation Cj2+
- Challenger 300, 601
- Champ
- Cirrus SR20, SR22, SR22T, SR2X
- Citation Jet
- Diamond DA 40, 42
- Embraer 505, 550
- Embraer Phenom 300
- Falcon 50, 900, 2000
- Falcon 7X, 900
- Grumman Single Engine Aircraft
- Helio Courier
- King Air 200
- Kodiak
- Lear 45
- Mooney M20J
- Phenom 300
- Piper Archer II, 28, 28A, 31, 32, 44, 46, 28-151, 28RT-201
- Piper Cherokee, Warrior II, 6
- Piper PA28
- Piper Saratoga, Apache, Comanche, Piper Turbo Arrow III, Dakota
- Piston Single
- Pitts S-2B, S-1-11B
- Revolution Aviation Tango XR2
- Robinson R44

- RV-3, 4, 5, 6, 6A, 7, 8, 8A, 9, 9A, 10, 12, 12iS, 14, 16
- Skyhawk
- SR20, 22
- Stinson 108
- Super Cub
- T18
- TBM 700C
- Turboprop
- Vans RVS, RV-6A, RV9A, 10

Of the **143 responses** to aircraft being equipped with ADS-B out, **89.5% replied that it was equipped**, while 6% responded that their aircraft was not, and 4% were not sure.

Please estimate how many operations you or your company has on an annual basis. (Note: 1 takeoff and 1 landing = 2 operations). Are your current aircraft operations at the Airport constrained (i.e., reduced payloads or stage lengths)?

There were **124 responses** to this open-ended question. The most common response was **100 operations** (18 responses) followed by 50 operations (10 responses). Eight replied with 200 operations, six with 20 operations, and five responded with 40, 300, and 1000 operations. Other responses ranged from 6 operations to 20,000 operations.

Of the **142 who responded** to airport operations being constrained, **75% replied that they were not,** 8.5% replied that they were, and 16% were unsure. Those who answered yes noted that there was a need for more runway length to ensure safety during rainy weather.

Do you have plans to purchase a new aircraft? Do you plan to replace or upgrade an existing aircraft? Are there any limitations with the infrastructure at the Airport that may keep you from purchasing a new aircraft?

Most who answered reported that they **do not plan on purchasing a new aircraft (70%).** Those who will (30%) noted many of the popular planes listed in the previous section about current aircraft based at Aurora Airport. Most also answered that they **do not plan to replace or upgrade an existing aircraft (82.5%).**

While many felt that there were **no limitations with the infrastructure at the airport (60%),** those who answered that there were (24%) cited a lack of hangar space as the most common issue.

Do you have anything else you would like to tell us? (open-ended)

Community members were worried about how potential airport updates and expansion may affect noise and pollution in the area. Many mentioned late-night flights and that it seemed there was a lack of enforcement of no-fly rules or sound abatements. Others were concerned about environmental hazards, or traffic impacts due to the projected increase in business and jets in the area. Some mentioned being wary of ODAV's transparency through the project and wanted the public to be informed and have a say in the process, as they are the most impacted. Respondents wanted to ensure that all land use laws were followed, and that there is no expansion onto farmland.

Other community members and several of those who use the airport's services did not have issues with airport operations and believed modernization will bring jobs to the area and have a positive impact on the local economy. Some noted that people bought homes in the area knowing the airport was already there and are now upset by its operations. Others also mentioned that the roadway traffic in the area is due to the growth and development of local cities and not the airport itself.

Pilots and people affiliated with airport operations are excited for the update. A few mentioned the need for more hangar space. Many touted the great services the airport provides, including training and emergency operations.

Please see unedited open comments in the Appendix at the end of the document.

Demographics

The project team requested demographic information to understand who in the community had been reached with the online survey. All questions about demographics were optional.

Age

The majority of respondents were 65 and older (43%) and 45-64 (39%). 15% reported being between the age of 25-44 and 3% were 19-24. There was only one response from an individual 18 or under.

Race/Ethnicity

The majority of respondents identified their race/ethnicity as white (81%). This was followed by 7.5% reporting "Other" and 5% as "Unknown". 3% of individuals reported identifying as Asian or Asian American, 2% reported identifying as American Indian/Alaskan Native, 2% identified as Slavic/Eastern European, and 1% identified as Black or African American, Middle Easter/North African, or Latino/a/x or Hispanic. Slightly less than 1% identified as Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander. Of those who replied "Other" or "Unknown", several replied that they identified as American, Finnish, did not want to answer, or felt the question was irrelevant.

Languages spoken at home

The overwhelming majority of respondents reported speaking English at home (approximately 97%), with 6.5% reporting speaking Spanish. Less than one percent spoke Russian, and a few respondents spoke German, Dutch, Japanese, and American Sign Language.

ZIP codes

Respondents were asked for their ZIP code so the project team could have a better understanding of who answered the survey. This was a required question. The following ZIP codes were provided:

97070 (28%); 97002 (25%); 97013 (4.5%); 97068 (3%); 97351 (3%); 97045 (2.5%); 97132 (2%); 97032 (1%); 97223 (1%); 97038 (1%); 97035 (1%); 97124 (1%); 97034 (1%); 97140 (1%); 97224 (less than 1%); 97062 (less than 1%); 97008 (less than 1%); 97071 (less than 1%); 97239 (less than 1%); 97303 (less than 1%).

APPENDIX

Comments are unedited and organized alphabetically by first word.

A longer runway would likely bring freighters, which would run in the middle of the night. Jet engine emissions are smaller than those from Internal Combustion Engines and slip directly into the bloodstream causing far more damage. There is no maximum number of operations per day allowed and no night time restrictions in place.
Aircraft and helicopters need to abide by the regulations and guidelines for flying over Aurora especially the flight schools. These are particularly bothersome during the simmer.
Any expansion onto farmland would be DISGUSTING! If the rich want to fly, let them fly to PDX where there is an established major airport. I fully support Oregon's land use goals and support the protection of farmland. I hope any attempt to expand onto farmland will tie the airport up in lawsuits for DECADES! I will contribute all the money possible to OPPOSE ANY EXPANSION ONTO FARMLAND. We are supposed to be fighting global warming and need to dim down the use of private aircraft, not promote more air traffic!
Any master plan must include a noise abatement program as specified in OAR 340-035-0045(4) due to the fact that current operations cause noise impacts that are not being mitigated and this process would provide a mechanism to develop an enforceable plan rather than voluntary noise abatement procedures.
Any new restrictions on this airport will have a negative impact on the local economy. Local residents and local politicians have not done adequate research to determine the potential long-term costs of airport operation and infrastructure restrictions.
Any way to enforce flight paths into & out of airport? My neighbor has a plane at Aurora Airport. He follows the flight guidelines. The noise from the airport on rural neighbors should be important. Seems to not be addressed in current meetings.
As a 30-year resident of Wilsonville, there is a small, very-vocal group of anti-airport proponents whose approach is not one of compromise. As a tax-payer of City of Wilsonville, the city has YET to disclose how much money has been spent trying to stop any and all expansion by the airport. Many residents like myself see the major benefits to our local economy etc for airport expansion.
As a Charbonneau resident, my main concern is noise and toxic pollution from aircraft exhaust.
Aurora Airport has a positive impact on the economy in and around Oregon. It has also been there longer than any residential development and should be allowed to expand and be grand fathered in for any regulations
Aurora airport is an important element contributing to the economic health of the local community. It provides over 1000 direct jobs plus allows for convenient access for business activities of all kinds. The Aurora airport is strategically located to support access for private and business aircraft which in turn supports business activities throughout the greater Portland area. Further development of this airport will economically benefit the region.
Aurora airport provides many jobs to individuals in area. UAO has great services including training and FBOs which help bring in people traveling from other states and sometimes countries which helps the local economy. It is home to multiple construction company flight operations and EMS flight ops as well.
Aurora is a vital airport to the metropolitan area. As a reliever airport it allows local pilots and businesses to operate without the congestion, travel, and constraints of PDX. Portland has a great system with relievers on three of the compass points (Hillsboro, Troutdale, and Aurora) for non 121 operations to exist and thrive and receive the stress and capacity at PDX. reducing or eliminating Aurora would increase the strain (ground traffic, noise, congestion, capacity limits) at the other two and reduce safety at PDX by substantially increasing air traffic on the approach and departure corridors.
Aurora is very important as an alternate airport when you cannot make an approach into Salem. Also to pick up passengers from the Portland area.
Aurora State Airport provides extremely valuable service for me, as i am able to continue learning and rent planes there
Aurora State Airport provides local jobs, a base for emergency ops such as fire fighting, can act as an alternate airport in case of seismic events and deserves state and local support. I got my training and pilot's license here and wish to see it prosper.

But I thought this got approved in 2012? No? Oh, ok. What if we all pretended like it did, then got mad when it didn't?
CITY OF AURORA, IT'S UNIQUE HISTORIC NATURE IS THREATENED BY A BUSY AND NOISY AIRPORT THAT ENCROACHES ON THE QUIET VILLAGE ATMOSPHERE NEEDED FOR TOURISM ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND RESIDENTIAL VALUATIONS.
Concerned about the noise level of low flying aircraft over Wilsonville. Also, that a large commercial flight training operation could use this airport and would have many flights over and around the local area at all hours. This occurred in Redmond, Or, with constant training flights at all hours.
Concerned with sound and air pollution. Already hear many aircrafts, especially helicopters, on a regular basis. This area is beyond the pdx metro expansion boundary and the air space should also be maintained and preserved for the health of the animals, people, and plants that live here.
Concerns about noise for Wilsonville residents as a result of the proximity of the Aurora airport.
Continued improvements to KUAO will enhance safety for general aviation, commercial aviation and the importance of having an airport as an alternative to KPDX is critical for general aviation.
Currently we encounter low flying sound aircraft over Charbonneau that is not only bothersome but concerning due to their low altitude
Desperately need more GA hangars
Disappointed in how airport has communicated with nearby cities to date.
Don't make any changes. Enough noise and traffic in Charbonneu and on I-5 and surface streets.
DonT let this airport grow and destroy the country and noise free area we live. You let it get it grow it will be a bigger problem.
Don't lie and make us feel like we can have an impact on changes when we can't.
Each runway needs way more approach lighting. Right now runway 17 has approach lighting but higher minimums than 35 that only has a PAPI. This is because of trees and power lines on 17. 5+ times a year we are forced to land at PDX and stay there for days waiting for UAO weather to clear
Eliminate evening through early morning noise
Establishing green space and trees around the airport mitigates impact as nearby areas develop. / encroach.
Everybody that bought a home near the airport knew that the airport was there when they did so. There is already a minimum amount of hangar space in the area and the rental costs are absurd due to the lack of available spaces.
Excessive airport noise is already an issue (and we are a few miles away from the airport) that many people in the surrounding communities already object to.
Follow all rules and procedures to get the plan in play.
Follow the laws and rules. The 2011 process was shady and broke trust with this impacted residents.
Following the land use law is not optional, even for an agency supported by influential legislators.
hasn't this expansion been voted down? It feels like there is a lot more air traffic in the last year, I would hate for that to get worse
He planes are getting louder and bigger. We are directly in the flight path on the north side of the river and swear to god they are going to land on my roof!
Hours of operation should be limited. We have flights landing at 3 am.
How can the airport raise revenues for the city of aurora as it is the closest city most directly impacted by growth and development of the airport.
I am all for a runway extension and weight limit increase. In regards to the locals that are upset about their proximity to the airport, I would say they shouldn't have moved so close to an airport.
I am opposed to the runway extension allowing larger jets to operate. Worried that larger passenger/freight carrying jets will be allowed.
I am sure decision and policy makers will do whatever lines their pockets or gives them political power. I unfortunately have little confidence decisions and actions will be made in the best interest of the local community including farmers and growers. A political group or politicians will do what is in their own best interest politically, monetarily or selfishly.
I believe it is important to seek the input of the "silent majority" of airport users and benefactors to not give over reliance on the very vocal "nimby" groups.
I do not see Aurora serving scheduled passenger flights but it is/will be an important GA airport that supports and grows local business. As the area grows so will the importance of the airport.

I do not support expansion of the Aurora state Airport because of negative impacts on its local area: (1) it would take valuable agricultural land out of production; (2) it would create traffic on local roads that are already at capacity; (3) it would increase air pollution of toxic lead from additional general aviation and pollutants from jet fuel; (4) it would increase noise pollution, which is already exceeding tolerable levels.
I do not want the aurora airport to be expanded in any capacity. It will have a negative impact on the local residents and businesses
I earned several pilot certificates at the airport and have been flying there for 20 years
I have lived near the airport for decades. I have no issues at present with the current levels of traffic or noise. I live on Airport Rd in the city limits. I would like to see the city of Aurora and local district benefit from any increase in airport activity. I do feel that the city of Wilsonville gets too much say in what happens in Aurora/Marion County.
I have lived next to airport sense 1975. I'm concerned about my property values going down because of increased noise and loss of precious farmland and increased development.
I know Life Flight is a necessary and worthwhile entity but I don't see why they have to fly low and directly over Charbonneau when returning from a trip. They occasionally rattle our dishes.
I live in Wilsonville directly under the approach from the north landing to the south. I hear corporate jets flying over my home between 10PM and 6AM, sometimes around 3AM. This is extremely unfair to Wilsonville residents, like myself. Please don't allow jets to fly over Wilsonville between 10PM and 6AM.
I strongly oppose making the Aurora airport than it is. I oppose taking farm land to lengthen the runway. I oppose making the airport more jet-friendly for a number of reasons, including taking farmland to lengthen the runway, and noise pollution. I oppose bringing more traffic into a rural farm area to use an airport that was never intended for large aircraft or commercial flights.
I support the airport and potential expansion as it will provide needed economic growth for the area.
I support the growth and development of the airport as a vital part of the community.
I think it is a much needed growth opportunity
I think it is critical to respect the residential areas impacted by the noise of increased aircraft traffic
I would be more than happy to see the runway extended and allow larger business jets the ability to bring their business here. I do not want to see general aviation disappear from this field as they are the consistent customers. We need more hangar space for both types of aircraft that is affordable to both and facilities/ FBO willing to perform maintenance on future jet customers.
I would like to have consideration given to the neighbors in nearby communities regarding noise and increased traffic issues.
I'm concerned about the amount of increased flight traffic and how low jets need to be
If u going to expand the airport just say it.. why hiding your plan?... you guys could have finished what u want to do long time ago.
Improving the runway and approaches at the airport will do nothing but increase safety and bring revenue to the local area. It should not even be a question as to whether this should be approved or not. Let's get it done and make Aurora better!
It becomes increasingly clear what many proponents of the Aurora Airport want it to be. There were designs being shown with images of passengers - adults and children alike - watching from a 'passenger' lounge of sorts complete with luggage in hand. This one particular 'future representation' of growth at the airport was removed once neighbors started getting involved and showing their displeasure at the thought of additional larger jet traffic.
It would be a shame and a sizable economic impact if the airport were to close
Jet and helicopter noise is my major concern. In the 4 years I've lived here it has increase 5 fold. Some of the helicopters fly so low the windows rattle.
Jobs, safety, property rights & growing our local economy are important.
Just concerned about the added noise in the approaches to the airport from the South.
Keep reminding pilots about noise abatement procedures. We love our neighbors and want them to love us as well!
Keep up the good work.
KUAO is a wonderful airport that allows local residents a readily available venue to both learn to fly and to continue to fly. I learned to fly there and I plan on basing a plane there in the next year. Please allow this airport to continue to thrive.

Land use rulings and laws must be followed. The efforts by those who to stand to gain monetarily from airport expansion to circumvent legal rulings are reprehensible.
Long term use of Aurora must include the Port of Portland's changes to their three airports. Aurora's use and development has been driven by the space and market forces from PoP's planning, especially at Troutdale.
Longer runway = safe operations
Longer runways are safer. An ILS or the modern GPS/WAAS equivalent approach options would be great.
Many of the private corp jets are violating noise issues already, how do you plan to police/prevent this and is it budgeted for?
Mulino would be a great alternative airport for me if it was upgraded. That would relieve congestion at KUAO. The runway needs to be lengthened and widened and more T-hangers should be built. I would base out of there if improvements were made!
My only problem with noise is from late evening to early morning
My primary interest in Aurora Airport is as a base for training future pilots. The existing schools are well respected and develop many future commercial pilots - with a shortage of pilots predicted in the future, it is important to have ready access to training facilities in the metro area
My son and I received our Private Pilot certificates while training at Aurora Flight Training at the Aurora Airport. There are some things that need improvement, but most importantly, this airport is a great location to reach many other airports within the state of Oregon. We expect to earn additional training and look forward to growth at the Aurora airport, not more restrictions.
Need more T hangars for sale. All new hangars are for jets not for small GA aircraft.
Need to consider the impact on the existing nearby residential neighborhoods.
No current infrastructure. Against change in land use and more noise over nearby neighborhoods. Our roads CANNOT handle more traffic. The Boone bridge cannot handle increased traffic. Wilsonville cannot handle increased traffic. When we moved into Charbonneau we were told by airport people at a meeting that they would not fly over Charbonneau. That didn't last. Sometimes low helicopters shake my house.
No expansion of runway so larger and noisier, polluting Jets/Turbo Props and Jet Helicopters can become based there and make air traffic more congested over our residential neighborhoods
Nobody wants the noise, the environmental damage
Noise adversely effects people like myself who invested in RURAL LIVING to void noise and smog. Noise adversely effects the profits of existing chicken farms.
Obey the law. Control pollution from leaded aviation fuel and sulfur from jet engines. Explain how you'll handle the "forever chemicals. Overflights Consider the health, safety, and property values f your neighbors
People that buy or build a home near an airport have made the decision on their own. The airport was there first and they intentionally bought or built a home. If you do that then don't like your decision, move someplace other than by an airport. You have created a self-imposed situation and should not blame what has been in place long before you came along.
People who have lived in the area a long time and those who have recently moved to the area want a quiet neighborhood.
People who move in next to an airport shouldn't complain about aircraft noise.
Please don't allow the expansion of the runway, we already have to deal with too many operators that don't respect the low noise impact guidelines that are in effect today. Reports are sent to the Aurora mgr daily and nothing is done to stop the flyovers in our community. There is the Salem or Hillsboro airport that can handle the larger planes. Please don't let the influence of commercial interest fuel the need for expansion. They are interested in filling their pockets and not our community.
Please keep the airport small!
Please no godawful helicopter training schools. Incredibly annoying little bastards.
Please RESTRICT hours of operation and flight paths over residential neighborhoods. Please do NOT extend the runway to allow for big planes/jets.
Pollution of various sources (noise, light, waste) are obviously considerations and will contribute to the over-all livability in the area.
Proceed with the runway expansion!
Regional airports are great for suburban/exurban communities. The less we have to use PDX, the better.
Restaurant

Runway length improvement is critically important for safety!
Seriously in need of small hangars. The whole region seems to be restricted with multi-year wait lists for hangar space. Even a covered T-shade would be better than ramp parking.
Should consider a restaurant on the airport. Perhaps a nice restaurant would attract locals to come to the airport and maybe they would gain more appreciation for everything good the airport provides rather than just thinking about the noise.
Stop flight from 8pm to 8 am as those that live in the path are woken up at all hours by low flying flights 800 ft above us.
The addition of the RNAV 17 approach greatly improved the utility of KUAO
The airport has been there since 1943 and has become a needed facility in the greater Portland area for many businesses. It is also a needed emergency field in case of a catastrophic earthquake that causes severe damage to our infrastructure. And it is used for companies that fight the ever increasing wildfires in our area.
The airport is a mainstay of the local area, bringing business, tax basis, and emergency services to the Southern PDX region. Please allow the experts in aviation to inform direction with the field, not neighbors who are operating from uneducated fear. We all welcome opportunities to work with neighboring communities and educate on the safe operations of GA/Corporate aircraft.
The airport is a valuable asset to all surrounding communities and our area. Our business and our employees rely on this airport to succeed and grow. Scheduled air service should never happen at this airport but growing corporate aircraft is a good thing. Being neighborly and having well defined departure and arrival procedures to reduce community overflight and noise should be supported. KUAO is an asset that should be well funded, managed and supported by most all.
The airport is a vital economic engine for our region. If it is artificially constrained, it will hamper the economic growth of our region. Space is limited. The runway should be extended while we are able.
the airport is an integral part of the community it should be helped to keep it functioning in the highest manner.
The airport needs to work with Aurora.
The airport noise/traffic is too much. I feel people should move closer to pdx if they need an established airport w larger planes/jets.
The Aurora airport should be updated and modernized for future growth.
The coming and going of the jets is very loud late nights and early mornings. We need restrictions
The flight routes o er residential areas (Charbonneau) are already too loud and expansion would only increase the current level of aircraft noise.
The North residents need to understand that an extension of the runway will make flights higher over their property
The pissing match between proponents and opponents of Airport project are hurting it and public perception. Also have concerns that some airport property/business owners are trying to get taxpayers to fund projects for personal benefit.
The proponents of airport expansion have lacked transparency in the way they have operated for years. We need a truly open process.
The residents of this area are already impacted by this airport and further incursion into the area is not necessary.
The road traffic is already unbearable at certain times of the day. Moving farm equipment has become downright dangerous. Don't make things worse by expanding this tiny airport. Leave it small, or make it even smaller.
The runway needs to be lengthened... if ANY jet using UAO loses an engine on takeoff, VERY FEW of them will have enough pavement to stop, or, get airborne on one engine and clear the fence at the airport boundary
The Santa Monica Airport is one good example of an airport that became a community nuisance when too many jets were based there. Now the airport is being shut down.
The south end of the airport where the water runs under the Hubbard Rd. cutoff, and Boones Ferry Rd. (by Murray Rd.) just south of Keil, the little creek runs through our property. Never floods, but was wondering how much more water will flow through here if extension is approved. Some homes have their driveway over this little creek supported by a culvert.

The traffic mess on I-5 has nothing to do with the Aurora Airport and everything to do with Wilsonville. Just look at traffic on Google Maps each night.
There is a lack of affordable hangar space for small aircraft in the area. Many of the large hangers for business jets were built where small hangers once stood. We have a flying club here that cannot afford to keep their aircraft at the airport. These are people who work for good above average wage, can't afford an aircraft of their own and as a club cannot justify buying a large hanger. Even if they subleased the other space the price per month would be over double what it is at other local airports. KTTD and KHIO have more affordable small hangers. We need them here as well.
This airport already creates helicopter and low flying plane noise around our Wilsonville neighborhoods. I do not support growth and expansion of this airport.
This airport is a big business supporter for the local economies.
This airport should have expanded airport services/activity. It is still far enough from urban areas to warrant significant expansions without undue objections
This is a residential area with some agriculture property mixed in. The effects of a commercial airport would significantly impact the neighborhood in a very negative way.
This is an area in our already-limited agricultural Garden of Eden. Converting the mland around it from agricultural-only use is a HUGE mistake.
This is an important airport for the area for economic reasons.
This is an important airport for the area.
This master plan should balance the needs of the airport with the needs of the surrounding neighbors. It should not be skewed in favor of either side.
This project is like a never ending nightmare. We have said NO, over and over again. The northern willamette valley is the Nile of the West, pavement should displace our precious soil . The current infrastructure does not support added traffic and freight, there is already insane bottlenecking to the north and south lanes of I-5.
Traffic in the area is a HUGE issue, from Portland south on I-5 all the way through Hubbard. Should the airport expand in a way that leads to heavier use there needs to be serious investment in alleviating additional traffic impacts. Land conversion to extend the airport shouldn't happen; the Farmland laws are on the books for good reason. I'm all for improving what the airport currently provides, but extending the runway would lead to bigger and more aircraft, which means more noise, more impact to the local community. Dollars would be better spent improving the Salem airport.
Unnecessary runway extension will lead to larger jets and excessive noise over residential areas. It will have a negative impact on residential home values that are primary investments of the families living near airport traffic.
Upgrades, or improvements to the airport should be done with the consideration that the airport existed at a certain point in time serving a particular need or business. In other words it existed as ‘this’ type of aviation and expectations. Anybody complaining about the existing airport that existed at the time they became a resident is null and void. You knew what you were getting into, live with it. As for improvements and expansion, these need to be done with the area residents and business expectations at the time they became residents of the area. As in, it was a fairly busy general aviation airport and if something is done to expand than it shouldn’t be excessive to what residents could have reasonably expected for increased airport use.
Very important airport in the Tri County area
Voluntary Noise Abatement needs to be more than Voluntary. The Low flying jets are a safety hazard and well as a nuance the residential areas near KUAO
We are on a highly used approach corridor for PDX not terrible We are on a highly used helicopter corridor inc a route used on the National Guard in the middle of the night Saturday PM/Sunday AM Small planes inc private jets are common overhead I’m assuming most are flying to and from the Aurora Airport So bottom line that’s enough in this airspace but realize the area is growing so that’s why I checked the box I did Commercial jets would drive us out of here after 30 years
We believe it is imperative to no longer delay the safety improvement of the lengthened runway, especially when the only objections are based on a lack of knowledge or incorrect information.
We have been resident's of the area for over 16 yrs and the airport has not been an issue from the air traffic to vehicle traffic.

We like living near the airport. Kids enjoy watching planes and choppers. Please ensure adequate infrastructure to local residents and traffic considerations prior to airport expansion. Lay a good base down so the residents and local businesses are not negatively impacted when these projects begin.
What is the purpose of Question #3? Are the people taking the survey supposed to go to the Oregon Aviation Plan and look up the airport classifications and affirm that the Aurora State Airport has been classified as Category II?
when the tower at the airport was constructed we were told it was for safety, yet the tower closes at night and the planes still land. the airport has had a great safety record, the need to enlarge and take on a more commercial role is not need when Salem airport is so close as is Portland airport.
Whoever built a barn directly on the extended runway 17 centerline south of the airport seems to be trying to block a runway extension
Will our property taxes go up significantly?
yeah, I am tired of corporate jets flying over my home, some at treetop level (on video) at times morning, late afternoon, nighttime. There is no reason for the flight pattern
You need to comply with land use laws.

Public Survey #2 (July 2024)

AURORA STATE AIRPORT

PRELIMINARY ALTERNATIVES PUBLIC OUTREACH SUMMARY

Prepared for

Oregon Department of Aviation

Prepared by

JLA Public Involvement

July 18, 2024

CONTENTS

Preliminary Alternatives Public Outreach Summary 1
Overview 2
Open House 3
Advertising 3
Event Format 3
Verbal Comments 4
Survey and Other Feedback 5
Survey Responses 5
Dots at Open House 7
Emails 7
Appendix 1: Advertising 8
Appendix 2: Open House Materials 11
Appendix 3: Presentation and Display Boards 14
Appendix 4: Open House Staff in Attendance 20
Appendix 5: Public Survey Responses 21
Optional Demographic Information 30
Appendix 6: Dots at Open House 31
Appendix 7: Emailed Comments 32
Appendix 8: Scanned Open House Comment Forms 37

Overview

The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) requires airports to periodically update their Airport Master Plan to determine the facility's needs and ensure the airport's safety, efficiency, and sustainability while considering economic, environmental, and social considerations. The Airport Master Plan assesses the airport's current and future needs, while also considering external factors like land use, transportation, and economic development that may impact future plans and operations.

The project is currently in Phase 2: Explore Solutions. During this phase, the technical team and ODAV developed a range of preliminary alternatives that were reviewed and approved as feasible by FAA. These preliminary alternatives were shared with the Planning Advisory Committee (PAC) and community at a public event and through an online survey. Feedback from the PAC and community members will help the technical team and ODAV to refine the alternatives for a final decision on what is included in the Master Plan.

Below is a summary of the outreach completed during this phase, as well as the comments collected. The full set of comments are included in the Appendices.

Open House

The second Open House for the Aurora Airport Master Plan project was held in-person on June 13, 2024 at North Marion High School in Aurora, Oregon. The event ran from 4:00 pm – 7:00 pm, and approximately 120 people participated, including several PAC members (although not every attendee signed in).



Advertising

The event was advertised electronically to PAC members through email to distribute to the organizations, community groups, and government agencies that they represent, as well as through ODAV's email list serve. Postcards were mailed to 276 airport users, neighbors, and stakeholders located in Aurora, Wilsonville, Canby, Portland and other surrounding communities, and three newspaper articles were published in June 2024 in the Wilsonville Spokesman which advertised/discussed the event. Additionally, the City of Wilsonville mailed their own postcards advertising the meeting. See Appendix 1 for full information.

Event Format

The event provided an opportunity to collect verbal and written comments from the community, as well as share the preliminary alternatives and answer questions. Attendees dropped in throughout the three-hour event.



Aurora State Airport
AIRPORT MASTER PLAN

OREGON DEPARTMENT OF AVIATION

NOTICE OF A MEETING

Notice is hereby given that the Oregon Department of Aviation (ODAV) will hold a Planning Advisory Committee (PAC) Meeting on June 11 and Open House on June 13.

PAC Meeting #6: Tuesday, June 11
5:00pm – 8:00pm (Zoom Meeting)

Open House: Thursday, June 13
drop by between 4:00pm – 7:00pm
North Marion High School, Commons
20167 Grim Rd NE, Aurora, OR 97002
Light refreshments provided; children welcome
Tendremos interpretación en español en la reunión.
We will have Spanish interpretation at the meeting.

For Additional Information, Please Contact:
Alex Thomas
Planning & Programs Manager
Oregon Department of Aviation
Alex.R.Thomas@odav.oregon.gov

Special accommodations are available upon request (with 48 hours notice)

The PAC meeting will review the preliminary alternative concepts. Airport planning work products and registration links for the virtual PAC Meeting at: https://publicproject.net/AuroraAirport

The event was organized as follows:

- Upon arrival, staff at the welcome table informed attendees of the event logistics, asked them to sign-in, and provided a handout with the preliminary alternatives and a printed comment form with space to record comments/questions. See Appendix 2 for comment form and handout.
    - Staff also explained other ways to submit comments, including the online survey, email (Tony Beach, ODAV left a stack of business cards at the table), verbal comments to any staff that were present, on flipcharts stationed around the room, or through the project website.
- A presentation about the project played in a loop near the welcome table for attendees to view while they waited. See Appendix 3 for displays.
- After a small group of attendees had gathered, they were guided through a series of informational displays to allow participants to hear the information and ask specific, detailed questions about the project and preliminary alternatives.

- There were three stations which covered: Background and Context; Landside Alternatives; and Airside Alternatives. See Appendix 3 for displays.
    - Each station had two to four associated display boards that visually showed information and graphics about the project.
    - Staff from ODAV and Century West were stationed at the display boards to explain the project, answer questions, and address concerns. See Appendix 4 for staff list.
- Attendees were encouraged to complete a printed comment form or submit their comments through the online survey using the two electronic tablets at the comment table or with the QR code posted around the room; the same questions were asked in these formats. Snacks were also provided in this area. See Appendices 5-8 for comments collected.



Approximately 75 attendees arrived within thirty minutes of the event opening. Because of this, some participants stated that they felt rushed through the stations. Based on this feedback, staff shifted the format to accommodate more groups of attendees.

The project team ran out of printed surveys at the end of the open house (100 were printed/distributed at the event and 33 were submitted back to the project team at the event and 10 were returned by mail), but staff assisted several attendees in taking the survey using the electronic tablets that were provided. A few attendees didn't feel comfortable taking the electronic survey, so staff set up a dot exercise to collect comments; flip charts were also positioned around the room for staff to write down comments from attendees throughout the event. See Appendices 5-8 for comments collected.

Verbal Comments

Overall, most respondents were not in favor of key elements of the preliminary alternatives. A minority of participants were airport users, airport tenants, or local businesses who were supportive of the project.

- **Property Acquisition:** The majority of respondents were strongly against acquiring property for additional hangars and parking, with only a small number strongly supportive, somewhat supportive or undecided.
- **Runway Shifting:** Most respondents felt that neither shifting the runway east nor west would work well. Some preferred shifting the runway east, shifting Hubbard Highway west, or were unsure or needed more information.

- **Runway Extension:** A significant majority were strongly against extending the runway up to 497 feet, while a smaller group were strongly supportive.
- **Runway Extension Direction:** Most respondents felt that neither extending the runway north nor south would work well. While some preferred extending it south or north.

Several attendees were angry about the project and many expressed frustrations that the FAA had ruled out several alternatives[1]. Others were frustrated that the event ran out of printed surveys and some did not feel that they were given enough time to fill out the survey during the event.

Survey and Other Feedback

The public survey was open from June 12 through June 25, 2024 through the following venues:


- **Total survey responses:** 75 (Appendix 5)
    - **Paper surveys during the open house:** 33 (Appendix 8)
    - **Mailed surveys:** 10 (Appendix 8)
    - **Electronic survey responses:** 32
- **Dots on a large easel pad during the open house:** 10 (Appendix 6)
- **Emails:** 16 (Appendix 7)

This survey was conducted with self-selected members of the community and does not qualify as a scientifically valid survey that is representative of the community. Additionally, there were no restrictions on the submission of commenting in multiple ways (printed surveys, online surveys, or emailed comments).

Survey Responses

Not all questions were answered, so there is not a consistent number of responses for each question.

The majority of respondents (64) do not use the airport, while eleven people stated that they did.



The majority of respondents (47) were strongly unsupportive of property acquisition for additional hangars and parking. Ten responses were strongly supportive of property acquisition for this purpose, nine were somewhat supportive, four felt unsure or had no opinion, and three were somewhat supportive.


Most respondents (35) did not feel that either option would work well for realigning the Hubbard Highway to the west or the runway to the east. Sixteen felt that shifting the runway to the east was their preference, and fifteen felt that shifting Hubbard Highway to the west was a better solution. Eight respondents were unsure or felt they needed more information.

[1] A total of eight alternatives were posted to the project website on June 11, 2024. After additional consideration, the FAA determined that three alternatives were not feasible because they did not adequately address compliance with standards for current operations at the airport. These non-feasible alternatives were not presented at the June 13, 2024 event but remained posted to the website with an explanation of the change.

Most respondents (50) felt strongly unsupportive of extending the runway up to 497 feet. Fifteen respondents were strongly supportive of extending the runway to meet safety requirements. Four people felt both somewhat supportive and somewhat unsupportive, and one person was unsure or had no opinion.

Most respondents (42) felt that neither option for a runway extension (to the north or south) would work well. Twenty felt that extending the runway south was the best option while six felt north was best, and one was unsure or needed more information.

The high-level themes from the open-ended comments (Appendix 5 and Appendix 8) include:



Operational

- Extend the Aurora Control Tower operational hours longer through the night or 24 hours a day for better monitoring.
- Implement IFR-only approaches and departures.

Infrastructure and Expansion Concerns

- No additional hangar space is needed.
- Mixed opinions, but most were not in favor of extending the existing runway by approximately 500 feet or adding a new primary East/West runway.
    - Questions and concerns about the necessity and impact of expanding the runway.
    - Concerns about larger aircraft usage and increased traffic.
- Consideration of utilizing underused airports like McMinnville and Salem before expanding Aurora.

Noise Abatement and Environmental Impact

- Strong emphasis on enforcing current noise abatement rules on all departures and approaches.
    - Create robust noise abatement district. Use Orange County/John Wayne Airport as an example if needed.
- Concerns about increased noise levels affecting residential areas, especially Charbonneau and Wilsonville.
- Environmental considerations and concerns, including impacts on local wildlife and pollution.

Community and Economic Impact

- Suggestion of equalizing airport fees across multiple airports in the region.
- Addressing how expansion impacts the surrounding communities, public health, and local wildlife.
- Mixed community responses with some supporting expansion for economic growth and others opposing due to noise and traffic concerns.
- Importance of public engagement and clear communication regarding the project.

Safety and Regulation Compliance

- Concerns about the necessity of the runway extension.
- Addressing compliance with FAA regulations and monitoring pilot adherence to noise abatement and flight path guidelines.
- Concerns about the airport's impact on local traffic and infrastructure and how that would negatively affect the surrounding community.
- Ensuring the safety of current operations with potential runway extensions for better aircraft performance.

Public Involvement and Transparency

- Calls for extending the public comment period.
- Need for clear information on project timelines, costs, and the overall impact on local communities.
- Transparency in decision-making processes and consideration of community feedback in planning and implementation.

Dots at Open House

- Overall, nine people felt very unsupportive of ODAV buying property when at capacity for additional hangars and aircraft parking, and one person was strongly supportive.
- Nine people also felt that neither runway option would work well for Aurora Airport, with one person preferring shifting Hubbard Highway to the west.
- Nine were strongly unsupportive of extending the runway up to 497 feet to meet safety regulations, with one person strongly supportive of the extension.
- Nine also felt that neither runway extension option would work, with one person showing that they were unsure.

Emails

The majority of emails were unsupportive of changes to the airport or the preliminary alternatives.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1: ADVERTISING

The project team and ODAV announced the open house and survey in the following ways.

Date	Method	Content
05/10/24	Postcard mailed to 276 airport neighbors, users, and members of adjacent communities	Notice is hereby given that the Oregon Department of Aviation (ODAV) will hold an in-person Public Open House. **When**: June 13, 2024; drop in from 4 – 7 p.m. **Where**: In person event; North Marion High School, Commons (20167 Grim Rd NE, Aurora, OR 97002) This meeting will provide an opportunity for the community, neighbors, and interested parties to learn about the Airport Master Plan preliminary alternatives. For copies of the airport planning work documents, please visit: https://publicproject.net/AuroraAirport **Accessible Meeting Information** Special accommodations are available upon advanced request. Please contact Alex Thomas at least 48 hours prior to the event to discuss specific needs. For airport questions or project information, please contact Alex Thomas, ODAV Aviation Planner, through the following means: **Email**: Alex.R.THOMAS@odav.oregon.gov
05/09/24	Planning Advisory Committee (PAC) email	As representatives on the PAC, we encourage you to share this information with your members or wider community. We would like to have as many people as possible there to discuss the preliminary alternatives for the Aurora State Airport. We hope to see you there. Thursday, June 13, 2024 Drop by between 4:00-7:00 pm North Marion High School, Commons (20167 Grim Rd NE, Aurora, OR 97002) Light refreshments provided; children welcome Tendremos interpretación en español en la reunión. We will have Spanish interpretation at the meeting. This meeting will provide an opportunity for the neighbors, PAC members, and other interested community members to learn about the Airport Master Plan project. This meeting will present the preliminary alternatives for the Aurora State Airport Master Plan. All written and verbal comments collected during the open house will be included in the event Summary.
06/07/24	PAC email	Hello PAC members – We hope that you will share this with your community or group that you represent. We've also included a poster and postcard that you can share. Please reach out if you have any questions. We'd also greatly appreciate you sharing on any social media platforms that you have. Thank you! --- The Aurora State Airport Master Plan will host an open house to show preliminary design alternatives and hear feedback on what the future Aurora State Airport could look like in the future. This Open House will be held in

		person on Thursday, June 13, 2024, between 4:00-7:00 pm in the Commons of North Marion High School, (20167 Grim Rd NE, Aurora, OR 97002) Please share this information with your friends and neighbors! We would like to talk with as many people as possible and hear community feedback on the preliminary alternatives. If you can't make the event, don't worry! We'll post all the information on the website and have an online survey for you to provide your thoughts on the draft alternatives (open from June 11-21): https://publicproject.net/AuroraAirport
05/13/24	ODAV list serve email sent to 1,910 recipients (with an 8% *bounce rate*, for a total of 1,762 delivered)	NOTICE OF AN OPEN HOUSE FOR THE AURORA STATE AIRPORT Airport Master Plan Project We want to announce and invite you to our next public open house, which will be held in-person. We hope to see you there. Thursday, June 13, 2024 Drop by between 4:00-7:00 pm North Marion High School, Commons (20167 Grim Rd NE, Aurora, OR 97002) Light refreshments will be provided; children are welcome. Tendremos interpretación en español en la reunión. We will have Spanish interpretation at the meeting. This open house provides an opportunity for the neighbors, PAC members, and other interested community members to learn about the project, including the preliminary alternatives for the Aurora State Airport Master Plan. All written and verbal comments collected during the open house will be included in the event Summary. Thank you again for your continued interest in, and participation with, the Aurora State Airport Master Plan project.
	Project Website	05/07/24; event details posted on "meetings" page 05/28/24; updated with postcard on "meetings" page 06/7/24; updated with handout on "meetings" page 06/10/24; updated with survey link on "home" page and on "meetings" page

The following news articles were published before and after the event which referenced the public event.

Date	Media Outlet	Author	Headline/Sub-Header
03/20/24	Wilsonville Spokesman	Krista Kroiss	Public meetings for the Aurora Airport master plan are back The first Planning Advisory Committee meeting in over a year was held recently and highlighted the airport's aviation forecast.

06/07/24	Wilsonville Spokesman	Krista Kroiss	Oregon Department of Aviation to hold two Aurora Airport meetings Next week, the Oregon Department of Aviation will hold an advisory committee meeting and open house for the Aurora State Airport Master Plan.
06/13/24	Wilsonville Spokesman	Krista Kroiss	What could adjustments to the Aurora State Airport look like? Various preliminary alternatives for the airport were presented to an advisory committee for its next 20 year master plan.
06/14/24	Wilsonville Spokesman	Krista Kroiss	What are the concerns over the proposed Aurora Airport adjustments? At an open house, community members learned and expressed concerns about preliminary options for the Aurora State Airport

APPENDIX 2: OPEN HOUSE MATERIALS

Aurora Airport Master Plan – Public Feedback Survey

Development Alternatives Review

1. Do you use the Aurora State Airport? (circle one)

- Yes
- No

2. If yes, please explain how you use the Aurora State Airport:

_____

Do you agree or disagree with these statements? (Circle/check one)

3. How supportive are you of the Oregon Department of Aviation (ODAV) buying property to handle hangars or aircraft parking if the existing airport property is at capacity?

- Strongly support property acquisition for future hangars and aircraft parking needs.
- Somewhat supportive
- Unsure/No opinion
- Somewhat unsupportive
- Strongly unsupportive of property acquisition for additional hangars and parking.

4. There will be tradeoffs for any decision that ODAV makes in order to meet current Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) standards. One of the tradeoffs with the alternatives includes either realigning the Hubbard Highway to the west or shifting the runway to the east, which impacts the use of hangars, loss of apron space, and relocates the Air Traffic Control Tower (ATCT). If you had to choose between these two options, which do you feel would work best for the Aurora State Airport?

- Shifting Hubbard to the west
- Shifting the runway to the east
- Unsure/Need more information
- Do not think that either option would work well

5. One of the other things that ODAV needs to consider with the Airport Master Plan is meeting the current safety regulations (set by the FAA). Currently the Aurora Airport runway doesn't meet the justified runway length. How supportive are you of extending the runway up to 497 feet to meet the justified runway length?

- Strong Supportive of extending the runway to meet safety requirements
- Somewhat supportive
- Unsure/No opinion
- Somewhat unsupportive
- Strongly unsupportive of extending the runway to meet safety requirements

More on back →

Return this survey during the event or mail back to JLA / Attention Aurora Airport Master Plan / 123 NE 3rd Ave #210, Portland, OR 97232 before June 24, 2024.

6. As mentioned above, there are tradeoffs with the different alternatives. If you support a runway extension, would you prefer it be extended it to the north or south?

- North
- South
- Unsure/need more information
- Do not think that either option would work well

7. Please provide any additional feedback to help ODAV as they review the preliminary alternatives:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Optional demographic questions (not tied to survey responses)

8. What is your race/ethnicity? (check all that apply)

- African American/Black
- American Indian or Alaska Native
- Asian/Asian American
- Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish
- Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
- White
- Other (please explain):

_____


9. What is your zip code? _____

11. Would you like to join our email mailing list to get updates on this project? Yes or No

Name: _____ Phone: _____

Email: _____

Return this survey during the event or mail back to JLA / Attention Aurora Airport Master Plan / 123 NE 3rd Ave #210, Portland, OR 97232 before June 24, 2024.



Comments:

Primary Components:

- Commercial development with ADG II taxilane access, large FBO hangar, and vehicle access and parking.
- The apron adjacent to the ATCT is reconfigured to include two drive through large aircraft parking positions on the south end of the apron.
  - » Approximately three feet of the south edge of the taxilane object free area (TLOFA) for the drive through parking encroaches upon private property to the south. Coordination with adjacent property owner and/or an easement may be necessary for development .
- Remaining ATCT apron is reconfigured to provide small aircraft tiedown parking with ADG I wingtip spacing.
- Realigned taxilane west of current Aurora Flight School facility to allow additional small aircraft tiedown parking.
- Proposed apron reconfiguration to meet FAA standards results in a net decrease of five tiedowns compared to the current aircraft parking configuration.
- Two large helicopter (35-foot rotor) parking positions and one small helicopter (25-foot rotor) parking positions are added.
- Storage building east of Aurora Flight School is removed to accommodate additional hangars on north side of existing ADG I hangar taxilane.
- One multi-unit T-hangar is replaced with small condo-style box hangars.
- Reconfigured fence and vehicle access road (outside the fence access provided to Aurora Flight School facility).
- Additional hangars infill is proposed for all available lots on the Airport.
- Approximately 145,000 square feet of additional hangar space is proposed.
  - » Includes removal of 15,000 square feet of existing space and construction of 160,000 square feet of new space.
- Storm water retention area is identified east of ATCT apron.

Aurora State Airport


AIRPORT MASTER PLAN PRELIMINARY ALTERNATIVES

The preliminary alternatives were developed to facilitate discussions surrounding the "big questions" that will guide the Oregon Department of Aviation (ODAV) on how best to meet the facility requirements for Aurora State Airport in the 20-year planning period.

https://publicproject.net/auroraairport#



Airside Alternative 1 — Maintain C-II, Realign Hubbard Highway and Extend Runway North



Comments:


Primary Components:
- Realigns Hubbard Highway outside of Runway Object Free Area (ROFA). As proposed, the highway is shifted approximately 30 to 35 feet west, within existing ODOT-owned highway right-of-way.
  - Note: The roadway alignment depicted is for illustration only. Further study and coordination with ODOT will be required to identify final roadway alignment needed to clear/control ROFA.
- Maintains 100 feet runway width (C-II standard).
- Extends runway 497 feet to the north resulting in a total length of 5,500 feet.
- Extends parallel taxiway (Taxiway A) to the north with runway.
- Property acquisition is required to accommodate east sections of ROFA (northeast and southeast).
- Keil Road is realigned to the outside of the ROFA.
- Reconfigure/relocate existing TTF access taxiway connection at current north end of Taxiway A to remove direct runway access at that location.
  - Realigned TTF access to be coordinated with adjacent property owner.
- Install painted islands between Taxiway A and the adjacent southern TTF properties to address direct runway access and V/PD issues.

Issues Addressed by Alternative:
- Extends runway to justified length of 5,500 feet.
- Clears ROFA of existing public roads.
- Airport control of ROFA achieved through property acquisition.
- Addresses direct runway access and V/PD issues through pavement removal and painted islands.

Other Issues to be Addressed:
- Septic drainfield remains in south end of RSA.
  - Further study is required to relocate drainfield out of RSA.
- Wind cone and weather equipment (ASOS) remain in RSA and ROFA.
  - Further study is required to identify new locations for equipment.
- Existing incompatible land uses (Hubbard Highway, Keil Road, Boones Ferry Road and residential areas) remain in RPZs.

New Issues:
- New incompatible land use (Arndt Road) in Runway 17 RPZ.
- Septic drainfield located in north end of extended RSA.
  - Further study is required to relocate drainfield out of future RSA.


Landside Alternative 1B — Commercial Hangar and FBO Development with Reconfigured Flight School Apron and Vehicle Service Road



Comments:

Primary Components:
- Identical to Landside Alternative 1A with the following exceptions:
  - A north/south vehicle service road (VSR) is proposed to provide dedicated vehicle access from the north boundary of the landside area to the south boundary of the landside area.
  - The proposed five tiedowns west of Aurora Flight School, the three proposed helicopter parking positions, and six proposed tiedowns on the ATCT apron are omitted to create space for VSR.
  - Two additional tiedowns are proposed west of the large FBO hangar, on the west side of the VSR.
  - This configuration results in a net decrease of 13 tiedowns compared to the existing aircraft parking configuration.

Airside Alternative 3 — Maintain C-II, Shift Runway East, and Extend Runway North



Comments:


Primary Components:
- Shifts runway 84 feet east to bring west edge of ROFA onto Airport property.
- All runway and parallel taxiway surfaces (ROFA, RSA, OFZ, RPZ, etc.) are shifted east based on the shifted runway centerline location.
- ATCT and other aviation use facilities (fuel, helicopter parking, etc.) to be relocated outside of ROFA.
  - Further study is required to determine new locations.
- Maintains 100-foot runway width (C-II standard).
- Extends runway 497 feet to the north resulting in a total length of 5,500 feet.
- Extends parallel taxiway (Taxiway A) to the north with runway.
- All property within the shifted/extended ROFA not owned by the Airport to be acquired.
- Keil Road is realigned to the outside of the ROFA.
- Reconfigure/relocate existing TTF access taxiway connection at current north end of Taxiway A to remove direct runway access at that location.
  - Realigned TTF access to be coordinated with adjacent property owner.
- Install painted islands between shifted Taxiway A and the adjacent southern TTF properties, where feasible to address direct runway access and V/PD issues.

Issues Addressed by Alternative:
- Extends runway to justified length of 5,500 feet.
- Clears ROFA of existing public roads.
- Airport control of ROFA achieved through property acquisition.
- Direct runway access and V/PD issues to be addressed in redesign of Taxiway A.
- Wind cone and ASOS are no longer in ROFA or RSA.

Other Issues to be Addressed:
- Septic drainfield remains in south end of RSA.
  - Further study required to relocate drainfield out of RSA.
- Existing incompatible land uses (Hubbard Highway, Keil Road, Boones Ferry Road and residential areas) remain in RPZs; some mitigated by runway shift.

New Issues:
- ATCT must be relocated/reconstructed outside of ROFA.
- Atlantic Aviation fuel equipment to be relocated outside of ROFA.
- ROFA directly abuts hangar doors for south TTF properties.
- The septic drainfield is located in the north end of (extended) RSA.
  - Further study required to relocate drainfield out of future RSA.
- New incompatible land use (Arndt Road) in Runway 17 RPZ.
- Requires relocation/replacement or decommissioning of localizer navigational aid.

Airside Alternative 4 — Maintain C-II, Shift Runway East, and Extend Runway South



Comments:


Primary Components:
- Shift runway 84 feet east to bring west edge of ROFA onto Airport property.
- Extends runway 497 feet to the south resulting in a total length of 5,500 feet.
- Maintains 100-foot runway width (C-II standard).
- Extends parallel taxiway (Taxiway A) to the south with runway.
- All runway and parallel taxiway surfaces (ROFA, RSA, OFZ, RPZ, etc.) are shifted east with shifted runway centerline.
- ATCT and other aviation use facilities (fuel, helicopter parking, etc.) to be relocated outside of ROFA.
  - Further study is required to determine new locations.
- All property within the shifted/extended ROFA not owned by the Airport to be acquired.
- Keil Road is realigned to the outside of the existing and future ROFA.
- Reconfigure/relocate existing TTF access taxiway connection at current north end of Taxiway A to remove direct runway access at that location.
  - Realigned TTF access to be coordinated with adjacent property owner.
- Install painted islands between shifted Taxiway A and the adjacent southern TTF properties, where feasible to address direct runway access and V/PD issues.

Issues Addressed by Alternative:
- Extends runway to justified length of 5,500 feet.
- Clears ROFA of existing public roads.
- Airport control of ROFA achieved through property acquisition.
- Direct runway access and V/PD issues to be addressed in redesign of Taxiway A.
- Wind cone and ASOS are no longer in ROFA or RSA.

Other Issues to be Addressed:
- Septic drainfield remains in south end of RSA.
  - Further study required to relocate drainfield out of RSA.
- Existing incompatible land uses (Hubbard Highway, Keil Road, Boones Ferry Road and residential areas) remain in RPZs; some mitigated by runway shift.

New Issues:
- ATCT must be relocated/reconstructed outside of ROFA.
- Atlantic Aviation fuel equipment to be relocated outside of ROFA.
- ROFA directly abuts hangar doors for south TTF properties.
- Additional incompatible land uses (residential properties, and realigned Keil Road) enter Runway 35 RPZ.
- Requires relocation/replacement or decommissioning of localizer navigational aid (located at Runway 35 end).

Landside Alternative 1A — Commercial Hangar and FBO Development with Reconfigured Flight School Apron




Comments:

Primary Components:

- Commercial hangar development with ADG II taxilane access, large FBO hangar, vehicle access and parking.
- The existing apron south of proposed FBO hangar proposed as tenant lease in conjunction with main ADG II access taxilane shift.
- Reconfigured small airplane tiedown apron adjacent to ATCT to provide appropriate wingtip and meet ADG I taxilane object free area (TOFA) clearances.
- Proposed apron reconfiguration to meet FAA standards results in a net decrease of four small airplane tiedowns and one large aircraft drive through parking position compared to the current aircraft parking configuration.
- Two large helicopter (35-foot rotor) parking positions and one small helicopter (25-foot rotor) parking positions are added.
- Realigned taxilane west of current Aurora Flight School facility to accommodate five additional small airplane tiedowns.
- New apron at current flight school area.
- Reconfigured fence and vehicle access road (outside the fence access provided to Aurora Flight School facility).
- Additional hangar infill is proposed for all available lots on the Airport.
- Approximately 154,000 square feet of additional hangar space, as depicted.
- Storm water retention area is identified east of ATCT apron.

Airside Alternative 2 — Maintain C-II, Realign Hubbard Highway and Extend Runway South



Comments:

Primary Components:

- Realigns Hubbard Highway outside of Runway Object Free Area (ROFA). As proposed, the highway is shifted approximately 30 to 35 feet west, within existing ODOT-owned highway right-of-way.
  - Note: The roadway alignment depicted is for illustration only. Further study and coordination with ODOT will be required to identify the final roadway alignment needed to clear/control ROFA.
- Maintains 100-foot runway width (C-II standard).
- Extends runway 497 feet to the south resulting in a total length of 5,500 feet.
- Extends parallel taxiway (Taxiway A) to the south with runway.
- Property acquisition is required to accommodate east sections of ROFA (northeast and southeast).
- Keil Road is realigned to the outside of the existing and future ROFA.
- Reconfigure/relocate existing TTF access taxiway connection at current north end of Taxiway A to remove direct runway access at that location.
  - Realigned TTF access to be coordinated with adjacent property owner.
- Install painted islands between Taxiway A and the adjacent southern TTF properties to address direct runway access and V/PD issues.

Issues Addressed by Alternative:

- Extends runway to justified length of 5,500 feet.
- Clears ROFA of existing public roads.
- Airport control of ROFA achieved through property acquisition.
- Addresses direct runway access and V/PD issues through pavement removal and painted islands.

Other Issues to be Addressed:

- Septic drainfield remains in south end of RSA.
  - Further study is required to relocate drainfield out of RSA.
- Wind cone and weather equipment (ASOS) remain in RSA and ROFA.
  - Further study is required to identify new locations for equipment.
- Existing incompatible land uses (Hubbard Highway, Keil Road, Boones Ferry Road and residential areas) remain in RPZs.

New Issues:

- Additional incompatible land uses (residential properties, and realigned Keil Road) enter Runway 35 RPZ.
- Requires relocation/replacement or decommissioning of localizer navigational aid (located at Runway 35 end).

APPENDIX 3: PRESENTATION AND DISPLAY BOARDS

Hello
&WELCOME

Aurora State Airport
Airport Master Plan Project Open House





https://publicproject.net/auroraairport#

What is an
Airport Master Plan?

The Airport Master Plan (AMP) is required by the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) to maintain a safe and efficient airport that is economically, environmentally, and socially sustainable. The Airport Master Plan will also:

- Define the current, short-term and long-term needs of the Airport through a comprehensive evaluation of facilities, conditions and FAA airport planning and design standards.
- Look at what is happening around the airport that could affect the future plans, development and operation of the airport such as land use, transportation, environmental, economic development, etc.

Aurora State Airport (ODAV Property)



What exactly is (and isn't) an AMP?


The AMP is a plan for the future of the airport and it:

- Is developed or updated every 10-20 years (on average)
- Is used to review existing airport conditions and facilities
- Includes forecasts that determine future aviation and non-aviation needs
- Provides a "road map" for development while remaining adaptable to changing aviation industry conditions and requirements
- Guides airport improvements that are economically, environmentally, and socially sustainable
- Includes a planning-level budget for facility improvements
- Results in a visual representation (ALP) of proposed facility improvements

An Airport Master Plan is NOT a:

- Design/construction project
- Guarantee of a proposed project
- Environmental analysis
- County land use plan/action
- County transportation system plan (TSP)
- Mandated expansion of the Airport


Project Schedule



Preliminary Alternatives

AIRSIDE ALTERNATIVE 1

Maintain C-II, Realign Hubbard Highway and Extend Runway North



Issues Addressed by Alternative:

- Extends runway to justified length of 5,500 feet.
- Clears ROFA of existing public roads.
- Airport control of ROFA achieved through property acquisition.
- Addresses direct runway access and V/PD issues through pavement removal and painted islands.

Other Issues to be Addressed:


- Septic drainfield remains in south end of RSA.
  - Further study is required to relocate drainfield out of RSA.
- Wind cone and weather equipment (ASOS) remain in RSA and ROFA.
  - Further study is required to identify new locations for equipment.
- Existing incompatible land uses (Hubbard Highway, Keil Road, Boones Ferry Road and residential areas) remain in RPZs.

New Issues:

- New incompatible land use (Arndt Road) in Runway 17 RPZ.
- Septic drainfield located in north end of extended RSA.
  - Further study is required to relocate drainfield out of future RSA.

AIRSIDE ALTERNATIVE 2

Maintain C-II, Realign Hubbard Highway and Extend Runway South



Issues Addressed by Alternative:

- Extends runway to justified length of 5,500 feet.
- Clears ROFA of existing public roads.
- Airport control of ROFA achieved through property acquisition.
- Addresses direct runway access and V/PD issues through pavement removal and painted islands.

Other Issues to be Addressed:


- Septic drainfield remains in south end of RSA.
  - Further study is required to relocate drainfield out of RSA.
- Wind cone and weather equipment (ASOS) remain in RSA and ROFA.
  - Further study is required to identify new locations for equipment.
- Existing incompatible land uses (Hubbard Highway, Keil Road, Boones Ferry Road and residential areas) remain in RPZs.

New Issues:

- Additional incompatible land uses (residential properties, and realigned Keil Road) enter Runway 35 RPZ.
- Requires relocation/replacement or decommissioning of localizer navigational aid (located at Runway 35 end).

AIRSIDE ALTERNATIVE 4

Maintain C-II, Shift Runway East, and Extend Runway South



Issues Addressed by Alternative:

- Extends runway to justified length of 5,500 feet.
- Clears ROFA of existing public roads.
- Airport control of ROFA achieved through property acquisition.
- Direct runway access and V/PD issues to be addressed in redesign of Taxiway A.
- Wind cone and ASOS are no longer in ROFA or RSA.

Other Issues to be Addressed:


- Septic drainfield remains in south end of RSA.
  - Further study required to relocate drainfield out of RSA.
- Existing incompatible land uses (Hubbard Highway, Keil Road, Boones Ferry Road and residential areas) remain in RPZs; some mitigated by runway shift.

New Issues:

- ATCT must be relocated/reconstructed outside of ROFA.
- Atlantic Aviation fuel equipment to be relocated outside of ROFA.
- ROFA directly abuts hangar doors for south TTF properties.
- Additional incompatible land uses (residential properties, and realigned Keil Road) enter Runway 35 RPZ.
- Requires relocation/replacement or decommissioning of localizer navigational aid (located at Runway 35 end).

AIRSIDE ALTERNATIVE 3

Maintain C-II, Shift Runway East, and Extend Runway North



Issues Addressed by Alternative:

- Extends runway to justified length of 5,500 feet.
- Clears ROFA of existing public roads.
- Airport control of ROFA achieved through property acquisition.
- Direct runway access and V/PD issues to be addressed in redesign of Taxiway A.
- Wind cone and ASOS are no longer in ROFA or RSA.

Other Issues to be Addressed:


- Septic drainfield remains in south end of RSA.
  - Further study required to relocate drainfield out of RSA.
- Existing incompatible land uses (Hubbard Highway, Keil Road, Boones Ferry Road and residential areas) remain in RPZs; some mitigated by runway shift.

New Issues:

- ATCT must be relocated/reconstructed outside of ROFA.
- Atlantic Aviation fuel equipment to be relocated outside of ROFA.
- ROFA directly abuts hangar doors for south TTF properties.
- The septic drainfield is located in the north end of (extended) RSA.
  - Further study required to relocate drainfield out of future RSA.
- New incompatible land use (Arndt Road) in Runway 17 RPZ.
- Requires relocation/replacement or decommissioning of localizer navigational aid.

LANDSIDE ALTERNATIVE 1A

Commercial Hangar and FBO Development with Reconfigured Flight School Apron



Primary Components:

- Commercial hangar development with ADG II taxilane access, large FBO hangar, vehicle access and parking.
- The existing apron south of proposed FBO hangar proposed as tenant lease in conjunction with main ADG II access taxilane shift.
- Reconfigured small airplane tiedown apron adjacent to ATCT to provide appropriate wingtip and meet ADG I taxilane object free area (TOFA) clearances.
- Proposed apron reconfiguration to meet FAA standards results in a net decrease of four small airplane tiedowns and one large aircraft drive through parking position compared to the current aircraft parking configuration.
- Two large helicopter (35-foot rotor) parking positions and one small helicopter (25-foot rotor) parking positions are added.
- Realigned taxilane west of current Aurora Flight School facility to accommodate five additional small airplane tiedowns.
- New apron at current flight school area.
- Reconfigured fence and vehicle access road (outside the fence access provided to Aurora Flight School facility).
- Additional hangar infill is proposed for all available lots on the Airport.
- Approximately 154,000 square feet of additional hangar space, as depicted.
- Storm water retention area is identified east of ATCT apron.

LANDSIDE ALTERNATIVE 1B

Commercial Hangar and FBO Development with Reconfigured Flight School Apron and Vehicle Service Road




Primary Components:

- Identical to Landside Alternative 1A with the following exceptions:
  - A north/south vehicle service road (VSR) is proposed to provide dedicated vehicle access from the north boundary of the landside area to the south boundary of the landside area.
  - The proposed five tiedowns west of Aurora Flight School, the three proposed helicopter parking positions, and six proposed tiedowns on the ATCT apron are omitted to create space for VSR.
  - Two additional tiedowns are proposed west of the large FBO hangar, on the west side of the VSR.
  - This configuration results in a net decrease of 13 tiedowns compared to the existing aircraft parking configuration.

LANDSIDE ALTERNATIVE 2

Commercial Hangar and FBO Development with Reconfigured Flight School Apron and Vehicle Service Road



Primary Components:

- Commercial development with ADG II taxilane access, large FBO hangar, and vehicle access and parking.
- The apron adjacent to the ATCT is reconfigured to include two drive through large aircraft parking positions on the south end of the apron.
  - Approximately three feet of the south edge of the taxilane object free area (TLOFA) for the drive through parking encroaches upon private property to the south. Coordination with adjacent property owner and/or an easement may be necessary for development.
- Remaining ATCT apron is reconfigured to provide small aircraft tiedown parking with ADG I wingtip spacing.
- Realigned taxilane west of current Aurora Flight School facility to allow additional small aircraft tiedown parking.
- Proposed apron reconfiguration to meet FAA standards results in a net decrease of five tiedowns compared to the current aircraft parking configuration.
- Two large helicopter (35-foot rotor) parking positions and one small helicopter (25-foot rotor) parking positions are added.
- Storage building east of Aurora Flight School is removed to accommodate additional hangars on north side of existing ADG I hangar taxilane.
- One multi-unit T-hangar is replaced with small condo-style box hangars.
- Reconfigured fence and vehicle access road (outside the fence access provided to Aurora Flight School facility).
- Additional hangars infill is proposed for all available lots on the Airport.
- Approximately 145,000 square feet of additional hangar space is proposed.
  - Includes removal of 15,000 square feet of existing space and construction of 160,000 square feet of new space.
- Storm water retention area is identified east of ATCT apron.

Thank You

PLEASE TAKE A MOMENT AND SUBMIT A PUBLIC FEEDBACK FORM BY JUNE 23,2024

Project Website: https://publicproject.net/AuroraAirport

APPENDIX 4: OPEN HOUSE STAFF IN ATTENDANCE

Agency Representatives
Anthony Beach*, ODAV*
Brandon Pike*, ODAV*
Alex Thomas, *ODAV*
Tim House, *FAA*


Staff and Consultants
Matt Rogers, *Century West*
David Miller, *Century West*
Samantha Peterson, *Century West*
James Kirby*, Century West*
Mark Steele, *Century West*
Brandy Steffen*, JLA Public Involvement*
Stacy Zurcher*, JLA Public Involvement*
Tuyen Ta, *JLA Public Involvement*
Ashley Balsom, *JLA Public Involvement*

APPENDIX 5: PUBLIC SURVEY RESPONSES

The following data includes all surveys submitted electronically, through paper surveys at the open house, or returned by mail through June 23, 2024.

1. Do you use the Aurora State Airport?

There were **75 responses** to this question. The majority of respondents (64) do not use the airport, while eleven (11) people stated that they did.




2. Please explain how you use the Aurora State Airport.

The eleven (11) responses explaining how people used the airport included:

- Fly some business jets that are based at UAO
- Manage Aircraft
- Pilot, aircraft hangar renter
- Keep A/C at Willamette Aviation
- We own two hangars at Aurora
- We own several hangars at KUAO that we rent out
- Family flies in from Seattle on small plane
- As a base for an Embraer Phenom 300 business Aircraft I manage and crew
- Corporate jet lease/rental
- Flying in and out. Property owner
- SEACAP tenant


3. How supportive are you of the Oregon Department of Aviation (ODAV) buying property to handle hangars or aircraft parking if the existing airport property is at capacity?

There were seventy-three (73) total responses to this question. The majority of respondents (47) were strongly unsupportive of property acquisition for additional hangars and parking. Ten (10) responses were strongly supportive of property acquisition for this purpose, nine (9) were somewhat supportive, four (4) felt unsure or had no opinion, and three (3) were somewhat supportive.




4. There will be tradeoffs for any decision that ODAV makes in order to meet current Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) standards. One of the tradeoffs with the alternatives includes either realigning the Hubbard Highway to the west or shifting the runway to the east, which impacts the use of hangars, loss of apron space, and relocates the Air Traffic Control Tower (ATCT). If you had to choose between these two options, which do you feel would work best for the Aurora State Airport?

Of the seventy-four (74) responses to this question, most (35) did not feel that either option would work well. Sixteen (16) felt that shifting the runway to the east was their preference, and fifteen (15) felt that shifting Hubbard Highway to the west was a better solution. Eight (8) respondents were unsure or felt they needed more information.




5. One of the other things that ODAV needs to consider with the Airport Master Plan is meeting the current safety regulations (set by the FAA). Currently the Aurora Airport runway doesn't meet the justified runway length. How supportive are you of extending the runway up to 497 feet to meet the justified runway length?

There were seventy- four (74) responses to this question. Most respondents (50) felt strongly unsupportive of extending the runway up to 497 feet. Fifteen (15) respondents were strongly supportive of extending the runway to meet safety requirements. Four (4) people felt both somewhat supportive and somewhat unsupportive, and one (1) person was unsure or had no opinion.



6. As mentioned above, there are tradeoffs with the different alternatives. If you support a runway extension, would you prefer it be extended it to the north or south?

Of the sixty-nine (69) responses to this question, forty-two (42) people felt that neither option would work well. Twenty (20) felt that extending the runway south was the best option. Six (6) people felt north was best, and one (1) person was unsure or needed more information.



7. Please provide any additional feedback to help ODAV as they review the preliminary alternatives.

There were 62 total responses to this open-ended question. *Full responses are in the table below. Photos of handwritten comments from paper surveys are also available in Appendix 8, but are also included in this table for readability.*

SC #[2]	Comment
SC.1	1) Staff ATC and Aurora Tower 24/7 2) IFR only approaches and departures 3) No additional hangar space 4) Noise abatement protocols mandatory on all departures and approaches (see Orange County/John Wayne Airport) 5) Equalize all airport fees for Portland, Hillsboro, and Salem Eugene Corvallis, and Aurora *6) Add an East/West runway as PRIMARY
SC.2	A) Believe option to extend BOTH ends of the existing runway for extra 500' should be considered. B) Believe ODAV needs to consider how underused, under-capacity McMinnville and Salem Airports can be better utilized before expanding Aurora. C) A more robust noise abatement policy must be considered for surrounding residential neighborhoods.
SC.3	Current laws and regulations are not being abided by the FAA tower both on takeoff and arrival of aircraft; currently there is no monitoring of compliance with the tower's instructions. The tower closes too early and pilot are on UFR. They are not monitored and fly too low over Charbonneau, the neighboring homes, and Wilsonville.

[2] Survey Comment Number

	Extended hours on existing Tower should be made. A NOISE ABATEMENT district should be enacted. OC Airport has a policy that works!
SC.4	Noise from planes doesn't seem to follow guidelines. Greater activity will make that noise levels more difficult for homeowners and residents.
SC.5	The current noise abatement rules should be followed. Extend hours for traffic controllers.
SC.6	We hear planes at all hours of the day and night. No more hangars, no larger runway either!! No (runway extension), keep Aurora a small airport. Marked South, Unsure/need more information, and do north think either option would work well for runway extension. Smaller, commercial airplanes are constantly flying over our houses in Charbonneau at all hours of the day and night. Life flight and helicopters don't bother me much. Please don't enlarge the runway cuz that means more traffic over our house. PDX can easily handle more air traffic using the Columbia River.
SC.7	Don't use the airport but hear all the planes, at all hours of the night. More hangars mean more planes and more noise. Absolutely not under any circumstance (referencing runway extension). Marked south, unsure/need more information, and do not think either option would work for runway extension. Aurora Airport does not (need) to be enlarged in any capacity. The current # of small (probably commercial) planes are constantly flying over the Charbonneau neighborhood, which I was told was illegal. PDX is a much bigger airport and can handle all the air travel going up and out over the Columbia River. Please let us enjoy retirement in peace!!!
SC.8	The noise abatement rules are not now being followed. Insure that constant compliance is supported especially after midnight. These planes are only supporting a few and are adversely affecting thousands.
SC.9	Extending the runway for larger planes? ODAV should create a noise abatement plane particularly for planes flying (take-offs and landing) into residential areas at night and early morning.
SC.10	I am not in favor of any expansion. We already have planes flying over Charbonneau daily that don't follow the noise abatement guidelines. If current traffic can't be managed - no more traffic!! Controllers should ensure this. Controllers should be added to midnight. Charbonneau has about 2,100 residents - if you must extend do NOT go east or north.
SC.11	The runway is too short for the super midsize jets during winter when wet. I wouldn't be shocked if somebody finally screwed up and landed long, and plowed right across the road on the north side of the field.
SC.12	No need to expand the airport
SC.13	Aurora airport is a necessary aviation link in the overall Oregon growth and service plan for the Willamette Valley. As international businesses are drawn to the expanding metro area it is necessary to provide these businesses with the transportation system that best suits them. It's painfully obvious that ODOT has dropped the ball on surface transportation, let's not do the same to air transportation.

	I would like to see ODA extend the comment period by 14 days to allow me to better prepare my argument in favor of airport expansion.
SC.14	I support Aurora Airport expansion and would like to see it accomplished soon.
SC.15	The first question on the comment page makes no sense do I use the aurora state airport. Can the public get in? I drive by the airport everyday never seen a welcome sign for the public. I have seen that the sign by the traffic lights is broken someone should probably fix that. Provide information on how the expansion can impact public health. Information of how the expansion impacts wildlife health and environment hopefully provided by certified wildlife biologist. How would the expansion benefit surrounding communities. How much profit will the airport and other partnerships be making from this expansion? Will this profit be shared with surrounding communities that will be impacted by the expansion. How will the traffic look during the expansion. The airport is surrounded by small/big communities we already hear the aircrafts at all times. If the small aircrafts make a lot of noise how will the big ones differ? Why can't the bigger aircrafts go to another airport that is equipped with the safety standards.
SC.16	There has been a steady decline in small Portland area runways over the years, since I was young and used to fly small planes. Now is the time to build an extended runway, while there is still inexpensive farmland nearby and Portland METRO hasn't taken over. It is good for the local economy combined with some high teck companies already located in Wilsonville.
SC.17	I am against any type of expansion of the Aurora Airport. Not only will it cause noise pollution but it will also cause more traffic which the roads in and around Aurora and surrounding cities can't handle.
SC.18	I am a 10 year Charbonneau resident. Som people have wanted more commercial opportunities in the area e.g. golf course sells property to Amazon, thus needing larger aircraft. City of Wilsonville tells residents the airport wants a longer runway to accommodate size/weight class no currently used. Who is correct?
SC.19	Regarding #5, how is "justified runway length" defined? No option shows a north end run-up apron. I will vote against any "option" that does not include a north end run-up area.
SC.20	No expansion!
SC.21	The airport should return to light A/C use. This "meeting" has lots of info available to take in however we were told 2x to move along. I had questions and was told to come back when it was less crowded - the line up of people was backing up. One "worker" commented to another that too many people showed up. I feel like I could have learned something but didn't. Was this just an exercise to say you had a meeting but w/o caring that the public was pushed through and left feeling our comments don't matter? I asked if survey has been done on traffic increase on Airport Road and was told "I have no idea." No options I saw included a N runup area but wasn't able to ask about it as line had to keep moving. As an Aurora citizen I am concerned about water/sewer needs of additional buildings and how it will impact our

	system. I overheard one "worker" tell a lady lengthening the runway will make it safer but will not increase the number of A/C takeoffs/landings at all - so not true!
SC.22	Do not want at all. No big planes coming in.
SC.23	Airport should its closest size and operation. No Aurora Airport expansion.
SC.24	I support moving the runway either into the existing space to realign the highway - although I'm not sure what re-aligning the highway will do to existing development. I strongly oppose extending the length of the runway. it will increase use and noise, and air pollution.
SC.25	Because of noise pollution and the added traffic, I'm completely against this.
SC.26	Timeline no clear. Costs to accomplish what?
SC.27	I am against any expansion that facilitates or allows more or larger aircraft to land or take off. My home is in the flight path, and we are VERY concerned with any increase in flight traffic, noise, pollution, etc.
SC.28	Want the Aurora Airport closed. Want C-II designation removed. No extension. Remove C-11 designation and go to only small general aviation...OR terminate license and eliminate airport!!
SC.29	Keep it with small planes! Don't want big ones flying over my house. Just illuminate airport and that takes care of problem. People in the area needed to have more say in this!
SC.30	Currently jets coming in all hours low is very disruptive. Air traffic has increased 10 fold since moving here 5 years ago.
SC.31	How many accidents have been caused by the runway being too short? How is vehicular traffic affected. Noise levels around airport continue to increase.
SC.32	Why was the airport "stay the way it is" taken off the menu? Why don't you punish the ones who violate the rules? What difference does (being involved) make when money decides everything?
SC.33	Count the actual number of planes daily using the runway. DO not use projections. Make the Aurora Airport tower a 24 hour tower. Reduce C-II planes flying into Aurora. Have pilots adhere to the FAA rules and regulations to NOT fly over housing developments, to not buzz houses and trees that are 3+ miles from the airport, with polluted exhaust. Fly over I-5 and not Airport Way.
SC.34	Do not support a runway extension. We are frustrated with the lack of participation of the "volunteer noise abatement." We can only imagine what it would be like when larger planes start landing at Aurora.
SC.35	NO EXPANSION PERIOD! Any of your proposals DO NOT! include noise abatement. The volunteer program is not working/we need designated noise sensitive zones! Period. We want to plead for Alternative #7 be recommended. No others are acceptable.
SC.36	Add to question 5 - Airport should be limited to comply with current safety regulations.
SC.37	Question 5 is backward; Aircraft use should be limited to safety standards applicable to the existing runway and facility.
SC.38	Let us have a regional airline at Aurora.

SC.39	The noise abatement policy is poorly attended to. Who holds pilots accountable if the could safely divert to the east or west rather than fly over Charbonneau, and they don't? Would like to be a good neighbor and support your airport business, but there has been no evidence from airport management that they will also be a good neighbor!
SC.40	Resident in Charbonneau. Noise abatement procedures are ignored by the majority of the pilots. I have two grown children who are pilots - I reviewed the issues with them to get their input. They both laughed and said that if the runway is expended that then the pilots with larger planes will just come in and lane - landing light on fuel if needed. Documenting larger aircraft will simply result in a need to increase the classification again. We want to be good neighbors but don't see evidence of that effort on the part of the airport management group. It's all about increasing fuel sales and hangar spaces to rent. This does nothing positive for the area except to increase profit to a small number of people. It also increases traffic congestion in the already vulnerable area that has increasing car accidents. If the only safe alternative is to expand the runway then I would support the expansion to the south.
SC.41	It's fine the way it is (the runway)! I am concerned with pollution and the extension of the airport to support larger planes, like jets. I would rather keep it as a small for private propeller planes as it always has been. I don't want it to be a regional airport for passenger planes, like Hillsboro or something like that. I live very near the airport and I am concerned with a possible airplane crash or the pollution That airplanes put out when taking off or landing. AV gas has lead in it, and most all small places use it.
SC.42	Use the Salem Airport - leave Aurora as is. We support the safety improvements but not the extension of the runway that would support larger aircraft using the airport. It is unclear what tax burden this would have on residential property. Current traffic and noise level is high and we are concerned the noise level will increase. Why is there a "no runway extension" alternative presented? We believe there is an unstated objective of increasing traffic and larger aircraft - we strongly disagree with an objective of increasing the airport to support larger aircraft!
SC.43	We live in Charbonneau. Already experiencing many low flyovers. Do not support runway extension - increased # of flights of larger aircraft. Traffic congestion on small roads around airport. Airport Rd. and Miley Rd. not safe currently worried about appropriating agriculture land to expand the airport. Concerned about environmental impact.
SC.44	I do not support making changes to the airport.
SC.45	I live in the southwest corner of Charbonneau and the large planes are very loud - we have to pause our conversations until the noise is over. I'm not against airports but I don't see the benefit of the large planes. Does the airport have any benefit to locals? All I hear is the noise, potential crash, or dumping of fuel. Nothing positive,
SC.46	Airplanes and jet noise is to loud right now. Do not need bigger jet louder noises from in and out bound planes and jets. Noise level is to loud right now. Pilots have no respect for residents. Fly to low over homes. If this change is enforce on the residents. Then we who live around it should be compensated.
SC.47	We live at Charbonneau. Extending to the South is the only alternative we would like.
SC.48	I live close to the airport. Larger aircraft and/or more frequents would be very disruptive to my quiet living space.

SC.49	I do not agree that a longer runway is needed. I have not seen enough evidence to even come close to justifying the extremely high investment of public funds at this airport.
SC.50	I have airplanes jets and helicopters flying over my house at all hours of the day and night. How will increasing air traffic benefit me and my neighbors who do not own private aircraft and who do not fly out of this airport?
SC.51	I believe the runway length increase is critical (and should be to 6000 ft as planned since 1976) but that the direction decision should be based on whichever works the best considering cost, feasibility, and land footprint. ODAV acquiring the acre abutting the Southwest corner of their landside parcel would make a significant improvement in ODAV ramp space, as well as largely benefiting Aircraft and vehicle access and movement.
SC.52	In discussion with Mr. Bishop and with FAA personnel at the meeting June 13th I was told that a detached threshold at either or both ends of the existing runway was not going to be an alternative. The effective lengthening of the runway for take off and departure abort would make the airport safer for aircraft of current size and weight and have a positive effect on noise over private property as aircraft would achieve a higher altitude quicker upon departure. I was told by FAA personnel that the detached thresholds would not meet FAA standards and no further clarification was available. If The Object Free Zone must be addressed then the moving of the highway would bring the airport into compliance. No additional extension, moving, widening, or hardening of the runway would be required. I believe this alternative would enhance airport safety, move further towards compliance with FAA requirements, not require moving the recently installed tower, and not compromise the area directly adjacent to the new, large hangars on private property. At the same time reducing the noise from departure aircraft over the community. This alternative deserves discussion and serious consideration, unless the ultimate goal is further lengthening, widening, and hardening of the runway expressly to accommodate yet larger, wider, and heavier commercial aircraft into our small community. The residents are firmly opposed to that type of illegal expansion considering the EFU designation of the adjacent land and current level of noise and pollution we experience daily.
SC.53	Enduring aircraft safety is of primary concern. Living in Wilsonville the amount of audible air traffic above is limited and does not affect day to day life.
SC.54	Concerned about water drainage from the extension if it happens. There is a little creek that goes from the field to the South of Keil. It goes under the highway and goes under Boones Ferry Rd. It could flood and ruin property at the West of Boones Ferry Rd. Murray Rd. goes over the culvert to 2 Homes. Flooding could wash out the culvert. Cause damage to peoples homes.
SC.55	Where are the other plans, specifically #7, and why were they suddenly dropped without notice?
SC.56	Wilsonville residents will be most affected by expanding the airport, how do Wilsonville citizens benefit from this enlargement? It is quite obvious that they don't. Deep pockets and greed should not be allowed to ruin our community. I will never stop fighting against this recklessness.
SC.57	There is not a good reason to expand the airport. IF the runway is not long enough how can they be flying airplanes out?

	It seems that you are more concerned with a money making fuel station than you are for any of the surrounding communities.
SC.58	I prefer no airport expansion.
SC.59	Nothing presented here seems like a win for the community as a whole.
SC.60	We are opposed to expanding the airport. We live in Wilsonville, and are concerned about additional noise and pollution. Based on the city of Wilsonville's analysis, the expansions are not needed. Please don't degrade our quality of life.
SC.61	This safety extension needs to be completed soon.
SC.62	Comment about the fleet mix: Did anyone take into consideration the number of aircraft that cannot use the airport due to the weight restrictions of the runway (Gulfstreams/Globals)? The runway weight was reduced to extend it's life, effectively eliminating any larger aircraft from using the airport which would skew the fleet mix. ODAV must have data on waiver requests over the years - approved, not approved or not responded to. Considering the aircraft that cannot use the airport, along with waiver request data, the fleet mix would show a higher number of larger aircraft using the airport which would possibly support a 6,000 foot runway rather than 5,500.

Below: Comments from City of Wilsonville.

Of the original draft set of seven Master Plan "airside alternatives," only Alternative 7 maintains most of the Airport's current layout and footprint:

WILSONVILLE OREGON

■ **Retains current runway length (5,003 feet)** and existing vast majority B-II class of aircraft standards rather than planning for a longer, strengthened runway that accommodates larger, heavier C-I, C-II and larger class of aircraft.

■ **Protects the important local agricultural economy:** Keil Road, a key access for local farmers, is not impacted by Alternative 7. Additionally, by restraining Airport expansion, speculative real-estate pressures that increase farmland rental costs are reduced, and help to keep farming economical in Oregon's bread-basket of French Prairie.

■ **Reduces land-use conflicts:** Existing Airport septic drain fields, wind cones, and weather equipment do not conflict with layout. Wilsonville-Hubbard Highway 551, Keil Road, Boones Ferry Road and nearby residential areas do not conflict with the Runway Protection Zone (RPZ). Alternatives 1-4 all propose Airport expansion that negatively impacts ag operations.

■ **Increases safety** by limiting runway access for pedestrians and vehicles and preventing over-weight/over-sized aircraft that can hold more fuel.

HOWEVER, Neither Alternative 7 nor any of the other draft alternatives in the draft Master Plan address any land-use, surface transportation, pollution and other issues of concern to area constituents:

• **Poor quality roads** in the Airport area vicinity are unimproved county roads with no shoulders or sidewalks, narrow lanes and deep ditches – no improvements are proposed by the Master Plan.

• **Negative impacts to the farming-based agricultural economy** due to Airport expansion and speculative real-estate deals near the Airport are not addressed.

• **No mitigation methods for low-flying overflights and loud aircraft noise** that negatively impact homeowner real-estate values and area residents' quality-of-life are presented in the Master Plan.

• **Pollution from fuel, sewage, stormwater and PFAS forever chemicals** generated by Airport users is disregarded, as are negative impacts to salmon-bearing streams near Airport.

• **Impacts from increasing Climate Change greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions** due to money-making Oregon Department of Aviation fuel sales at Aurora State Airport are disregarded.

• **Oregon Department of Geology and Mineral Industries (DOGAMI) data shows that the Aurora State Airport is located in an area subject to major potential damage in a projected 9.0 Cascadia Subduction Zone Earthquake.** Airport area soils are prone to shaking and liquefaction during major earthquake, resulting in runway broken-apart into many sections and unserviceable for a long period of time. Only helicopters, which don't need a runway, will be able to operate for months or years after the Big One.

For more information: www.ci.wilsonville.or.us/asa

FAA tells public three Alternatives that maintain current layout of Airport accommodating majority of Airport users "Will Not Be Considered Further":

WILSONVILLE OREGON



Change to B-II, Shift Runway North, and Maintain Current Length


The 'System of Airports' around Aurora State Airport

How does the Aurora State Airport fit in with other airports in the area? Does it make sense to spend millions on expanding Aurora, when so many other airports are operating far below past levels? The Master Plan makes no attempt to conduct an analysis. In the interest of safety, should we keep larger private jets with heavy fuel loads at the safest possible airport, PDX, where highest level fire services are provided 24/7 on-airport?

Airport	Direction & Distance from KUAO	Runway dimensions (largest)	Weight Capacity (single gear)	Fire & Rescue	TAF data avg daily Total Ops (peak year)	ATADS data 2019: avg daily Total Ops	ATADS data 2023: avg daily Total Ops	ATADS data % local Ops	ATADS data 2023 vs peak year
Aurora (KUAO)	–	5,003ft x 100ft	30,000 lbs	no ARFF Index	286 (2013)	172	173	46%	-40%
Portland International (KPDX)	22nm NNE	11,000ft x 200ft	200,000 lbs	ARFF Index E	898 (1997)	653	521	1%	-42%
Hillsboro (KHIO)	19nm NW	6,600ft x 150ft	50,000 lbs	no ARFF Index	714 (2008)	422	503	64%	-30%
Salem (KSLE)	23nm SW	5,811ft x 150ft	105,000 lbs	ARFF Index B	272 (2007)	108	121	41%	-56%
McMinnville (KMMV)	16nm W	5,420ft x 100ft	40,000 lbs	no ARFF Index	213 (2007)	noATC, no count	noATC, no count	??	
Troutdale (KTTD)	24nm NE	5,399ft x 150ft	19,000 lbs	no ARFF Index	367 (2018)	267	287	72%	-22%
Eugene (KEUG)	70nm SSW	8,009ft x 150ft	120,000 lbs	ARFF Index C	443 (1991)	172	159	32%	-64%

ARFF: Aircraft Rescue & Fire Fighting Index ranges from 'A' to 'E'; PDX has the highest ARFF Index, to handle accidents for the largest aircraft.
ATADS & TAF are two FAA databases; ATADS provides precise operational counts for each of 500+ U.S. airports with ATC (air traffic control tower); TAF is Terminal Area Forecast and provides past annual operations totals and future projected ops levels for each of nearly 4,000 U.S. airports.
Weight Bearing Capacity is an important metric, to define which aircraft can safely and sustainably use a runway. When an airport authority allows uses by larger and overweight aircraft, the runway surface is rapidly degraded, which reduces safety.

For more information: www.ci.wilsonville.or.us/asa



ASA MP Operations Data Analysis by Type of Aircraft

TABLE 3-7: AURORA STATE AIRPORT INSTRUMENT FLIGHT OPERATIONS

	TFMSC IFR Operations by AAC/ADG - Calendar Year Data									Average Annual Operations		
AAC/ADG	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021		
A-I	2,372	2,638	2,414	2,482	2,750	2,750	3,428	2,458	2,162	2,330	2,578	28.0%
A-II	410	494	1,108	1,554	1,814	1,966	1,844	1,158	930	1,398	1,268	13.8%
A-III	14	6	2	4	4	10	6	2	0	4	5	0.1%
A-IV	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
B-I	1,498	1,368	1,422	1,194	1,198	1,126	1,134	1,190	1,024	1,154	1,231	13.4%
B-II	2,222	2,232	2,214	2,620	3,270	3,110	3,152	3,798	3,448	4,182	3,025	32.8%
B-III	0	0	0	2	0	2	4	8	2	0	2	0.0%
B-IV	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
C-I	360	374	514	440	340	306	274	286	170	274	334	3.6%
C-II	348	378	294	208	316	370	358	226	242	264	300	3.3%
C-III	18	10	4	8	0	14	50	54	10	0	17	0.2%
C-IV	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
C-V	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
D-I	2	8	16	0	4	6	8	4	0	12	6	0.1%
D-II	4	0	4	0	2	6	2	8	26	84	14	0.2%
D-III	6	10	4	2	6	8	4	0	4	6	5	0.1%
D-IV	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
D-V	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Unknown	446	390	380	388	504	376	366	472	442	572	434	4.7%
Total	7,700	7,908	8,376	8,902	10,208	10,050	10,630	9,644	8,460	10,280	9,218	100.0%
Operations by AAC C and D Aircraft	738	780	836	658	668	710	696	578	452	680	676	
Operations by ADG II and Larger	3,022	3,130	3,630	4,398	5,412	5,486	5,420	5,254	4,662	5,938	4,635	

87.9%

7.3%

Source: FAA TFMSC Report - 4/04/2022 (Aurora State Airport)

Comparing the latest 2021 Operations data with the 10-year Average Annual Operations data reveals the following:


- The most active class of aircraft accounting for largest share of operations at 33%, B-II aircraft totaled 2,066 ops in 2021, *45% over the average.*
- The second most active group, C-I aircraft, totaled 252 ops in 2021, *23% below the average.*
- The third most active group, C-II aircraft, totaled 218 ops in 2021, *52% below the average.*
- The fastest growing group, D-II aircraft, totaled 80 ops in 2021, *515% above the average.* These flights were mostly Gulfstream IV (GLF4) jets, topping out at ~74,000 pounds.

CONCLUSION: Aurora State Airport is a B-II dominated airport with C-I and C-II declining, but D-II use exploding. However, the FAA and ODAV insist that Airport is classified as C-II.

The data also shows that B-II and smaller aircraft compose 87.9% of Airport's Average Annual Operations, while C-I and larger aircraft make-up just 7.3% of all operations.

It appears the 'tail is wagging the dog': the smallest portion of Aircraft (7.3%) that are the largest size are dictating to the vast majority 87.9% of Airport users that the Airport should be expanded.

This data also indicates that airport authority Oregon Dept. of Aviation (ODAV) is willing to allow use of the Aurora State Airport runway by larger and overweight aircraft (C-I and larger), with a tradeoff that these aircraft generate huge fuel flowage revenues to ODAV due to aircraft large fuel capacities. However, public safety is jeopardized and Airport runway maintenance costs increased when larger Aircraft are allowed to use Airport that is currently violating FAA safety requirements.



We like the Aurora State Airport the way it is!

Let's keep it that way with No expansion!

WILSONVILLE OREGON

Oregon Department of Aviation's 6 of 7 Preliminary Alternatives for new Draft Aurora State Airport Master Plan propose to:

■ **Expand the Airport's direct impact on neighboring communities** with a longer runway for bigger airplanes, taking private property. *The Master Plan ignores significant problems with low-flying overflights and noise, increased traffic, sewage, pollution, climate change, farm impacts, underground fuel storage, uncertain firefighting capacity and earthquake-prone soils.*

■ **Extend the Airport runway by approximately 500 feet to 5,500 feet to allow larger, heavier aircraft to land and take-off with more fuel.** *The main revenue source for Oregon Department of Aviation is a tax on aviation fuel; so more fuel sales means more $ money $ for government agency, despite negative impacts to residents, farmers, environment and climate change.*

■ **Ignore 9 years' worth of actual Airport control tower flight operations data to project future Airport growth**. Rather than use actual Airport operations data or the standard "FAA Oregon Federal Contract Tower Terminal Area Forecast (TAF) Model," the Draft Master Plan uses inflated population growth projections of Clackamas and Marion Counties to determine future Airport growth. *Oregon Department of Aviation is using a dubious methodology that inexplicably equates population growth with increasing flights at Airport — a false correlation between general population growth of counties and Airport without passenger air service.*

The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA)-approved Oregon Department of Aviation's Airport Operations Forecast is 50% greater than the standard FAA Oregon contract tower forecast. The "Marion and Clackamas County Combined Population Growth Model" projects annual operations to increase by 0.9% per year, whereas the "Oregon Federal Contract Tower TAF Model" estimates 0.6% annual growth rate.

■ **Deprive citizens of the right to appeal the FAA Airport Operations Forecast that calls for expansion**. Oregon Department of Aviation asserts that the Airport Operations Forecast is not appealable. *By preventing public challenge, federal and state aviation agencies appear to do as they please without being answerable to citizens.*

■ **FAA is now telling the public that a "No Action" Alternative is Not allowable and only Airport expansion can occur since Airport is violating too many air safety requirements.** *Without an apparent basis in law, federal agency now appears to have put the fix in for larger Airport and to disregard public feedback.*

■ **FAA and Oregon Department of Aviation disregard Airport operations data that shows decrease over time in larger, heavier C-I and C-II aircraft, and that smaller, lighter B-II and smaller aircraft are the vast majority of Airport users.** *Government agencies appear to collude on backroom deals that provide wealthy developers with more tax-payer funded subsidies.*

■ **Disregard that other nearby airports** (Hillsboro, PDX, Salem, McMinnville) **with over 5,000-foot runways are underutilized** and would welcome additional based aircraft and operations.

For more information: www.ci.wilsonville.or.us/asa

Optional Demographic Information

This information was optional and used to see who was heard from in the community, and who the project team still needs to reach out to. It was not tied to names or survey responses.

8. What is your race/ethnicity? (check all that apply)

There were fifty-three (53) responses to this question. The overwhelming **majority identified as white (91%).** Two people chose "other", with one person questioning why this question mattered. One person each identified as American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian/Asian American, and Hispanic/Latino/Spanish.

9. What is your age?


There were 30 responses to this question. This question was left off the paper surveys, so responses are only from those who chose to answer electronically. Of those who answered, 47% were aged 65 or older (14 responses), 30% were aged 45 – 64 (9 responses), and 23% were aged 25 – 44 (7 responses).


9. What is your ZIP code?

- 97070 (Wilsonville) – 49
- 97002 (Aurora) – 12
- 97071 (Woodburn) – 2
- 97140 (Sherwood) – 2
- 97132 (Newberg) – 1
- 97062 (Tualatin) – 1
- 97032 (Hubbard) – 1

APPENDIX 6: DOTS AT OPEN HOUSE

Ten community members who attended the in-person Open House also answered survey questions on easel paper by placing dots on their preferences when no more comment forms were available.





APPENDIX 7: EMAILED COMMENTS

Comments that were received by email or through the website by July 1, 2024 are below.

Date	Question/Comment
06/10/24	We are writing to express our strong objection to lengthening runways and increasing size of aircraft at Aurora Airport. Planes from this airport already take off and land over densely populated areas and this proposal will seriously adversely affect communities in and near the flight path both in terms of noise and quality of life, and also in terms of safety. In addition, the Boone Bridge section of I-5 is already a traffic nightmare and adding traffic to and from the airport is not tenable. We have a more than adequate airport in Portland and the studies do not support the need for this expansion any time in the near future Please take citizens and neighbors concerns into consideration and stop any expansion of Aurora Airport.
06/11/24	Attached is an outline of the property parcel that I showed to Tony & Kenji and that is available to ODAV. As we discussed this Aurora ramp space would facilitate a huge improvement in Aircraft and vehicle movement at UAO. This property transfer would go along with ODAV's 1995 plans to own & control ramp space as well as the FAA's 1985 directive for ODAV to increase their UAO ownership percentage Please add this to the master plan record and contact me with any questions.
06/12/24	I am opposed to the expansion of the Aurora Airport. As a resident in Wilsonville, OR, I already see far too many large and small planes above my house. The noise is awful and scares the wildlife. The small is also terrible and has notably affected our health.
06/12/24	For too long Charlotte Lehan, Tim Knapp, Greg Leo and the current Wilsonville City Council have stood in the way of much needed progress of bringing the airport up to date. In fact, I would argue the City makes a big show of fighting the airport expansion to secure NIMBY (not-in-my-backyard) votes to distract from the major issues it is dealing with. These include major traffic, congestion and parking issues that have been eroding public support for current council urban renewal projects like gutting Town Center with thousands of people. It is long passed time that the airport be upgraded and expanded.
06/13/24	We are local residents in Butteville and we totally support the planned growth of the Aurora State airport, adding 500ft to one end of the runway to increase safety margins for larger aircraft and develop the land mid-field with hangars. UAO is a fantastic airport that has so many businesses, employing many locals.
06/13/24	Good Day! I am writing of support for the Aurora airport runway extension.

	This airport is so critically important to our area, providing over 1200 jobs, providing fire fighting equipment and expertise (Columbia Helicopter/HTC) and life saving services (Lifeflight/ organ transport services). Adding 500' to the runway will make the airport safer as any pilot can attest. Having lost a best friend in an airplane accident at Coos Bay/South Bend off the end of the runway, I know this is a life or death solution. Please support this extension which has been part of the master plan since the 70's for safety reasons. This is also ground zero for subduction earthquake disaster relief. ODART is doing a simulation soon in support of this. Look at the big picture. Airplanes fly over every corner of the United States- (except military restricted zones). They use navigational way points to travel. People near those way points are just as equally affected by airplanes as those near an airport and do they send you their complaints? I recently sold a $2,000,000 home across the street from the Newberg VOR on Chehalem Mountain. They were not concerned in the least about aircraft traffic.
06/13/24	I won't be able to attend the North Marion High meeting tonight to discuss the Airport Master Plan. I would like to itemize the problems or issues with the plan from my perspective as a home owner. -I live in Charbonneau and have for the last 15 years. Over the last 4-5 years the number of aircrafts and the overflight noise has increased greatly which makes it very difficult to hear when sitting on my porch when the planes fly so close over Charbonneau. It sometimes feels like the plane is going to crash. The noise level is much more obvious at Charbonneau than downtown Wilsonville because the flight plans go straight over Charbonneau. -to extend the airport runway will allow larger aircrafts to use it and increase even more the noise level. The infra structure to support increase usage is not mentioned in any of the master plans I have read. Why is that? Traffic on I-5 is already horrendous and the rural roads around the airport cannot handle more cars/trucks. -if only the flight plans to depart and arrive would be vectored away from Charbonneau. I can see the aircraft markings from my porch so they are sometimes not very high in the sky….. For example why can't the planes fly over I-5 or over the many acres of forest and farm land to access the runway. Take the planes away from the populated areas of Wilsonville. Think of options which will accomplish what both the locals and the airport want…a compromise so one side isn't the loser. -I fear the interests of our neighborhoods have taken a back seat for financial gain of the airport businesses and the ODA. The methods that the ODA has taken to push this master plan in the past is evidence of my concern.

	-Bigger doesn't mean better nor changing what has worked for this small airport. Put the interest of local residents as the reason to NOT implement the master plan. Consider the future of the communities who have to live around the airport.
06/14/24	**Aurora Airport Expansion** **Noise Mitigation** Request that if the airport is allowed to lengthen the runway for larger aircraft, that those flights be limited to the I-5 freeway corridor. That steeper take-off angles be mandated. And that Wilsonville OR be designated a Noise Abatement Zone. Today, Helicopter Transport fly directly over our home in Wilsonville. Sometimes at low altitude but always in the late and early morning hours. Our windows shake and dogs bark in the neighborhood. To be fair, you have already addressed this issue by requiring pilots of business jets to gain altitude quickly but still present noise pollution upon take-off and landing over town.. along with helicopter "red-eye" service. The I-5 corridor won't eliminate noise but will help.
06/15/24	Please record that we strongly oppose this expansion. There are multiple alternative airports in the greater Portland/Salem area to use for larger, heavier aircraft.
06/16/24	My wife and I are residents of Charbonneau (Wilsonville). We wish to register our strong opposition to any proposed airport expansion. Expansion of the airport, especially the lengthening of the runway, will encourage increased air traffic and enable and encourage larger jets that will further increase overflight noise. The increased air traffic will also lead to increased local road traffic in the vicinity of the airport and on I-5. The city of Wilsonville has registered opposition to the airport expansion and listed many reasons that the expansion is ill advised and unnecessary. We join with the City in opposition to airport expansion. Another factor in our opposition to airport expansion is that other property owners in the vicinity of the airport will seek exceptions to the land use restrictions outside the urban development zone. Langdon Farms has already sought an exception to the land use regulations to build a truck depot. If the airport were to be expanded, that would provide more justification for Langdon Farms and other property owners to convert from recreational use and farmland to industrial uses in support of the expanded airport. We have lived in Charbonneau for twelve years and have enjoyed the relative quiet of the area and lived with the current level of noise from jet overflights. Increase in the level of aircraft noise and road traffic through expansion of the airport would degrade the area irreparably. Please do not expand the airport and especially do not lengthen the runway to enable larger jets to land and take off from the Aurora State Airport. I was disappointed that I was unable to speak to a senior member of the Oregon Department of Aviation at the June 13 meeting.

06/17/24	I request that the one-acre ramp parcel that I own abutting the SW corner of ODAV's landside parcel be considered as potential additional ODAV ramp for short term Aircraft parking and as a taxi lane to allow aircraft and vehicle access to the ODAV parcel from taxiway A. This small parcel could open up access for the tower, Pacific Coast Avionics, the CAA, and the entire ODAV ramp.
06/17/24	As a PAC member, I strongly discourage any plan to move the runway due to the existing ramp constraints with a "one sided" (due to hwy 551) Airport and due to the giant cost, complexity, destruction of existing businesses, and unknowable time schedule. Thank you.
06/23/24	As a local resident, I am highly concern on this project. My daily work and personal life depend on traveling through the Arndt Rd into Canby and to access the Freeway through Portland-Hubbard Hwy, just like many others that live in my community at Century Meadows. This project would impact greatly our commute, specially when taking kids into school. Making the airport accessible to larger aircraft would raise hazard concerns driving near by any of those aircraft. Which also includes the higher levels of pollution. Specially for the existing area, since there are many water bodies in the area, the increase of jet fuel could affect the environment as well as the health of people and animals that live in the surrounding areas. Increased of noise of large aircraft can also impact people's health affecting sleep patterns and kids' ability to study.
06/27/24	Upon a review of Figure 11, page 13, from the Preliminary Alternatives Summary, an important feature of the Hot Spot mitigation plan was omitted. The intent of the modification is to eliminate Hot Spot 1 and mitigate the traffic congestion on the Alpha Taxiway when runway 17 is in use. To eliminate the Hot Spot aircraft taxing would need to make two ninety turns to enter the runway as depicted. Does the ALP need modification to allow access from the TTF property just north of the airport property at A1? The second element is to reduce the traffic congestion that bottlenecks taxiway A. This is accomplished by establishing an exit only lane from the movement area. See the attached diagram and FAA 7460-1. The aircraft traffic flow on the TTF, non-movement area will be controlled by signage, pavement markings and reflectors. Please let me know if you have any questions.
06/28/24	The residents of Sunset Estates are against expansion of the Aurora Airport, are concerns are water, air and noise pollution!!!!Also the Highways in the area cannot handle more traffic, especially with the conditions the roads and the lack of turning lanes on 551!!!!
07/01/24	I wholeheartedly support continued aviation operations at the Aurora State Airport. I am a private pilot who earned my pilot certificate thanks to the existence of the airport and Fixed Based Operators (FBO's) like Willamette Aviation and Aurora Aviation at a location that was convenient for me with instruction and aircraft rentals that were affordable to me. I am an active member of the Columbia Aviation Association, an aviation community of pilots

	based at KUAO that are united by a passion for aviation. Our mission includes fostering aviation safety, education, mentoring and outreach, and we provide opportunities to expand our members' aviation expertise. I am proud to now own and operate an aircraft that runs on unleaded gasoline ("MOGAS"). I support maintaining the existing runway, taxiways and control tower such that any future plans do not interrupt airport operations. As a safety professional, I support the promotion of safety improvements for ground and air operations. I also recommend connecting the south end operations with the midfield operations via a vehicle access behind the old church property as well as connecting the ramp in front of the Columbia Aviation Association's clubhouse directly to the taxiway toward runway 35. I do NOT support the annexation of KUAO into the City of Aurora. I believe it would increase our taxes and provide no tangible benefit to airport users like me. Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

APPENDIX 8: SCANNED OPEN HOUSE COMMENT FORMS

The following scans show the 38 completed open-ended comments collected during the open house or mailed back to the project team (not all comment forms included answers to this open-ended question). All information from these printed forms was included in Appendix 5; these scans are listed below for reference.

7. Please provide any additional feedback to help ODAV as they review the preliminary alternatives:

① staff ATC & aurora tower 24/7
② IFR only approaches & departures
③ no additional hangar space
④ noise abatement protocols mandatory on all departures and approaches (see Orange County/ John Wayne airport
⑤ equalize all airport fees for Portland, Hillsboro, & Salem Eugene, Corvallis, & Aurora
*⑥ Add a East/West runway as primary

Optional demographic questions (not tied to survey responses)

7. Please provide any additional feedback to help ODAV as they review the preliminary alternatives:

A) BELIEVE OPTION TO EXTEND BOTH ENDS OF EXISTING RUNWAY FOR EXTRA 500' SHOULD BE CONSIDERED.
B) BELIEVE ODAV NEEDS TO CONSIDER HOW UNDER-USED, UNDER-CAPACITY MCMINNVILLE & SALEM AIRPORTS CAN BE BETTER UTILIZED BEFORE EXPANDING AURORA.
C) A MORE ROBUST NOISE ABATEMENT POLICY MUST BE CONSIDERED FOR SURROUNDING RESIDENTIAL NEIGHBORHOODS

7. Please provide any additional feedback to help ODAV as they review the preliminary alternatives:

- Current laws and regulations are not being abided by the FAA Tower, both on take-off and arrival of aircraft; currently there is no monitoring of compliance with the Tower's instructions.
- The tower closes too early and pilots are on VFR. They are not monitored once fly too low over Chardonneau, the neighboring homes and Wilsonville
- Extended hours on existing Tower should be made
- A NOISE ABATEMENT district should be enacted. OC airport has a policy that works!

Optional demographic questions (not tied to survey responses)

7. Please provide any additional feedback to help ODAV as they review the preliminary alternatives:

Noise from planes doesn't seem to follow guidelines. Greater activity will make that noise levels more difficult for homeowners & residents.

7. Please provide any additional feedback to help ODAV as they review the preliminary alternatives:

The current noise abatement rules should be followed.
Extend hours for traffic controllers.

7. Please provide any additional feedback to help ODAV as they review the preliminary alternatives:

Smaller, commercial airplanes are constantly flying over our houses in Charbonneau at all hours of the day & night!! Life flight & helicopters don't bother me much. Please dont enlarge the runway cuz that means more traffic over our houses. Pdx can easily handled more air traffic using the Columbia river.

7. Please provide any additional feedback to help ODAV as they review the preliminary alternatives:

Aurora Airport does not to be enlarged in any ~~capacity~~ capacity. The current # of small (probably commercial planes) are constantly flying over the Charbonneau neighborhood, which I was told is illegal. Pdx is a much bigger airport and can handle all the air travel going up and out over the Columbia River. Please let us enjoy are retirement in peace.!!

7. Please provide any additional feedback to help ODAV as they review the preliminary alternatives:

The noise abatment rules are not now being followed. I am sure that constant compliance is supported especially after midnight.

These planes are only supporting a few and are adversely affecting thousands.

7. Please provide any additional feedback to help ODAV as they review the preliminary alternatives:

ODAV should create a noise abatement Plan particularly for planes flying (take-offs and landing) into residential areas at night and early morning.

7. Please provide any additional feedback to help ODAV as they review the preliminary alternatives:

I am not in favor of any expansion. We already have planes flying over Charbonneau daily that don't follow the noise abatement guidelines. If arrent traffic can't be managed - no more traffic!! Controllers should ensure this. Controllers should be added to midnight. Charbonneau has about 2,100 residents - if you must extend do NOT go east or north.

7. Please provide any additional feedback to help ODAV as they review the preliminary alternatives:

REGARDING # 5. HOW IS "JUSTIFIED RUNWAY LENGTH" DEFINED"?

NO OPTION SHOWS A NORTH END RUN-UP APRON. I WILL VOTE AGAINST ANY "OPTION" THAT DOES NOT INCLUDE A NORTH END RUN-UP AREA.

7. Please provide any additional feedback to help ODAV as they review the preliminary alternatives:

NO EXPANSION

7. Please provide any additional feedback to help ODAV as they review the preliminary alternatives:

this "meeting" has lots of info available to take in however we were told 2x to move along. I had questions + was told to come back when it was less crowded - the line up of people was backing up. One "worker" commented to another that too many people showed up. I feel like I could have learned something but didn't. Was this just an exercise to say you held a meeting but w/o caring that the public was pushed through and left feeling our comments don't matter?

Optional demographic questions (not tied to survey responses)

[redacted]

No options I saw included a N runup area but wasn't able to ask about it as line had to keep

I asked if survey has seen done on traffic increase on Airport Road and was told "I have no idea"

one: _____

I overheard one "worker" tell a lady lengthening runway will make it safer but will not increase # of A/C takeoffs / landings at all → so not true!

/ Attention Aurora Airport Master Plan / 123
2024.

as an Aurora citizen I am concerned about water | sewer needs of additional buildings how will impact our system

7. Please provide any additional feedback to help ODAV as they review the preliminary alternatives:

Do not want at all.
NO big Planes coming IN

7. Please provide any additional feedback to help ODAV as they review the preliminary alternatives:

Airport should it's current size and operation

NO
AURORA AIRPORT
EXPANSION

Optional demographic questio... ...ises)

7. Please provide any additional feedback to help ODAV as they review the preliminary alternatives:

I support moving the runway either into the existing space or to re-align the highway - although I'm not sure what re-aligning the highway will do to existing development. I strongly oppose extending the length of the ~~highway~~ runway. It will increase use & noise, & air ~~& no~~ pollution

7. Please provide any additional feedback to help ODAV as they review the preliminary alternatives:

Because of Noise, Pollution, and the added traffic I'm completely against this.

7. Please provide any additional feedback to help ODAV as they review the preliminary alternatives:

Timeline not clear

Costs to Accomplish what?

7. Please provide any additional feedback to help ODAV as they review the preliminary alternatives:

I AM AGAINST ANY EXPANSION THAT FACILITATES OR ALLOWS MORE OR LARGER AIRCRAFT TO LAND OR TAKE OFF. MY HOME IS IN THE FLIGHT PATH, AND WE ARE VERY CONCERNED WITH ANY INCREASE IN FLIGHT TRAFFIC, NOISE, POLLUTION, ETC.

7. Please provide any additional feedback to help ODAV as they review the preliminary alternatives:

Remove C-11 designation and go to only small general AVIATION..... OR TERMINATE License and eliminate AIRPORT!

7. Please provide any additional feedback to help ODAV as they review the preliminary alternatives:

Keep it with small planes! Don't want big ones flying over my house. Just eliminate airport & that takes care of problem. People in the area needed to have more say on this!

7. Please provide any additional feedback to help ODAV as they review the preliminary alternatives:

Currently jets coming in all hours low is very disruptive. Air traffic has increased 10 fold since moving here 5 yrs ago.

7. Please provide any additional feedback to help ODAV as they review the preliminary alternatives:

How many accidents have been caused by the runway being too short?

How is vehicular traffic affected

Noise levels around airport continue to increase.

7. Please provide any additional feedback to help ODAV as they review the preliminary alternatives:

Why was the AIRPORT "STAY THE WAY IT IS" taken off the menu?

Why don't you punish the ones who violate the rules?

7. Please provide any additional feedback to help ODAV as they review the preliminary alternatives: - Count the actual number of planes daily using the runway
- Do Not Use Projections
- Make the Aurora Airport tower a 24 hour tower.
- Reduce C-11 plans flying into Aurora.
- Have pilots adhere to the FAA rules & regulations to not fly over housing developments &, to not buzz houses & trees that are 3+ miles from the airport, with polluted exhaust.
- Fly over I-5 and not Airport Way.

Optional demographic questions (not tied to survey responses)

8. What is your race/ethnicity? (check all that apply)

7. Please provide any additional feedback to help ODAV as they review the preliminary alternatives:

We are very frustrated with the lack of participation of the "Volunteer noise abatement". We can only imagine what it would be like when larger planes start landing at Aurora.

South
Unsure/need more information
Do not think that either option would work well

NO EXPANSION PERIOD

7. Please provide any additional feedback to help ODAV as they review the preliminary alternatives:

ANY OF YOUR PROPOSALS DO NOT! INCLUDE NOISE ABATEMENT. THE VOLUNTEER PROGRAM IS NOT WORKING / WE NEED DESIGNATED NOISE SENSITIVE ZONE'S ! PERIOD

WE WANT TO PLEDGE FOR ALTERNATIVE # 7 BE RECOMMENDED NO OTHERS ARE ACCEPTABLE

7. Please provide any additional feedback to help ODAV as they review the preliminary alternatives:

LET US HAVE A REGIONAL AIRLINE AT AVL!!2

7. Please provide any additional feedback to help ODAV as they review the preliminary alternatives:

The noise abatement policy is poorly attended to. Who holds pilots accountable if they could safely divert to the east or west Rather than fly over Charbonneau, and they don't? We would like to be a good neighbor and support your airport business, but there has been no evidence from airport management that they will also be a good neighbor!

Optional demographic questions (not tied to survey responses)

8. What is your race/ethnicity? (check all

7. Please provide any additional feedback to help ODAV as they review the preliminary alternatives:

Resident in Charbonneau. Noise abatement procedures are ignored by the majority of the pilots. I have two grown children who are pilots. I reviewed the issues with them to get their input. They both laughed and said that if the runway is expanded that then pilots with larger planes will just come in + land — landing light on full if needed. Documenting larger aircraft will simply result in a need to increase the classification again. We want to be good neighbors but don't see evidence of that effort on the part of the airport management group. It's all about increasing fuel sales + hangar spaces to rent. This does nothing positive for the area except to increase profit to a small number of people. It also increases traffic congestion in an already vulnerable area that has increasing car accidents.
If the only safe alternative is to expand the runway then I would support the expansion to the south.

Optional demographic questions (not tied to survey responses)

7. Please provide any additional feedback to help ODAV as they review the preliminary alternatives:

I am concerned with pollution and the extension of the airport to support larger planes, like jets. I would rather keep it as a small for private propeller planes as it always has been. I don't want it to be a regional airport for passenger planes, like Hillsboro or something like that. I live very near the airport and I am concerned with a possible airplane crash or the pollution that airplanes put out when taking off or landing. AV gas has lead in it, and most all small planes use it

Optional demographic questions (not tied to survey responses)

8. What is your race/ethnicity? (check all that apply)

- African American/Black
- American Indian or Alaska Native
- Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
- White

7. Please provide any additional feedback to help ODAV as they review the preliminary alternatives: Use the Salem airport — leave Aurora Airport as is.

We support the ~~safety~~ improvements but not the extension of runway that would support larger aircraft using the ~~runway~~ airport. ** It is unclear what tax burden this would have on residential property. Current traffic noise level is high and we are concerned the noise level will increase. Why is there a "no runway extension" alternative presented? We believe there is an unstated objective of increasing traffic and larger aircraft. → We strongly disagree with an objective of increasing the ~~city~~ airport to support larger aircraft!

Optional demographic questions (not tied to survey responses)

7. Please provide any additional feedback to help ODAV as they review the preliminary alternatives:

We live in Charbonneau. Already experiencing many low flyovers. Do not support runway extention — increase # of flights of larger aircraft, traffic congestion on small roads around airport. Airport Rd & Miley Rd. not safe currently. Worried about appropriating agriculture land to expand Airport. Concerned about environmental impact.

7. Please provide any additional feedback to help ODAV as they review the preliminary alternatives:

I LIVE IN THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF CHARBONNEAU AND THE LARGE PLANES ARE VERY LOUD. WE HAVE TO PAUSE OUR CONVERSATIONS UNTIL THE NOISE IS OVER.

IM NOT AGAINST AIRPORTS BUT I DON'T SEE THE BENEFIT OF THE LARGE PLANES. DOES THE AIRPORT HAVE ANY BENEFIT TO LOCALS? ALL I HEAR IS THE NOISE, POTENTIAL CRASH OR DUMPING OF FUEL — NOTHING POSITIVE

Optional demographic questions (not tied to survey responses)

7. Please provide any additional feedback to help ODAV as they review the preliminary alternatives:

Airplans and jet Noise is To Loud right now Do not Need bigger Jet Nouder noises From in and out bound planes and Jets Noise level is To Loud right now. pilots have no repeet For residents. Fly To Low over homes. IF This change is enForce on The residents. Thenwe who live around it should be compensated For problem

7. Please provide any additional feedback to help ODAV as they review the preliminary alternatives:

We live at Cherbourneau. Extending to the South is the only alternative we would like

7. Please provide any additional feedback to help ODAV as they review the preliminary alternatives:

I live close to the airport. Larger aircraft and/or more frequents would be very disruptive to my quiet living space

Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Correspondence



North Hangar Area (On Airport and Through the Fence) – Source: Century West Engineering

Chapter 4
Facility Goals and Requirements

Introduction

Facility goals and requirements were developed based on the data presented in the earlier draft Airport Master Plan chapters and the information obtained from project stakeholders during Planning Advisory Committee (PAC) Meetings #1 and #2, Open House #1, and other PAC work sessions. The FAA-approved aviation activity forecasts, presented in Revised (November 2023) Working Paper No. 1 (Chapter 3), were used to identify the current and future Design Aircraft and their corresponding runway design codes (RDC), and to quantify demand-driven facility needs such as aircraft parking, hangar space and airport capacity. All airfield facility requirements definitions used in this chapter are based on Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) airport design and airspace planning standards.

The facility goals and requirements evaluation process is designed to identify the adequacy of existing airport facilities to meet future demand. The evaluation uses established planning criteria to define future facility needs for the Aurora State Airport (Airport) through the current 20-year planning period. This evaluation is performed within the framework of the Regional Setting, Airside, Landside, and Airport Administration elements for the Airport. The next step in the airport master planning process will be to translate the broadly defined facility needs into specific facility improvement options capable of addressing the projected facility requirements.

The proposed goals and requirements were developed in coordination with Oregon Department of Aviation (ODAV) staff for presentation to the PAC, other project stakeholders, and the general public for review and comment during PAC Meetings, Open Houses, and on the project website. These represent the goals, objectives, and facility improvements required to satisfy future aviation demand, while also addressing broader issues affecting the Aurora State Airport.

- FACILITY GOAL. Represents the goals, policies, and objectives developed in response to the issues/ opportunities identified during the planning process.
- FACILITY REQUIREMENT. Represents the facility needs and/or improvements required to satisfy identified capacity/demand requirements, FAA standards, and applicable state laws.

Design Aircraft and Airport Design Standards Discussion

The existing and future design aircraft are determined based on the current and projected level of activity described in Chapter 3 – Aviation Activity Forecasts. The design aircraft establishes existing and future airport planning and design standards that will guide future planning, design, and improvement of the Airport.

DESIGN AIRCRAFT AND FAA REFERENCE CODE

The design aircraft designation is intended to represent the most demanding aircraft using the Airport on a regular basis when establishing the AAC/ADG for airfield planning and design purposes. FAA defines "regular" use as 500 annual operations. Operations by larger or more demanding aircraft may be accommodated based on facility capabilities or limitations. Example aircraft are presented in **Figure 4-1**.

As discussed in Chapter 3 – Aviation Activity Forecasts, the existing and future design aircraft identified for the Airport is a medium-sized business jet included in Aircraft Approach Category C/Airplane Design Group II (AAC/ADG C-II). The Canadair 600 (CL60), per the FAA Aircraft Characteristics Database, is representative of the segment of business jet activity associated with AAC/ADG C-II.

FIGURE 4-1: SAMPLE OF TYPICAL AIRCRAFT AND DESIGN AIRCRAFT AT THE AURORA STATE AIRPORT



Source: Century West Engineering

RUNWAY DESIGN CODE

The Runway Design Code (RDC) defines the design standards used for runway construction. The RDC is comprised of the two inputs related to (current/future) design aircraft, combined with approach visibility minimums for the runway:

- Aircraft Approach Category (AAC) – based on the approach speed of the aircraft;
- Airplane Design Group (ADG) – based on the wingspan and tail height of the aircraft; and
- The lowest approach visibility minimums established for the runway:
  - » Approach visibility minimums are determined by FAA for each runway based on the category of approach (visual, non-precision instrument, or precision instrument) and the most capable existing or future approach procedure.
  - » Lower visibility minimums generally correspond to instrument approaches that allow aircraft to descend to lower altitudes before requiring visual contact to be established with the runway environment prior to landing.
  - » RDC visibility minimums for each runway end are expressed in Runway Visual Range (RVR). Ground-based RVR transmitters project horizontal beams of light near the runway to measure forward visibility levels. The RVR values (measured in feet) correspond to visibility measurements commonly expressed in fractions of statute miles (e.g., 1-mile, 3/4-mile, etc.). The RVR for a runway reflects the most capable approach type or procedure for either runway end.

The existing RDC for Runway 17/35 is based on the current approach parameters (e.g., approach type and visibility minimums). As noted earlier, no change is anticipated in the aircraft-specific components of the RDC (AAC/ADG C-II). However, the approach visibility component may change within AAC/ADG C-II. Potential outcomes include maintaining or changing the existing approach visibility minimums. However, it is noted that changes to the visibility component of the RDC can trigger changes in dimensions for other airfield design standards, particularly runway protection zone (RPZ) dimensions.


The **existing RDC for Runway 17/35 is C-II-4000** (lower than 1-mile, but not lower than 3/4-mile).

Potential RDC outcomes for both the existing and future runway lengths include:

1. Maintain existing RDC.
2. Change (downgrade) instrument approach visibility minimums to “not lower than 1-mile” **(RDC: C-II-5000)**.

A final recommendation for the future Runway 17/35 RDC will be based on the evaluation of airside (runway-taxiway system) alternatives conducted in Chapter 5 – Development Alternatives and in the RPZ Assessment. **Figure 4-2** illustrates existing RPZ dimensions related to the potential RDC options noted above.

FIGURE 4-2: RUNWAY DESIGN CODE/RUNWAY PROTECTION ZONE



Source: Century West Engineering

APPROACH AND DEPARTURE REFERENCE CODE

The Approach and Departure Reference Codes (APRC and DPRC) are not design standards, but rather an operational tool intended to aid Air Traffic Control (ATC) and airport staff to determine the capabilities of the airfield based on existing runway to parallel taxiway separation. Specifically, the APRC and DPRC identify the most demanding aircraft by Aircraft Approach Category (AAC), and Airplane Design Group (ADG) that may operate (approach or depart) on a runway in specific conditions without generating ATC operational controls.

The APRC is a three-component code that describes the most demanding aircraft by AAC and ADG that may operate concurrently with other aircraft on the airfield in certain visibility conditions without generating ATC operational controls. Since the APRC considers both AAC and ADG, it is possible for an airport to have two APRCs, where one represents the most demanding aircraft by AAC (paired with a lower ADG), and the other represents the most demanding aircraft by ADG (paired with a lower AAC).

The DPRC is similar to the APRC but is a two-component code (AAC and ADG) and does not consider a visibility component. The DPRC describes the type of aircraft that can depart a runway while any other aircraft is on the parallel taxiway. Much like ARPC, a runway may have two DPRCs to account for both AAC and ADG.

Table L-1 in *FAA Advisory Circular (AC) 150/5300-13B* lists the APRC based on runway to parallel taxiway separation and visibility minimum. The separation distance at the Aurora State Airport is 300 feet and the visibility minimums are not lower than 3/4 mile. This combination identifies APRCs of B/III/4000 and D/II/4000.

Table L-2 in the same AC lists the DPRC based only on runway to parallel taxiway separation. Referencing the Aurora State Airport's 300-foot separation identifies DPRCs of B/III and D/II.

The APRCs and DPRCs identified above indicate that the following aircraft may land, or depart on the runway, and taxi on the parallel taxiway at Aurora without operational restrictions:


- Within Approach Categories A and B, Airplane Design Groups I(S), I, II, & III.
- Within Approach Categories C and D, Airplane Design Groups I and II.

TAXIWAY DESIGN GROUP

Taxiway design group (TDG), see **Figure 4-3**, is based on the physical dimensions of the aircraft landing gear, including distance from the cockpit to the main gear (CMG) and main gear width (MGW). These dimensions affect an aircraft's ability to safely maneuver on airport taxiways and dictate pavement fillet design. Although the TDG dimensional standards are presented for taxiways, they are also commonly used for taxilane design. Taxiways and taxilanes may be designed/constructed to different TDGs based on the expected use by specific types of aircraft. For example, the major taxiways at an airport should be designed for consistency with the design aircraft. Individual taxiways/taxilanes that are intended to accommodate only small aircraft would be designed based on the size of aircraft and the corresponding TDG.

The major taxiways at the Aurora State Airport are designed to accommodate ADG II aircraft, which are best represented by TDG-2A and -2B standards. **The use of TDG-2A and -2B standards accommodates the current and future Design Aircraft (CL60) and a diverse mix of other B/C/D-II aircraft that fall within the TDG-1B, -2A, and -2B criteria.** Taxilanes providing access to hangar areas and aprons will serve a variety of aircraft, primarily included in TDG-1A, -1B, -2A, and 2B. The TDG classification for these areas will be based on aircraft for which they are intended and determined in the alternatives evaluation process.

FIGURE 4-3: TAXIWAY DESIGN GROUPS



Source: Century West Engineering

FAA DESIGN STANDARDS

FAA AC 150/5300-13B Airport Design serves as the primary reference in establishing the geometry of airfield facilities. A comparison of existing condition dimensions and optional future design standards for the runway-taxiway system are summarized in **Table 4-1**. It is noted that all listed design standards are based on AAC/ADG C-II, which corresponds to the existing and future design aircraft. Optional standards based on different approach visibility minimums may affect specific design standards within AAC/ADG C-II.

FAA DESIGN STANDARDS

Specific design standards and conditions applicable to the Aurora State Airport facilities are presented in the following sections of this chapter within the sidebar "FAA Design Standards" text boxes. For additional information reference the appropriate sections within FAA AC 150/5300-13B.

TABLE 4-1: FAA DESIGN STANDARDS SUMMARY

		Existing Conditions/Standards		Optional Standards	
FAA Standard		Existing Dimensions	Existing Standard AAC/ADG C-II (not lower than 3/4 statute mile)	AAC/ADG C-II (Visual and not lower than 1 statute mile)	AAC/ADG C-II (Lower than 3/4 statute mile)
Runway Width		100'	100'	100'	100'
Runway Centerline to Parallel Taxiway Centerline Separation		300'	300'	300'	400'
RSA*	Width	500'	500'	500'	500'
	Length beyond runway end	1,000'	1,000'	1,000'	1,000'
	Length prior to threshold	600'	600'	600'	600'
OFA*	Width	685'*	800'	800'	800'
	Length beyond runway end	1,000'*	1,000'	1,000'	1,000'
OFZ	Width	400'	400'	400'	400'
	Length beyond runway end	200'	200'	200'	200'
Precision OFZ	Width	N/A	N/A	N/A	800'
	Length	N/A	N/A	N/A	200'
RPZ*	Inner Width	1,000'	1,000'	500'	1,000'
	Outer Width	1,510'	1,510'	1,010'	1,750'
	Length	1,700'	1,700'	1,700'	2,500'
	Acres	48.978	48.978	29.465	78.914
Runway Blast Pad**	Width	100' (RWY35)	120'	120'	120'
	Length	150' (RWY 35)	150'	150'	150'
Runway Shoulder Width		10'	10'	10'	10'
Taxiway Width		35'	35'	35'	35'
Taxiway Safety Area Width		79'	79'	79'	79'
Taxiway Object Free Area Width		124'	124'	124'	124'

Source: FAA Advisory Circular 150/5300-13B and Century West Engineering documented existing conditions

*Existing Non-Standard Conditions Identified through the Facility Requirements evaluation:

- OFA: Hubbard Highway is partially located within Runway 17/35 OFA, approximately 373 feet west of runway centerline at its nearest point.
- OFA: Keil Road is partially located within Runway 17/35 OFA, approximately 312 feet east of runway centerline at its nearest point.
- RPZs: Existing RPZs extend beyond airport property and include surface roads or other built items.
- RSA: Drain field in RSA to be evaluated for conformance with FAA standards.
- RSA: Drainage ditch along Taxiway A is within the RSA, options for mitigation will be shown in CH 5 - Development Alternatives.
- RSA: The ASOS is within the RSA, options for relocation will be evaluated in CH 5 - Development Alternatives.
- RSA: The segmented circle and windcone are within the RSA, options for relocation will be evaluated in CH 5 - Development Alternatives.

**Blast Pad: There is no blast pad on Runway 17 end. Blast pads are not required, but are generally recommended for runways with jet traffic

Demand/Capacity Analysis

Annual service volume (ASV) is a measure of estimated airport capacity and delay used for long-range planning. ASV, as defined in *FAA AC 150/5060-5, Airport Capacity and Delay*, provides a reasonable estimate of an airport's operational capacity.

For long-term planning purposes, the FAA estimates ASV capacity for a single runway with no air carrier traffic is approximately 230,000 operations. Hourly capacity is estimated to be 98 operations per hour during visual flight rules (VFR) conditions and 59 operations/hour during instrument flight rules (IFR) conditions.

- 2021 Capacity: 76,028 Annual Operations / 230,000 ASV = 33% (demand/capacity ratio)
- 2041 Capacity: 90,230 Annual Operations / 230,000 ASV = 39% (demand/capacity ratio)

Operations in 2021 accounted for 33% of the ASV. Figure 2-2 in *AC 150/5060-5* indicates average delay per aircraft with this ratio is approximately 0.1 to 0.2 minutes. This results in a total annual aircraft delay ranging between 7,603 to 15,206 minutes. Based on forecast operations, the 2041 operational activity will account for 39% of ASV. Average delay per aircraft will remain in the range between 0.1 to 0.3 minutes. This results in a total annual aircraft delay ranging between 9,023 to 27,069 minutes.

Based on the above analysis, the average delay per aircraft at the Aurora State Airport is expected to remain below one minute through the planning period and no capacity enhancements to reduce delay times are anticipated during the planning period.

Regional Setting Goals and Requirements

The proposed facility goals and requirements for the regional setting of the Aurora State Airport are developed to address the issues and opportunities that fit within the regional context of the Airport. The regional setting is focused on the impacts and relationships that the Airport may have within the social, economic, and environmental context of the region, counties, and associated municipalities. The regional setting elements considered include location and vicinity, socioeconomic factors, airport history, system role, airport operations, applicable planning studies, environmental data, local surface transportation, and land use/zoning. Understanding the national, state, and local role of the Aurora State Airport provides important context about the facility and its users.

The Aurora State Airport is located in proximity to multiple local jurisdictions, each of whom have a public interest in protecting public-use airports and adjacent lands consistent with Oregon state law. The Airport, which was constructed in 1943, is an established public-use transportation facility closely resembling urban type densities (impervious pavement surfaces and building footprint coverage) in a rural environment. The pressure of rapid change and growth on and near the Airport due to a quickly growing metropolitan area has made planning and improvement of aviation related facilities an important topic for airport users and businesses, neighbors, and municipalities within the region.

The following goals reflect ODAV's current and future management objectives for the Aurora State Airport, consistent with its role as an established public-use air transportation facility:

- FACILITY GOAL. Support efforts by aviation-related businesses and neighboring jurisdictions to ensure the continued economic benefits of the Airport, including job creation and support of the local and regional tax base.
- FACILITY GOAL. Maintain effective, ongoing public outreach to promote public awareness and perception of the Aurora State Airport.
- FACILITY GOAL. Work with federal (FAA), state, and private partners to support the funding of facility improvements to satisfy aviation demand.
- FACILITY GOAL. Maintain and improve facilities as necessary, consistent with the national, state, and local roles defined for the Airport and public demand.
- FACILITY GOAL. Continue to monitor aircraft operations and based aircraft counts to provide FAA justification for funding future facility improvements.

Land use, transportation, and environmental issues are inextricably linked together. Understanding and addressing these interrelated issues within the context of the Airport and its local and regional setting is a critical step to developing an implementable planning document. Several of these key issues are discussed in more detail below.

Many of the regional surface transportation issues raised throughout the planning process, including traffic congestion on nearby rural roads, state highways, and interstate highways, are relevant planning topics for the greater community to consider. The traffic congestion and related concerns discussed during PAC meetings equally affect airport users, airport businesses, and non-aviation-related neighbors. However, the typical regional surface transportation concerns identified during the planning process are outside of ODAV jurisdiction and outside of the scope of work for this federally-funded airport master plan.

These important surface transportation issues are the responsibility of Marion County, Clackamas County, representative metropolitan districts, and the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT). The regulation of adjacent off-airport aviation related private property falls under the sole jurisdiction of Marion County. Developments are subject to local transportation and planning requirements for which ODAV has no statutory control. Based on the jurisdictional requirements prescribed by Marion County, any planned development that occurs on ODAV property that has the potential to increase vehicle traffic demand is subject to project-specific traffic analysis and/or planning study as a condition of approval. These types of evaluations are typically performed at the project design and permitting stage associated with local development review and approval, and are outside the scope of an airport master plan.

- FACILITY REQUIREMENT. As required under applicable regulations, coordinate with state and local land use and transportation agencies to define any necessary surface transportation infrastructure improvements driven by proposed improvement projects on ODAV property.

The analysis of environmental factors for federally funded projects is defined by the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) and implemented in the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The regulations require agencies like the FAA to integrate the NEPA process with other planning projects as early as possible. As part of this Airport Master Plan, an environmental screening (**Appendix 2**) was conducted during the existing conditions analysis to begin the process of incorporating potential environmental factors. The environmental screening analysis and airport master planning process is not intended to be part of the formal NEPA process. It is intended to serve as the basis for future projects' purpose and need in environmental evaluation and the alternatives that the FAA will carry forward into the NEPA process (*AC 150/5070-6B* - Appendix D).

During the airport master planning process, PAC members and public stakeholders expressed concerns about noise from helicopters operating on privately owned parcels adjacent to the Airport and fixed-wing traffic operating from ODAV property. PAC members and public stakeholders also shared concerns about air quality (sulfur and lead emissions from jet and piston aircraft), water quality/availability, groundwater runoff, and other factors that fit within the NEPA categories described in Chapter 2 – Existing Conditions Analysis. The environmental concerns raised by PAC members and public stakeholders are being documented and will be provided on the project webpage and included as **Appendix 9** in the airport master plan for future consideration by the FAA during the completion of any environmental assessment required by NEPA.

- FACILITY REQUIREMENT. As required under applicable regulations, coordinate with local, state, and federal agencies to conduct appropriate environmental study and permitting for future development projects that occur on ODAV property.

- FACILITY GOAL. Coordinate with users of the Aurora State Airport, Air Traffic Control Tower staff, and adjacent helicopter operators (Columbia Helicopters and HTS) in the continual improvement of the voluntary "Fly Friendly Program" for the Airport that identifies noise-sensitive areas and considers changes in common visual flight paths to mitigate noise exposure around the Airport. This effort should also be coordinated with the FAA Seattle Airports District Office (ADO), local land use jurisdictions, and airport neighbors.

All proposed airport improvements are subject to Marion County review based on applicable zoning requirements.

Per OAR 660-13-0030 (2)[1], "A city or county with planning authority for one or more airports, or areas within safety zones or compatibility zones described in this division, shall adopt comprehensive plan and land use regulations for airports consistent with the requirements of this division and ORS 836.600 through 836.630."

At the conclusion of the Airport Master Plan, Marion County, Clackamas County, City of Aurora, City of Barlow, and City of Wilsonville will all require a comprehensive plan update to remain compliant with state land use laws. Each of these jurisdictions are located within the boundaries of the Part 77 airspace defined for Runway 17/35 at the Airport. Marion County, which is the jurisdiction responsible for land use development on, and surrounding the Airport, has acknowledged this requirement in comprehensive plan Policy #2 of the "Air, Rail, Water, Energy and Pipeline Transportation Policies."[2]

- FACILITY REQUIREMENT. Support adoption of the airport master plan into local planning documents as required by OAR 660-13-0030, which implements ORS 836.600 through 836.630 and Statewide Planning Goal 12 (Transportation) by applicable jurisdictions.

- FACILITY REQUIREMENT. Support local updates or development of overlay zoning designations, as required in OAR 660- 013-0050 and OAR 660-013-0070, consistent with planned facility improvements upon selection of a preferred alternative:
  - Marion County – update overlay zones (Marion County Code, Chapter 16.21) for airspace protection;
  - Clackamas County – update overlay zones (Clackamas County Zoning and Development Ordinance (ZDO), Chapter 713) for airspace protection;
  - City of Wilsonville – develop overlay zone ordinance for airspace protection; and
  - City of Barlow – develop overlay zone ordinance for airspace protection.

1 A city or county with planning authority for one or more airports, or areas within safety zones or compatibility zones described in this division, shall adopt comprehensive plan and land use regulations for airports consistent with the requirements of this division and ORS 836.600 through 836.630. Local comprehensive plan and land use regulation requirements shall be coordinated with acknowledged transportation system plans for the city, county, and Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) required by OAR 660, division 12. Local comprehensive plan and land use regulation requirements shall be consistent with adopted elements of the state ASP and shall be coordinated with affected state and federal agencies, local governments, airport sponsors, and special districts. If a state ASP has not yet been adopted, the city or county shall coordinate the preparation of the local comprehensive plan and land use regulation requirements with ODA. Local comprehensive plan and land use regulation requirements shall encourage and support the continued operation and vitality of airports consistent with the requirements of ORS 836.600 through 836.630.

2 The County should review and take appropriate actions to adopt State master plans for public airports in Marion County.

The *2003 Oregon Airport Land Use Compatibility Guidebook (LUGB)* presents the means and requirements for local governments to comply with airport land-use requirements established in OAR 660-013. The document is primarily intended as a guide to assist community review of airport-related planning issues. Chapter 6 of the LUGB outlines techniques for establishing compatible land uses at and around airports. One of the techniques discussed is the creation of separate zoning districts for airports. Establishing an airport development zone "creates a more distinct area of influence for the airport; gives the airport better opportunity to expand for airport-related dependent and compatible uses; and avoids possible unintended uses that often accompany an overlay zone."[3]

As previously discussed in Chapter 2 – Existing Conditions Analysis, Marion County is the jurisdiction responsible for the zoning and land use approvals at the Airport. The existing zoning designation for the Airport is Public (P) as defined in Marion County Code 17.171. The intent of the P zone is "to provide regulations governing the development of lands appropriate for specific public and semipublic uses and to ensure their compatibility with adjacent uses." Airports are permitted in the P zone with a Conditional Use approval. According to the LUGB and general planning practice, the lack of an "airport specific" zone and the added Conditional Use requirement associated with the actual zone may unduly burden new development of aviation related facilities. Although development of airport-specific zoning represents "best practice" in land-use planning, it is important to note that Marion County consistently recognizes the suitability and appropriateness of aviation-related developments within the P zone applied to the Airport.

- FACILITY GOAL. Request Marion County to evaluate options for revising their zoning code to include airport-specific zoning for public use airports, to support a future rezone of the Airport. The proposed addition of airport-specific zoning more closely aligns with the guidance provided in the LUGB.
- FACILITY GOAL. Request Marion County to rezone the Airport to the applicable airport-specific zone, once adopted.

Airside Elements Goals and Requirements

The airside facilities goals and requirements section includes a discussion of the area airspace, instrument flight procedures, runways, taxiways/taxilanes, aprons/tiedowns/aircraft parking, and airside support facilities.

AREA AIRSPACE AND INSTRUMENT FLIGHT PROCEDURES

The Class D airspace surrounding the Aurora State Airport (see **Figure 2-12**, Chapter 2) is regulated by the FAA and is in effect during the hours when the Air Traffic Control Tower (ATCT) is in operation. See Chapter 2 - Existing Conditions Analysis for a description of local airspace categories and features.

Since the Class D controlled airspace for the Airport was created when the ATCT began operation in late 2015, aircraft flight paths have evolved with formal direction provided by air traffic controllers (e.g., traffic pattern entry/departure, traffic avoidance instructions, etc.). As noted previously, the control of aircraft in flight in Class D airspace is at the direction of the ATCT and is outside the regulatory authority of ODAV. The standard operating characteristics of fixed-wing aircraft and helicopters vary based on the capabilities and needs of the specific aircraft.

Aircraft flight paths and the associated noise exposure are important issues regulated by FAA. The noise evaluations that will be conducted in the Airport Master Plan are defined by the FAA-approved project scope of work and cannot be modified without FAA approval.

3 LUGB (Page 6-2)- Airport Development Zone - This type of zoning is applied to areas around an airport identified for airport related and dependent uses. It often replaces industrial, public facility or other designations currently given to the airport site and immediate vicinity. The Airport Development Zone is a base zoning district that identifies outright and conditionally permitted uses on airport property. The zone should include areas used or needed for airport operations, areas needed for anticipated facility growth, airport-related industry and commercial operations and airport-related industrial, commercial or recreational activities. According to OAR 660-013-0160, local governments must update their zoning and land use regulations to conform to this division at periodic review.

Airspace issues addressed in the planning process are defined by FAA and involve specific design components intended to protect aircraft in flight from hazards (built items, obstacles, or terrain). These include both **14 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 77** airspace surfaces established for specific landing areas (runways, etc.) and **FAA Terminal Instrument Procedures (TERPS)** surfaces that define the unobstructed airspace corridors required to permit aircraft to operate without visual reference to outside surroundings. These arrival and departure paths have both vertical and lateral clearance requirements to known obstacles such as terrain or other items. See descriptions of these airspace surfaces in Chapter 2 – Existing Conditions Analysis.

These airspace surfaces are defined by approach type (visual, non-precision instrument, precision instrument) and the minimum approach visibility required for the most capable instrument approach procedure (IAP). The design aircraft parameters represented in the AAC/ADG are also reflected in some airspace planning criteria.

The existing Part 77 surfaces for Runway 17/35 are defined by the most demanding approach criteria currently in place. This is currently the 7/8-mile approach visibility minimum requirement established by FAA for the published Runway 17 and 35 RNAV/GPS IAPs, and the requirement established by FAA Notice to Air Missions (NOTAM) for the Runway 17 Localizer IAP.

Prior to the planning process, published IAP minimum visibilities for existing IAPs were as low as 3/4-mile. This visibility threshold was the result of a change implemented by the FAA Flight Procedures Team that was not requested by ODAV or recommended in previous planning for the runway. Early in the airport master planning process, several airspace issues related to this change were identified. These centered primarily on the significantly larger object free surfaces surrounding the runway that would be required to comply with Part 77 obstacle clearance standards. The expanded airspace would impact both on- and off-airport structures, roads, and other built items that were impractical to address. Based on this technical assessment, ODAV requested that FAA Flight Procedures Team (responsible FAA office) raise the approach visibility minimums to 7/8-mile to align the procedures with airspace planning established for the runway. This request was approved by FAA and is currently reflected in published FAA flight procedures or NOTAM.

In addition to addressing potential obstacle clearance conflicts, the ODAV request to raise the approach visibility minimums was supported by analysis of local weather conditions. Ten years of historical visibility data recorded by the Automated Surface Observing System (ASOS) located on the airfield were analyzed to gauge the occurrence of visibility conditions (increments) below 1-mile. The analysis indicated that visibility conditions less than 1-mile account for 2.74% of total observations. However, visibility conditions between 3/4-mile and 1-mile account for 0.49% of total observations.

TABLE 4-2: AURORA STATE AIRPORT ASOS RECORDED VISIBILITY OBSERVATIONS

	Observations	%
Greater than or equal to 3-mile vis.	589,823	94.54%
Greater than or equal to 1-mile but less than 3-mile vis.	16,945	2.72%
Less than 1-mile vis.	17,111	2.74%
3/4-mile vis.	3060	0.49%
Less than 3/4-mile	14,051	2.25%
Total observations	623,879	100.00%

Source: Aurora State Airport ASOS, 10 years of recorded data

The data in **Table 4-2** demonstrate the small incremental benefit provided by an instrument approach with 3/4-mile visibility minimums at the Aurora State Airport, compared to the next higher increment, in terms of airport accessibility. Existing site characteristics make accommodating 3/4-mile or lower approach visibility minimums impractical.

RUNWAY

Facility goals and requirements for Runway 17/35 were evaluated relative to runway orientation, length, width, pavement strength, and FAA design standards.

RUNWAY ORIENTATION AND CROSSWIND COVERAGE

Runway orientation is a function of wind speed and direction combined with the ability of aircraft to operate under given conditions. FAA has defined the maximum allowable direct crosswind for ADG II aircraft as 13 knots. A direct crosswind is when the wind direction is 90 degrees offset from the direction of flight. Lower and higher crosswind components (10.5 and 16 knots) are defined for smaller and larger general aviation (GA) aircraft. Most aircraft can tolerate higher crosswind speeds when the intersecting angle is reduced.

TABLE 4-3: WIND ANALYSIS

		10.5 knots	13 knots	16 knots
Runway 17	IFR	79.85%	79.98%	80.03%
	VFR	70.80%	70.94%	71.01%
	All-Weather	72.45%	72.59%	72.65%
Runway 35	IFR	71.58%	71.60%	71.61%
	VFR	58.04%	58.16%	58.20%
	All-Weather	60.81%	60.92%	60.95%
Combined Runway 17/35	IFR	99.77%	99.92%	99.99%
	VFR	99.62%	99.89%	99.99%
	All-Weather	99.65%	99.89%	99.99%

Source: FAA ADIP

The FAA recommends that primary runways accommodate at least 95% of local crosswind conditions. When this level of coverage is not provided, the FAA recommends consideration of a crosswind runway. An updated analysis of 10 years of onsite wind conditions was conducted to assess wind coverage provided by Runway 17/35. The ASOS-collected wind data indicates that Runway 17/35 accommodates more than 99% of all-weather wind conditions for large and small GA aircraft. Due to prevailing winds, Runway 17 is most often the preferred runway. The results of the analysis are summarized in **Table 4-3**.

- FACILITY REQUIREMENT. It is recommended that the current runway alignment be maintained throughout the planning period.

RUNWAY LENGTH

The planning methodology used to define a runway length capable of satisfying existing and future demand at the Aurora State Airport is established by the FAA: *AC 150-5325-4B, Runway Length Requirements for Airport Design.* As noted in Chapter 2 – Existing Conditions Analysis, the current length of Runway 17/35 is 5,003 feet.

Demonstrating that defined runway lengths are justified is directly related to the FAA-approved forecast of aviation demand coupled with a detailed evaluation of aircraft operations, including aircraft that may be constrained by the current runway length. A constrained operation typically means that an aircraft operator must reduce payload/useful load (passengers, fuel, etc.) based on the runway length available. This is most common in warmer months when higher temperatures increase aircraft takeoff and landing distances, but it can also occur at moderate temperatures for some aircraft.

Using FAA planning methodologies, the evaluation of runway length requirements begins with the operational requirements of the design aircraft, or family of aircraft, expected to use the runway. Several airfield-specific conditions that affect aircraft performance are then verified including airport elevation, runway gradient, and the assumed operating temperature (average daily maximum temperature of the hottest month of the year). These inputs are applied to runway length curves presented in *AC 150-5325-4B* for the applicable segment of the GA aircraft fleet.

The FAA recommends a planning evaluation based on the “family of aircraft” approach for runways used by large airplanes (maximum takeoff weights between 12,500 pounds and 60,000 pounds) to capture the most common aircraft within a particular category. This grouping of aircraft is further characterized by determining the “useful load factor” at which they operate, based on the haul lengths and service needs of those aircraft.

This methodology is consistent with FAA planning criteria that correlates the needs of the existing and future design aircraft to approval of the Airport Layout Plan drawing and project eligibility for FAA funding. The specific design criteria applied to a runway does not preclude use by larger aircraft. Use by heavier aircraft may also be permitted with approval by airport management.

Aircraft Performance Curves (Runway Length Requirements)

For GA runways that accommodate large airplanes, the FAA recommends use of performance curves for runway length planning. The curves were developed by FAA based on approved airplane flight manuals, and they are intended to represent the needs of the fleet, rather than a single aircraft or type. This approach provides a more effective indication of the requirements of overall aircraft rather than relying on the requirements for an individual aircraft.

The design aircraft, or family of aircraft, defined in the FAA-approved Aviation Activity Forecasts, is matched to the applicable runway length curves that are defined based on the factors described below.

AC 150-5325-4B (Figure 3-2 and 3-3) provides two runway length curves for both the 75% and 100% segment of the fleet to reflect different useful loads for this category of aircraft. As noted earlier, useful load represents the payload (passengers, fuel, etc.) carried by the aircraft. The AC provides 60% and 90% useful load factors for both fleet percentages. For general reference, when an aircraft is at its maximum gross weight, it has reached its maximum useful load; however, that may not include full fuel tanks or a full passenger load depending on the aircraft's certificated design limits.

Percentage of Fleet

AC 150-5325-4B identifies *"Airplanes that Make Up 75 Percent of the Fleet" and "Remaining 25 Percent of Airplanes that Make Up 100 Percent of Fleet."* The AC provides guidance for selecting the appropriate grouping of aircraft fleet and the corresponding runway length curves that should be used for planning. The AC indicates that designers should use 75% of fleet curves when the aircraft under evaluation are not found in the 100% of fleet group. If a relatively few airplanes under evaluation are listed in the 100% of fleet aircraft group, then FAA recommends that the 100% fleet curves should be used.

Table 4-4 summarizes representative aircraft within these groups and identifies the listed aircraft currently using the Aurora State Airport.

TABLE 4-4: AC 150/5325-4A - 75% AND 100% OF FLEET AIRCRAFT

75% of Fleet	100% of Fleet
British Aerospace – Bae 125-700	British Aerospace – Bae Corporate 800, 1000
Beechcraft, Mitsubishi – Beech Jet - 400A, Premier I	Bombardier – Challenger 600, 601-3A/3ER, 604
Bombardier – Challenger 300	Cessna – S550 Citation S/II, 650 Citation III/IV, 750 Citation X
Cessna – Citation I, II, III, V, VII, CJ-2, Bravo, Excel, Encore, Sovereign	Dassault – Falcon 900C/900EX, 2000/2000EX
Dassault – Falcon 10, 20, 50	IAI – Astra 1125, Galaxy 1126
Israel Aircraft Industries – Jet Commander 1121, Westwind 1123/1124	Learjet – 45XR, 55/55B/55C, 60
Learjet – 20 series, 30 series, 40, 45	Raytheon Hawker – Horizon, 800/800 XP, 1000
Raytheon Hawker – Hawker 400, 600	Sabreliner – 65/75
Rockwell – Sabreliner 75A	

Source: FAA AC 150/5325-4B
Notes: 1. Red text indicates aircraft operating at the Aurora State Airport according to TFMSC data.

Table 4-5 summarizes 10 years of historical jet aircraft instrument flight plan filings for the Aurora State Airport. The filings provide a reliable indication of jet activity at the Airport, which has consistently included more than 500 annual operations for aircraft in the 100% of fleet grouping. Based on FAA criteria, use of the 100% of fleet runway length curves is appropriate for the Aurora State Airport.

TABLE 4-5: TFMSC IFR DATA - SELECT JET AIRCRAFT WITH MAXIMUM CERTIFICATED TAKEOFF WEIGHT OF MORE THAN 12,500 POUNDS

	Aircraft Designator	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Operations by Aircraft that make up 75% of the Fleet Group											
BAE HS 125	HS25	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Beechjet 400/400A/400XP*	BE40	32	66	46	34	26	14	4	6	24	38
Beechjet Premier/Raytheon 390 Premier	PRM1	70	100	88	76	68	4	16	12	4	4
Bombardier Challenger 300	CL30	32	102	72	74	78	104	88	80	62	54
Bombardier Challenger 350	CL35	0	0	0	4	2	0	22	56	84	108
Cessna 500 Citation I	C500	0	4	8	0	20	20	2	0	0	0
Cessna 501 Citation I Special	C501	78	70	46	14	16	12	30	16	8	20
Cessna Citation CJ-2	C25A	44	68	178	82	74	188	234	154	100	184
Cessna Citation CJ-3	C25B	46	36	26	102	86	106	90	306	182	66
Cessna Citation CJ-4	C25C	6	12	2	4	10	72	60	636	678	790
Cessna 550 Citation II/Bravo	C550	212	134	164	226	262	158	212	174	138	162
Cessna 550 Citation Bravo	C55B	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	16
Cessna 551 Citation II/Special	C551	6	4	6	14	56	26	12	0	4	0
Cessna 560 Citation V Encore/Ultra	C560	366	498	466	590	694	774	708	632	546	626
Cessna 560 XL Citation Excel/XLS	C56X	106	118	132	260	318	400	438	396	340	286
Cessna 680 Citation - Latitude	C68A	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	30	30	40
Cessna 680 Citation Sovereign	C680	64	56	68	72	66	90	140	150	140	254
Cessna 700 Citation - Longitude	C700	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Dassault Falcon 10	FA10	64	74	70	92	20	0	10	0	0	0
Dassault Falcon 20	FA20	94	86	28	14	98	74	76	68	66	82
Dassault Falcon 50/EX*	FA50	16	32	108	228	320	332	276	286	216	306
Embraer EMB545/Legacy 450	E545	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	4	2
Embraer ERJ 135/140/Legacy	E135	0	4	6	0	2	2	0	0	0	0
Embraer Legacy 500	E550	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	4
Embraer Phenom 300	E55P	14	106	98	96	88	130	56	80	256	434
Hawker 600	H25A	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
IAI Westwind 1124	WW24	10	8	4	2	10	2	2	4	0	0
Learjet 28	LJ28	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
Learjet 31	LJ31	4	2	0	0	6	54	92	110	32	22
Learjet 35	LJ35	2	8	18	0	4	6	8	4	0	12
Learjet 40	LJ40	10	0	8	0	4	0	2	0	2	6
Sabreliner 40/60	SBR1	2	4	0	2	2	0	0	0	2	0
Operations by Aircraft that make up 100% of the Fleet Group											
Bombardier Challenger 600/601/604	CL60	126	122	36	12	68	82	64	60	96	78
Cessna 650 Citation III/IV	C650	94	92	120	144	122	126	104	68	68	42
Cessna 750 Citation X	C750	60	76	92	94	102	100	108	92	84	38
Dassault Falcon 2000/EX	F2TH	2	14	6	4	6	4	40	134	124	366
Dassault Falcon 900C/EX	F900	180	148	48	10	56	82	70	110	32	24
Dassault Falcon F7X	FA7X	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	4	2	0
Gulfstream 150	G150	2	0	0	2	2	6	80	24	4	2
Gulfstream 280	G280	0	0	6	2	0	0	0	2	0	2
Hawker 700/800/800XP	H25B	224	212	316	118	42	28	34	22	8	32
Hawker Horizon	HA4T	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	6
IAI Astra 1125	ASTR	178	152	164	114	160	162	96	14	0	4
IAI Galaxy 1126	GALX	8	10	16	0	2	4	0	4	2	2
Learjet 45	LJ45	116	156	180	236	242	212	112	140	124	208
Learjet 55	LJ55	0	2	0	0	2	0	4	2	0	0
Learjet 60	LJ60	2	4	10	82	36	14	30	16	6	10
Operations by Aircraft with Maximum Takeoff Weight > 60,000 lbs											
Gulfstream II/G200	GLF2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gulfstream III/G300	GLF3	0	0	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	2
Gulfstream IV/G400	GLF4	4	0	4	0	2	6	2	8	26	88
Gulfstream V/G500	GLF5	6	10	4	2	0	4	2	0	4	6
Gulfstream VI/G600	GLF6	0	0	0	0	6	4	2	0	0	0
Bombardier Global 5000	GL5T	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0
Bombardier Global Express	GLEX	18	10	4	8	0	14	50	52	10	0
Total		2304	2602	2654	2818	3182	3424	3398	3956	3510	4444
Operations by 75% of the Fleet Group Aircraft		1280	1592	1644	1988	2332	2576	2594	3200	2918	3534
Operations by 100% of Fleet Group Aircraft**		1024	1010	1010	830	850	848	804	756	592	910

Source : FAA TFMSC Data; Notes: 1. **Total Operations by 100% of Fleet Group Aircraft includes Operations by Aircraft with Maximum Takeoff Weight > 60,000 lbs.

Aircraft Useful Load

Once the appropriate runway length curve set is identified based on percentage of aircraft fleet, an additional step is required to determine the appropriate useful load factor that applies to the aircraft operating at the Aurora State Airport. Useful load factors are based on the haul lengths and service needs of the design aircraft or a grouping of aircraft.

The FAA requires use of either 60% or 90% of useful load factors as described in Paragraph 303 of *AC 150-5325-4B*. Paragraph 303 explains that the *"75% of fleet at 60% useful load curve provides a runway length sufficient to satisfy the operational requirements of approximately 75% of the fleet at 60% useful load. This figure is to be used for those airplanes operating with no more than a 60% useful load factor."*

To justify a runway length based on the higher demand profile of 90% useful load curves, FAA requires documentation of 500 annual takeoffs and landings to/from airports beyond 1,000 nautical miles (NM) by aircraft in the 100% of fleet group. Traffic Flow Management System (TFMS) Flight plan data acquired from FAA through a Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) request was queried to identify operations by aircraft included in the 100% of fleet group originating at or departing from the Aurora State Airport. Operations between the identified city-pairs with distances of at least 1,000 NM were totaled. This exercise did not identify 500 annual operations by aircraft in the 100% of the fleet group traveling at least 1,000 miles. As a result, the 60% useful load curves should be used in determining runway length requirements.


Runway Length Calculation

Figure 4-4 depicts the runway length curves for 100% of the fleet group with 60% useful loads identified in Figure 3-2 of *AC 150-5325-4B*. The Aurora State Airport is located at an elevation of 199.8 feet above mean sea level (MSL) and the mean maximum temperature (the average daily high temperature for the hottest month of the year) is 83°F.[4] Based on these inputs and the FAA runway length curves for 100% of fleet at 60% useful load, an unadjusted runway length of 5,300 feet is identified.

Further adjustment of the above length is required to account for effective runway gradient and wet and slippery conditions. It should be noted that these adjustments are not cumulative since the first adjusts for takeoffs and the latter adjusts for landings. After both adjustments have been independently applied, the larger resulting runway length is the standard methodology's recommended length.

Runway gradient is addressed by increasing the unadjusted runway length at a rate of 10 feet for each 1-foot of difference between runway high and low points. The runway has an elevation difference of 3.3 feet resulting in an adjusted runway length of 5,333 feet. For the 60% useful load fleet group, adjustments for wet and slippery conditions can increase the runway length either by 15% or up to a maximum of 5,500 feet, whichever is less. Applying a 15% adjustment to the runway length calculated above exceeds 5,500 feet. So, the recommended length is increased to 5,500 feet to satisfy the requirements for the wet/slippery conditions.

FIGURE 4-4: 100% OF FLEET AT 60% USEFUL LOAD CURVES



Source: FAA Advisory Circular 150/5325-4B

4 NOAA National Centers for Environmental Information, https://www.ncei.noaa.gov/access/us-climate-normals/

Summary of Comments on 4 UAO_Airport Facility Requirements_31424 FAA Review Copy - CWE Responses 20240411.pdf

Page: 4-15

Number: 1 Author: Mobile User Date: 4/11/2024 10:34:53 AM
When was this done? Was this prior to my activity with this project?

Author: Mark Steele Subject: Sticky Note Date: 4/11/2024 10:34:53 AM
The data were requested via FOIA in January 2022.

Based on local conditions, the standard methodology outlined above and in *AC 150-5325-4B*, and direction from FAA-SEA ADO, a runway length of 5,500 feet is required to accommodate 100% of large airplanes (60,000 pounds or less maximum gross takeoff weight) at 60% useful load for the current 20-year planning period.

- FACILITY REQUIREMENT. Consistent with FAA planning methodologies and direction from FAA-SEA ADO, a runway length of 5,500 feet at the Aurora State Airport defines the justified runway length for the planning and analyses to be performed in Chapter 5 – Development Alternatives.

RUNWAY WIDTH

Runway 17/35 is 100 feet wide with 10-foot-wide paved and gravel shoulders. The existing runway configuration meets the current and future FAA design standards defined for AAC/ADG C-II. Runway 35 has a paved blast pad (100 feet wide by 150 feet long). The Runway 17 end does not have a blast pad.

- FACILITY REQUIREMENT. The runway width and shoulders should be maintained at the existing width of 100 feet (with 10-foot shoulders). The blast pad adjacent to Runway 35 should be widened and adding a blast pad at the Runway 17 end is recommended based on current jet aircraft activity and common runway utilization.

FAA DESIGN STANDARDS

Runway Blast Pads

Existing/Future Standards: The AAC/ADG C-II standard for a blast pad is 120 feet wide and 150 feet long.

Condition: Runway 35 has a blast pad that is 100 feet wide and 150 feet long. Runway 17 does not have a blast pad. The Runway 35 blast pad should be widened to meet standards, while a new blast pad should be constructed for Runway 17.

RUNWAY PAVEMENT STRENGTH

The existing published weight bearing capacity for Runway 17/35 is 30,000 pounds for aircraft equipped with single wheel gear (SWG) and 45,000 pounds for dual wheel gear (DWG) aircraft. Runway pavement strength and weight rating has become an important issue due an increase in aircraft landing requests submitted to airport management for aircraft over 60,000 pounds. The existing and future design aircraft is categorized as AAC/ADG C-II. A review of the FAA Aircraft Characteristics Database (2023), identified a range of maximum takeoff weight (MTOW) for AAC/ADG C-II between 21,500 pounds and 75,000 pounds for the 26 aircraft listed, including the Challenger 600 (CL60) which has a MTOW of 36,200 pounds. All of the listed aircraft are equipped with dual wheel landing gear.

The current runway pavement section was constructed in 2005 and is reaching the end of its 20-year design life. Operations by aircraft that exceed the runway's published weight bearing capacity may be expected to cause premature pavement stress and reduce the remaining lifespan of the runway pavement. As indicated in earlier documentation of air traffic, operations by aircraft with 12,500- to 60,000-pound operating weights at the Aurora State Airport are significant in volume and growing (see **Table 4-5**). The Airport also has on occasion accommodated limited operations by aircraft greater than 60,000 pounds.

The forecast increase in demand by aircraft weighing 45,000 to 60,000 pounds may warrant strengthening the runway pavement section as part of the next runway reconstruction project. This would prolong the service life of the runway and would provide additional durability for the limited amount of activity that exceeds 60,000 pounds. There is minimal demand for SWG aircraft above 30,000 pounds. Additional fleet mix analysis will be required by FAA to justify a change in pavement section design. This work is outside the airport master plan scope of work and would be performed in a pre-design element of project formulation.

- FACILITY REQUIREMENT. Maintain current weight bearing capacity, and perform additional engineering and fleet mix analyses to determine the appropriate runway pavement strength consistent with future pavement rehabilitation needs.

Page: 4-16

Number: 1 Author: Timothy A House Subject: Comment on Text Date: 4/11/2024 10:34:53 AM
This is not referenced in the adjacent paragraphs. What does this mean?

Author: Mark Steele Date: 4/11/2024 10:36:51 AM
This is worded poorly. It should say "in coordination with FAA-SEA ADO". We'll update the text.

Number: 2 Author: Mobile User Date: 4/11/2024 10:34:53 AM
Not required. Is there a current erosion issue that would justify the addition of the blast pad?
See AC 150/5300-13B Chapter 3.7.4.2 Recommended Practices.

Author: Mark Steele Date: 4/11/2024 12:51:55 PM
It is correct that blast pads are not a requirement or a recommendation for ADG-II runways. However it is generally good practice to include blast pads on runways servicing jets to prevent erosion issues. We will change the requirement to a facility goal.

RUNWAY DESIGN STANDARDS

Runway 17/35 meets applicable FAA dimensional and clearance standards with two exceptions:

Runway Protection Zones (RPZ) – Portions of the existing RPZs extend off airport property and contain public roads. These issues are related to FAA land use compatibility guidelines.

Runway Object Free Area (OFA) – Portions of the existing OFA extend off airport property and contain public roads. Vehicles traveling on the roads penetrate the OFA. One helicopter parking position located south of the ATCT is located within OFA.

These items are discussed further in this chapter and in evaluations (RPZ Analysis and OFA Modification of Standards [MOS] Analysis) that will be completed as supporting elements for the Airport Master Plan's airside alternatives analyses.

A review of the applicable design standards is provided in the following section. Definitions of design standards and brief summaries of existing conditions are provided in the adjacent sidebars. As noted in **Table 4-1**, presented earlier in the chapter, the current AAC/ADG C-II design standards applied to the runway-taxiway system are consistent with runway approach visibility minimums "not lower than 3/4-mile." This standard corresponds to current instrument approach visibility minimums of 7/8-mile since the next incremental visibility threshold available is "not lower than 1-mile."

Runway Protection Zone

The FAA provides interim guidance regarding RPZs and incompatible land uses with a particular focus on roads located within RPZs. This guidance directs airport sponsors to evaluate any planned changes to existing RPZs that introduce or increase the presence of roads within the RPZ.[5] FAA *AC 150/5300-13B* (Appendix I, Section 3) also provides current FAA guidance on permissible land uses within the limits of RPZs.

FAA guidance recommends the evaluation of existing roads in RPZs during airport master planning to determine if feasible alternatives exist for realignment of a road outside RPZs or for changes to the RPZs themselves. The FAA Seattle ADO has indicated that the primary focus of their review under this guidance is related to proposed changes to RPZs, which may include change to a runway end/RPZ location, approach visibility minimums, or the built items located in an RPZ. Any proposed changes in the length or threshold configuration of a runway that changes the location of existing RPZs are subject to review by FAA headquarters in Washington D.C.

FAA DESIGN STANDARDS

RPZ

Existing Standard: AAC/ADG C-II/not lower than 3/4-mile RPZs (48.978 acres). RPZs should be owned by the Airport or under control by easement and should be clear of incompatible land uses such as roads and buildings.

Future Standard (Options): Maintain existing standard or apply AAC/ADG C-II/not lower than 1-mile RPZs (29.465 acres) if instrument approach visibility minimums are changed from 7/8-mile to 1-mile.

Condition: Both Runway 17 and 35 RPZs have areas that are outside of ODAV-owned land and contain multiple incompatible land uses. As part of this Airport Master Plan, an analysis of the existing and proposed RPZs will be evaluated as part of the development alternatives analysis to identify an agreeable solution to address the incompatibilities.

The FAA also encourages airport sponsors to control RPZs through fee simple ownership. In cases where ownership is not in place, easements are used to control activities within the RPZ. Both RPZs for Runway 17/35 have small areas that extend beyond ODAV-owned property. ODAV has secured Avigation (FAA term: Air + Navigation) easements for these sections of the existing RPZs.

[2] FAA September 27, 2012, Interim Guidance on Land Uses Within a Runway Protection Zone

Page: 4-17

Number: 1 Author: Mobile User Date: 4/11/2024 10:34:53 AM

The interim guidance memo was replaced. AC-150/5190-4B issued on 9/16/2022 is the latest guideline for RPZ.

Author: Mark Steele Date: 4/11/2024 12:35:17 PM

We've updated the text to reflect the current guidance

Number: 2 Author: Mobile User Date: 4/11/2024 10:34:53 AM

This has been replaced.

Author: Mark Steele Date: 4/11/2024 12:35:34 PM


We've updated the text to reflect the current guidance

The existing AAC/ADG C-II RPZ dimensions for Runway 17/35 are determined by the lowest published IAP visibility minimums of 7/8-mile. The corresponding RPZ dimensional standard is incrementally defined by FAA for runway approach visibility minimums "not lower than 3/4-mile" since the next available visibility increment is "not lower than 1-mile," which is not compatible with approaches having 7/8-mile visibility minimums.

For the purposes of this evaluation both the existing and an optional RPZ are displayed in **Figure 4-5**. The optional RPZ corresponds to dimensional standards defined for "approach visibility minimums not lower than 1-mile." As depicted in the figure, sections of both the existing (not lower than 3/4-mile) and optional (1-mile) RPZs for Runways 17 and 35 have identified land use incompatibilities. The size of future RPZs in relation to approach visibility requirements and land use compatibility will be assessed further in Chapter 5 – Development Alternatives Analysis.

- FACILITY REQUIREMENT. Based on the conformance issues identified, it is recommended that existing and future RPZ land use compatibility be evaluated further and coordinated with FAA through the alternatives analysis process.

FIGURE 4-5: RUNWAY 17/35 PROTECTIONS ZONES NON-STANDARD CONDITIONS



Source: Century West Engineering

Object Free Area (OFA)

The runway OFA is a flat surface that sits at the same elevation as the runway. The OFA should be clear of terrain and above ground objects except for those required for air navigation or aircraft ground maneuvering purposes. *FAA AC 150/5300-13B* defines both dimensional and obstruction clearance standards for runway OFAs.

The OFA for Runway 17/35 has been identified as a nonstandard condition due to fencing, public roads, privately owned helicopter landing pads and roads, windcone, ASOS, and other objects located outside of ODAV property control, as depicted in **Figure 4-6**. As part of this Airport Master Plan, an OFA MOS analysis will be completed as part of Chapter 5 – Development Alternatives Analysis.

FAA DESIGN STANDARDS


Runway OFA

Existing/Future Standards: AAC/ADG C-II/not lower than 3/4-mile standard is 800 feet wide (400 feet each side of runway centerline) and 1,000 feet beyond the runway ends. The OFA should be clear of above ground objects except for those required for air navigation or aircraft ground maneuvering purposes. Additional gradient standards apply.

Condition: The OFA for Runway 17/35 includes non-standard conditions such as fencing, public roads, and other objects off airport property that are located within the OFA. As part of this Airport Master Plan, an OFA MOS analysis will be completed as part of Chapter 5 – Development Alternatives Analysis.

- FACILITY REQUIREMENT. Based on the facility needs identified in Chapter 4, it is recommended that the existing and future OFA be evaluated further and coordinated with FAA in the scoped OFA MOS Analysis as part of Chapter 5 – Development Alternatives Analysis.

FIGURE 4-6: RUNWAY OBJECT FREE AREA NON-STANDARD CONDITIONS



Source: Century West Engineering

Runway Safety Area (RSA)

The RSA is a flat surface that sits at the same elevation as the runway and is intended to be clear of terrain and above ground objects. The RSA is intended to enhance the safety of aircraft that overshoot, overrun, or veer off the runway, as well as to provide access for Aircraft Rescue and Firefighting (ARFF) equipment during such incidents. *FAA AC 150/5300-13B* defines dimensional, gradient, surface condition, and obstruction clearance standards for the RSA.

The RSA for Runway 17/35 meets AAC/ADG C-II design standards with the exception of the drain field located in the southeast corner of the RSA, the drainage ditch along Taxiway A, the ASOS, and windcone on the west side of the runway. The compatibility of non-standard items and potential mitigation strategies will be evaluated in Chapter 5 – Development Alternatives Analysis.

- FACILITY REQUIREMENT. AAC/ADG C-II RSA standards must be met and maintained for the existing runway and applied to any future runway configuration options evaluated in the development alternatives analysis.

Obstacle Free Zone (OFZ)

The AAC/ADG C-II standard width for the Runway 17/35 OFZ is 400 feet based on operations by large aircraft. The OFZ extends 200 feet beyond the runway ends. FAA definition, the runway OFZ clearing standard *"precludes aircraft and other object penetrations, except for frangible NAVAIDs that need to be located in the OFZ because of their function."*

FAA DESIGN STANDARDS

RSA

Existing Standard: AAC/ADG C-II/not lower than 3/4-mile standard is 500 feet wide (250 feet each side of runway centerline) and 1,000 feet beyond runway ends. The RSA should be cleared and graded with no objects higher than 3 inches above grade, except for FAA-approved items that are frangible (breakaway mounts). Additional gradient and surface compaction standards apply.

Condition: There are several items within the RSA for Runway 17/35 including the drain field, drainage ditch, ASOS, and windcone that will be studied further within the development alternatives. Future runway planning will require that the FAA standards are maintained.

Runway OFZ

Existing/Future Standards: Runway OFZ standards are based on approach visibility minimums of the runway, and the size and approach speeds of the aircraft using the runway. The standard for runways used by large aircraft are 400 feet wide or 200 feet each side of runway centerline and 200 feet beyond runway ends.

Inner-Approach OFZ

Existing/Future Standards: For runway ends with an approach lighting system (ALS), such as Runway 17, an inner-approach OFZ is required. By FAA standard, the inner-approach OFZ begins 200 feet from the runway end (at the same elevation) and extends 200 feet beyond the last light unit in the ALS. Its width is the same as the runway OFZ and rises at a slope of 50 (horizontal) to 1 (vertical) from its beginning.

Condition: Runway 17/35 meets the FAA dimensional and obstacle clearing standards for runway OFZ and the inner-approach OFZ (for Runway 17). Future runway planning will require that the FAA standards are maintained.

The OFA for Runway 17/35 and the inner-approach OFZ for Runway 17 meet AAC/ADG C-II design standards. In the event an ALS is proposed for Runway 35, the inner-approach OFZ standards would apply.

- FACILITY REQUIREMENT. AAC/ADG C-II OFZ standards must be maintained for the existing runway and applied to any future runway configuration options evaluated in Chapter 5 – Development Alternatives Analysis.

Runway Markings

The markings on Runway 17/35, as noted in Chapter 2 – Existing Conditions Analysis, are consistent with FAA standards for color (white), configuration, and approach type, and are in good condition. The Runway 17 and 35 end identifiers (numbers) are based on the magnetic heading of each runway end. Runway end numbers are periodically updated based on the ongoing change in magnetic variation. The runway's alignment relative to magnetic north will be evaluated to determine if a change in runway designation will be required in the current planning period.

- FACILITY REQUIREMENT. Runway markings should be maintained consistent with FAA standards. Periodic repainting should be incorporated into the ODAV Pavement Maintenance Program.

TAXIWAYS AND TAXILANES

The existing taxiway and taxilane systems on ODAV property were analyzed relative to the runway, apron, and aircraft parking requirements, hangars, and FAA design standards. Existing taxiway markings at the Airport are consistent with FAA standards for color (yellow) and configuration, and are generally in good condition.

The existing runway to parallel taxiway centerline separation for Taxiway A is 300 feet, which meets the current C-II standard.

It is noted that existing parallel taxiway separation would not meet the standard of 400 feet for C-II runways with lower than 3/4-mile visibility minimums. Due to other facility limitations associated with implementing "lower than 3/4-mile visibility minimums," it is unlikely that visibility minimums will be reduced.

Taxiway A, the run-up apron at the south end of the taxiway, and connector taxiways (A1-A5) generally meet standards with several notable exceptions, as depicted in **Figure 4-7**.

Two FAA-designated hot spots exist on the Aurora State Airport taxiway system. A hot spot is a location on an airport movement area with a history or potential risk of collision or runway incursion, and where heightened attention by pilots and drivers is necessary. The hot spots and other locations on the Taxiway A system that warrant further consideration are summarized below:

- Hot Spot #1 is located at Taxiway A and A1. Based on previous discussions with FAA, it is understood that this hot spot will be removed from the designation list if proper marking and signage is installed. Airport management reports that the signage and appropriate markings have been updated. Further discussion with FAA will be required to remove the designation from the FAA Hot Spots List database.
- Hot Spot #2 is located at Taxiway A and A4. This location is identified as a "direct access" taxiway and solutions to address this non-standard condition will be considered during the development alternatives analysis.

FAA DESIGN STANDARDS

Runway to Parallel Taxiway Separation
Existing/Future Standards: AAC/ADG C-II/not lower than 3/4-mile standard is 300 feet.

Condition: The parallel taxiway (Taxiway A) for Runway 17/35 has a centerline-to-centerline separation of 300 feet.

Parallel Taxiway to Taxilane Separation
Existing/Future Standards: The separation standard between a parallel taxiway and an adjacent parallel taxilane is based on ADG. The ADG II standard is 101.5 feet.

Condition: The centerline-to-centerline separation between Taxiway A and the north side hangar taxilanes is 105 feet and exceeds standards. Future development of any parallel taxiway/taxilanes will meet the standards of the ADG/TDG for which they are designed.

Taxiway Width
Standards: TDG 2A/2B standard taxiway width is 35 feet.

Condition: Taxiway A and the five connector taxiways (A1-A5) meet the FAA dimensional standard (width). Future taxiways will be required to meet the ADG/TDG standards for the intended aircraft use.

Page: 4-20

Number: 1 Author: Timothy A House Subject: Comment on Text Date: 4/11/2024 10:34:53 AM

I am not sure that the signage and marking improvements has occurred. When were the improvements completed and specifically what were they. This type of discussion was not had at the latest RSAT.

Author: Mark Steele Date: 4/11/2024 12:54:20 PM

We've updated the text to reflect the current status of the markings and signs - Markings have been updated, signs will be updated in a future project.

Two interior runway connector taxiways (A3 and A4) provide a direct access path to the runway from adjacent apron parking areas. The aprons have a wide expanse of unbroken pavement fronting the east edge of Taxiway A, between Taxiway A3 and A4. These direct access conditions and the wide expanse of pavement are not consistent with current FAA taxiway design guidance. Changes in pavement configuration will be evaluated in the airside alternatives analysis. Options may include increasing the distinction between apron and taxiway pavements, limiting the number of aircraft access points along this section of Taxiway A, and modifying the direct paths in the A3 and A4 runway-taxiway-interface to improve pilot situational awareness and reduce the potential for inadvertent runway incursions.

The north end of runway/taxiway system does not currently have a designated aircraft runup area. A review of options will be performed in the airside alternatives analysis near Taxiways A1 and A2. Options may include concepts for both ODAV property and private property that were explored in a recent environmental assessment. It is noted that options that were previously considered, which included acquisition of private property were met with resistance from existing airport users and were ultimately excluded from the scope of work in the environmental assessment. A potential site located on ODAV property near Taxiway A2, adjacent to the old fuel pumps, has been identified as a possible location to be considered during the development alternatives process.

FAA DESIGN STANDARDS

Taxiway Safety Area (TSA)

Standards: ADG II standard is 79 feet wide or 39.5 feet each side of the taxiway centerline for the entire length of the taxiway. Additional gradient standards apply.


Condition: The existing TSAs on the Airport meet FAA dimensional and grading standards. Future taxiway improvements will be required to meet the standards of the ADG for which they are designed.

Taxiway Object Free Area (TOFA)

Standards: ADG II standard is 124 feet wide or 62 feet each side of taxiway centerline.

Condition: The TOFA for Taxiway A and Taxiways A1-A5 satisfy FAA dimensional and obstacle clearing standards for ADG II. Future taxiway improvements will be required to meet the standards of the ADG for which they are designed.

FIGURE 4-7: TAXIWAY / TAXILANE NON-STANDARD CONDITIONS



Source: Century West Engineering

Page: 4-21

Number: 1 Author: Timothy A House Subject: Comment on Text Date: 4/11/2024 10:34:53 AM

This geometry configuration is challenging. It does not meet the standards. There is direct access and the connector taxiway is supposed to have a radius where it turns to align with the threshold. Since this is private land our options are limited, but the geometry needs addressed.

Author: Mark Steele Date: 4/11/2024 11:04:11 AM

Agreed that this is a challenging geometry to work with. We've added text concerning the direct access at A1 in the previous paragraph. Options for a runup area will be evaluated in the alternatives analysis. Both the direct access issues and runup area are included as facility requirements on the next page.

The taxilane object free area (TLOFA) standard for ADG II aircraft is 110 feet (55 feet each side of centerline). The ADG II standard is applied to much of the airfield on ODAV property. ADG I TLOFA standards—79 feet (39.5 feet each side of centerline)—are applied to several small aircraft areas. By FAA standard, the TLOFA should be free of items that could create a hazard for taxiing aircraft including parked aircraft, hangars, fences, other built items, and natural terrain. It is common for taxilanes serving aircraft parking aprons and hangar developments to be designed to meet the standards of a particular group of aircraft using the facilities.

The taxilanes in the apron area adjacent to the ATCT generally meet FAA TLOFA dimensional standards for ADG I and ADG II aircraft, where applicable. Future Improvement of taxilanes associated with apron and aircraft parking expansion will meet the standards of the ADG for which they are designed.

Several taxilanes located between hangar rows have non-standard TLOFA widths due to building separation and other obstructions like fencing on adjacent private property. The TLOFAs in these areas range from 69 to 79 feet. The areas where the TLOFA is narrower than required by standards are not typically considered to be deficient by airport users based on the aircraft using the facilities. *AC 150/5300-13B* provides guidance for calculating appropriate taxilane centerline to object separation distance based on the wingspan of the most demanding aircraft anticipated to use the taxilane.

The equations offered in the AC include:

- Taxiway centerline to object separation equals 0.7 times airplane wingspan plus 10 feet.
- Taxiway centerline to object separation equals 0.6 times airplane wingspan plus 10 feet.

Doubling the results of the above equations yields in a TLOFA width appropriate for that or smaller aircraft

For a typical single-engine fixed-wing aircraft or light-twin aircraft with a 41-foot wingspan, the FAA formula yields a recommended TLOFA of 69 feet wide. Options to provide standard TLOFA widths on ODAV-owned property will be considered in Chapter 5 – Development Alternatives Analysis. For long-term hangar redevelopment, the FAA may require standard TLOFAs, if physically feasible, as hangars are replaced at the end of their useful life.

- FACILITY REQUIREMENT. Coordinate completed mitigation on Hot Spot #1 with FAA to remove from the FAA's active list.
- FACILITY REQUIREMENT. Evaluate modifications to Hot Spot #2 to identify an acceptable solution/redesign for Taxiway A4 in Chapter 5 – Development Alternatives Analysis.
- FACILITY REQUIREMENT. Define measures required to correct the "direct access" taxilane at Taxiway A and A3 by identifying an acceptable solution/redesign in Chapter 5 – Development Alternatives Analysis.
- FACILITY REQUIREMENT. Evaluate north aircraft runup area options at the north end of Taxiway A in Chapter 5 – Development Alternatives Analysis.
- FACILITY REQUIREMENT. Evaluate TLOFA clearance options for taxilanes in Chapter 5 – Development Alternatives Analysis.
- FACILITY GOAL. Taxiway markings should be maintained consistent with FAA standards. Periodic repainting should be incorporated into the ODAV Pavement Maintenance program.

APRONS AND TIEDOWNS

Transient aircraft are typically stored on the Airport for short periods of time, typically less than a day. Based aircraft may be stored either in hangars or on apron tiedowns. However, national and local trends have shown it is the preference of aircraft owners to favor hangars when storing their aircraft at their base airport, rather than using outside parking on aprons. For the purposes of this study, it is assumed that based aircraft will be accommodated predominately by hangar storage and additional future demand for apron parking will be driven by transient aircraft. The anticipated demand for long-term tiedowns for based aircraft is expected to be small and can be incorporated into the transient demand.

Past planning studies have quantified transient tiedown demand using an FAA methodology that has since been removed from *AC 150/5300-13B*. An alternative method described in **Airport Cooperative Research Program (ACRP) Report 113** was used instead. The ACRP method applies the following formula to operations fleet mix forecast to estimate future demand for transient aircraft parking:

*(X/2 * T)/365 * P = Number of Transient Parking Positions*

Where:

X = number of operations

T = percent of operations that are transient (51% at the Aurora State Airport)

P = percent of transient aircraft that are parked on the apron at the same time (50% estimated)

The ACRP formula was applied to operations fleet mix forecast estimates in Table 3-18 in Chapter 3 to calculate the number of additional transient aircraft tiedown spaces needed over the 20-year planning period. Previous planning studies identified a standard ratio of 360 square yards (3,250 square feet) of apron per tiedown intended for a single-engine piston aircraft, such as the Cessna 182, to account for taxilanes and required spacing between aircraft. This area is 3.1 times the footprint area of the Cessna 182. To scale up to other types of aircraft and calculate the apron space needed, the same multiplier was applied to the corresponding footprint areas of the representative aircraft for each aircraft type. The anticipated transient aircraft parking positions and required apron space are summarized in **Table 4-6**.

TABLE 4-6: TRANSIENT AIRCRAFT TIEDOWN AND APRON REQUIREMENTS

	Single Engine Piston	Multi Engine Piston	Turbo-prop	Jet	Helicopter	Total
Additional Transient Aircraft Parking						
2026	1	(1)	1	1	1	3
2031	1	(1)	1	1	1	3
2041	(2)	(1)	2	3	1	3
Total	**0**	**(3)**	**4**	**5**	**3**	**9**
Additional Apron Area (sq. ft)						
2026	3,250	(5,200)	7,400	9,200	4,100	18,750
2031	3,250	(5,200)	7,400	9,200	4,100	18,750
2041	(6,500)	(5,200)	14,800	27,600	4,100	34,800
Total	**0**	**(15,600)**	**29,600**	**46,000**	**12,300**	**72,300**

Source: Century West Engineering

It should be noted that the operations fleet mix forecast projects a decrease in operations by multi-engine piston aircraft. This results in a decrease of three parking positions required to accommodate these aircraft. As this transition occurs, these tiedown locations should be repurposed to accommodate demand by other aircraft.

- FACILITY REQUIREMENT. An additional 72,300 square feet of apron is needed during the current planning period to accommodate projected demand. The need for an additional 9 aircraft parking positions is defined over the course of the planning period.

Page: 4-23

Number: 1 Author: Timothy A House Subject: Comment on Text Date: 4/11/2024 10:34:53 AM

Appendix E? How does this ACRP method compare?

Author: Mark Steele Date: 4/11/2024 12:19:18 PM

Appendix E provides general guidelines for determining parking apron area needed. The ACRP method largely incorporates these guidelines. One notable difference is that the ACRP method bases demand on average daily operations while Appendix E recommends using operations at average peak period.

Number: 2 Author: Mobile User Date: 4/11/2024 10:34:53 AM

What is available to support these estimates?

Author: Mark Steele Date: 4/15/2024 12:20:00 PM

There is little hard data available that allows us to definitively quantify transient ops. However, your comment pointed out that the previous numbers were based on itinerant operations. We've reworked the analysis to separate transient from the itinerant ops. The adjusted OPSNET ATCT counts show 51% of annual ops are itinerant. We are assuming that 25% of those are transient and that split will remain steady over the planning period. 50% transient AC parked at one time is a planning level estimate used in lieu of quantifiable parking data. We will update the table and add text to explain in the paragraph below.


AIRFIELD PAVEMENT CONDITIONS

An updated Pavement Evaluation/Maintenance Management Program inspection (PEP), performed by ODAV contractors, was conducted in 2023 for all airfield pavements. A summary of pavement conditions provided in the 2023 pavement condition report states:

- Section Pavement Condition Index (PCI) at the Aurora State Airport range from a low of 18 (a PCI of "Serious") to a high of 94 (a PCI of "Good"). The area-weighted average PCI for all airport pavements is 62, corresponding to an overall PCI of "Fair."

A graphical depiction of predicted 2028 and 2033 (assuming no future pavement maintenance) is presented below in **Figure 4-8**. The area weighted average condition for existing airfield pavements is predicted to be "Fair" in 2028, and projected to be "Poor" in 2033 according to the PEP. Additional pavement analysis for Runway 17/35 completed by ODAV in 2023 confirmed that rehabilitation will be required in the current planning period as the runway reaches the end of its 20-year design life. Continued use by heavier aircraft is expected to accelerate pavement wear and may impact the timetable for rehabilitation. ODAV is currently considering a range of pavement management options to avoid premature pavement failure that would require costly emergency repairs or an extended unplanned closure of the runway.

FIGURE 4-8: PREDICTED PAVEMENT CONDITIONS



Source: Oregon Department of Aviation – 2023 Pavement Evaluation/Maintenance Management Program

- FACILITY REQUIREMENT. Perform ongoing airfield pavement maintenance in accordance with ODAV PEP recommendations to maximize the longevity of the airfield pavements during the current planning period and beyond.
- FACILITY REQUIREMENT. Rehabilitation of Runway 17/35 is anticipated in the near-term (0-5 years), based on its current condition, age, and use.
- FACILITY REQUIREMENT. Rehabilitation of the southern two-thirds of the existing Taxiway A pavement is anticipated during the 10- to 20-year phase of the planning period.
- FACILITY REQUIREMENT. Rehabilitation of the main apron pavement is anticipated during the 10- to 20-year phase of the planning period.

AIRPORT SUPPORT SERVICES

Airport support services and facilities includes the typical airside supporting facilities such as airfield lighting, signage, weather reporting equipment, ground-based navigational aids (NAVAIDS), and fueling facilities.

Runway/Taxiway/Apron Lighting

The Runway 17/35 and taxiway lighting system consists of standard Medium Intensity Runway Lighting (MIRL) and Medium Intensity Taxiway Lighting (MITL). The apron edges and some taxilanes are marked with blue edge reflectors. The lighting system is in good condition. Typical airfield lighting systems have a useful life of 20 years, though some systems may operate beyond the estimated useful life. For planning purposes, replacement of all airfield lighting systems will be assumed during the current planning period of 20 years.

Current generation airfield lighting is moving exclusively toward light-emitting diode (LED) systems. FAA design guidance for airfield lighting is to provide consistency between incandescent or LED systems. As a result, upgrading any individual airfield lighting to system to LED will prioritize airfield-wide LED upgrades as funding is available. A similar issue may exist for any future runway or taxiway extensions where combining existing incandescent systems and new LED systems may not be compatible with FAA guidance.

- FACILITY REQUIREMENT. The existing MIRL system can be maintained through the end of its useful life. Replacement of the existing MIRL system with LED units is anticipated during the current planning period. Depending on overall project requirements and funding levels, MIRL replacement may also be considered as part of the anticipated runway pavement rehabilitation project to minimize operational downtime for the runway. The MIRL system should be updated as necessary to address any changes to the runway identified in the development alternatives analysis process.
- FACILITY REQUIREMENT. The existing MITL system can be maintained through the end of its useful life. Replacement of the existing MITL with LED units is anticipated during the current planning period. The MITL system should be updated as necessary to address any changes to the taxiway system identified in the development alternatives analysis process.
- FACILITY REQUIREMENT. Apron and taxilane edge reflectors should be maintained and periodically replaced as needed. Additional edge reflectors should be installed as necessary for new construction or reconfiguration identified in the development alternatives analysis process.

Airfield Signage

The runway-taxiway system has extensive internally illuminated lighted signage that conveys directional, location, and runway clearance information to pilots. Upon a recent site survey, all lighted signs appeared to be in good working condition.

- FACILITY REQUIREMENT. Existing airfield signage can be maintained through the end of its useful life. Replacement of existing signs with LED units is anticipated during the current planning period.

  ODAV has been working with the FAA Runway Safety Action Team (RSAT) to increase opportunities for safety on the airfield, including the installation of additional lighted signage.

Weather Reporting

The Aurora State Airport has an automated weather observing system (ASOS) owned and operated by the FAA that provides 24-hour weather information. The ASOS is located on west side of the Airport between Runway 17/35 and the Hubbard Highway. The ASOS is in good working condition, but will likely require replacement during the current planning period.

- FACILITY REQUIREMENT. It is recommended that ODAV continue coordinating maintenance of the ASOS with the National Weather Service (NWS). A Letter of Agreement (LOA) with NWS, FAA Tech Operations, and the ATCT provides for access to maintain the equipment. Continue to protect the defined ASOS critical area from encroachment to ensure reliable site readings.

NAVAIDS

NAVAIDS at the Aurora State Airport include both visual NAVAIDS and electronic NAVAIDS. Visual NAVAIDS include Visual Approach Slope Indicators (VASI) on both runway ends, the Omnidirectional Approach Lighting System (ODALS) on Runway 17, and the airport rotating beacon. All NAVAIDS on the field are reported to be in functional operating condition.

Several electronic NAVAIDS maintained by the FAA, both on site in the vicinity, serve operations at the Aurora State Airport. These include the Runway 17 Localizer (LOC) with Distance Measuring Equipment (DME) and the Newberg (URG) Very High Frequency Omnidirectional Range with DME (VOR/DME).

- FACILITY REQUIREMENT. The airport rotating beacon can be maintained through the end of its useful life. Replacement with an LED unit is anticipated during the current planning period. In the event of changes to the airfield, the rotating beacon may be relocated or reconfigured as necessary. Tree growth in the immediate vicinity of the rotating beacon should be controlled to maintain beacon visibility from the air in all directions.
- FACILITY REQUIREMENT. The Runway 17 ODALS can be maintained through the end of its useful life or upgraded based on current approach lighting system technologies. Replacement with an LED unit is anticipated during the current planning period. New FAA-funded ODALS installations are uncommon. Options for installation of a new generation approach lighting system should be addressed in the airside development alternatives analysis process, in addition to any system changes that may be related to changes in the runway.
- FACILITY REQUIREMENT. The VASI units can be maintained through the end of their useful life. Replacement with an LED Precision Approach Path Indicator (PAPI) system is anticipated during the current planning period, or in the event of changes to the runway.

Fixed-Base Operations/Flight Training Services/Fuel Services

Fixed-base operations (FBO), flight training, and fuel services are provided by several commercial operators. Some are located on private property with TTF access and others are located on ODAV property with leases.

Page: 4-26

Number: 1 Author: Mobile User Date: 4/11/2024 10:34:53 AM

Is this what gets your approach below 1 mile? That may be an option, remove at end of useful life and not replace.

Author: Mark Steele Date: 4/11/2024 12:49:50 PM

The visibility minimums for the runway are not tied directly to the ODALS. LOC and GPS approaches are capable of achieving minimums below 1 mile independent of lighted approach aids. The replacement of the ODALS at end of useful life will be evaluated in the alteranatives analyisis.

Author: Mark Steele Subject: Sticky Note Date: 4/11/2024 2:04:18 PM

As recently as 5300-13A (Table 3-4 - Standards for Instrument Approach Precedures), FAA "Recommended" Approach Lights for 3/4 mile to < 1 mile and >= 1 mile visibility minimums for straight-in procedures, noting "ODALS, MALS, SSALS, and SALS are acceptable."

Number: 2 Author: Mobile User Date: 4/11/2024 10:34:53 AM

Are these FAA owned/maintained?

Author: Mark Steele Date: 4/15/2024 12:15:04 PM

The VASIs are FAA-owned. We've updated the text to clarify.

Landside Elements Goals and Requirements

The landside facilities goals and requirements section includes a discussion of the GA terminal areas, hangars and airport buildings, airport surface roads and vehicle access, vehicle parking, airport fencing, and utilities. The focus of the Airport Master Plan is on the facilities located on ODAV owned property.

GENERAL AVIATION TERMINAL AREAS

There is approximately 8 acres of land in the ODAV terminal area that are available for future hangars, aircraft storage, and other aviation related needs.

HANGARS/AIRPORT BUILDINGS

As previously discussed, hangars are generally preferred for storage of aircraft based at the Airport, while tiedowns are predominately used by transient aircraft. For this study, most demand for storage of aircraft based at the Aurora State Airport will be met through hangars.

The Aurora State Airport has a variety of hangar types. These hangars are privately managed and include T-hangars, conventional box hangars, and commercial hangars. Currently an estimated 971,100 square feet of hangar space is available to airport users. The occupancy status of all the privately owned and managed hangars is not available, but it is estimated that the existing hangars are operating at or near capacity.

Table 4-7 summarizes the criteria used to estimate hangar space demand over the planning period. The typical physical requirements for the different types of based aircraft type included in the aviation activity forecasts are used to approximate an appropriate hangar area for each type. The footprint of the representative aircraft is the product of the aircraft's wingspan (or rotor diameter) and length. A low, high, and average hangar area for each aircraft type is provided. The low hangar areas listed for single-engine, multi-engine, and turboprop are representative of the space provided by a T-hangar for each aircraft type. The high hangar areas listed are representative of the space provided by a conventional box hangar and includes additional space around the aircraft to further protect against damage. For this study, the average of the two were used to calculate storage space needed.

TABLE 4-7: HANGAR AREA CRITERIA

	Single Engine Piston	Multi Engine Piston	Turbo-prop	Jet	Helicopter
Example Aircraft	Cessna 182	Cessna 340	King Air 200	Cessna Citation III	Bell 206
Footprint (Wingspan x Length, sq. ft.)	1,044	1,651	2,384	2,969	1,322
Low Hangar Area per Aircraft (sq. ft.)	1,100	1,700	2,500	3,500	1,500
High Hangar Area per Aircraft (sq. ft.)	2,000	3,500	4,000	5,000	3,000
Average Hangar Area per Aircraft (sq. ft.)	1,550	2,600	3,250	4,250	2,250

Source: FAA Aircraft Characteristics Database, Century West Engineering

The above areas were applied to the five-year forecast increments by aircraft type from the based aircraft fleet mix forecast presented in Chapter 3. The FAA-approved aviation activity forecasts suggest a decline in single-engine piston, multi-engine piston, and turboprop aircraft over the 20-year planning period. As presented in **Table 4-8**, the resulting facility requirements analysis indicates decreased demand for T-hangars and smaller box hangars that house individual aircraft and an increase in demand for larger corporate style hangars that accommodate ADG I and II jet aircraft and multiple single-engine aircraft in a single building.

TABLE 4-8: HANGAR AREA REQUIREMENTS

	Single Engine	Multi Engine	Jet	Helicopter	Total
Additional Aircraft					
2026	(21)	(4)	2	2	(21)
2031	(20)	(3)	3	2	(18)
2041	(33)	(4)	5	5	(27)
Total	**(74)**	**(11)**	**10**	**9**	**(66)**
Additional Hangar Area (sq. ft.)					
2026	(32,550)	(10,400)	8,500	4,500	(29,950)
2031	(31,000)	(7,800)	12,750	4,500	(21,550)
2041	(51,150)	(10,400)	21,250	11,250	(29,050)
Total	**(114,700)**	**(28,600)**	**42,500**	**20,250**	**(80,550)**

Source: Century West Engineering

- FACILITY REQUIREMENT. The remaining undeveloped areas in the ODAV Terminal Development Area and any future infill development opportunities should be reserved to accommodate aeronautical uses.

AIRPORT SURFACE ROADS

The Airport's blue and purple gates provide landside access to ODAV property from the public right-of-way. There are limited internal vehicle roads and taxilanes located in ODAV's landside area. Several vehicular/pedestrian deviations (V/PD) have occurred on the Airport in recent years. ODAV has been working with the FAA Runway Safety Action Team (RSAT) to increase opportunities for safety on the airfield.

- FACILITY REQUIREMENT. Existing on-airport surface roads on ODAV property should be maintained and updated as required to serve future landside development identified in the development alternatives analysis.
- FACILITY GOAL. A drivers training program could be established to promote on-airport drivers safety.

VEHICLE PARKING

Within the ODAV Terminal Area vehicle parking is limited and should be considered when conceptualizing new hangar construction to prevent vehicles parking on taxilanes, aprons, or object free areas.

- FACILITY REQUIREMENT. Maintain the existing vehicle parking facilities and consider vehicle parking when conceptualizing new hangar construction to prevent vehicles parking on taxilanes, aprons, or object free areas.

AIRPORT FENCING

The entire airport facility is fenced with designated vehicle gates. The existing fencing and gates are in good condition.

- FACILITY REQUIREMENT. Maintain the existing perimeter fencing/access gates, and update as required by future improvements identified in the development alternatives analysis.

Airport Administration Goals and Requirements

Airport administration goals and requirements include recommendations and best practices for airport ownership, facility management, finance, airport user rates and charges, and compliance with FAA grant assurances.

Goals related to ODAV's management of the Aurora State Airport, consistent with its current and future operational requirements, are provided for each administrative category listed below.

AIRPORT OWNERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT

The Aurora State Airport is owned and operated by ODAV. ODAV manages the Aurora State Airport among a group of 28 state-owned or -operated airports with 15.5 full-time equivalent (FTE) employees based in Salem. As the airport owner (sponsor), ODAV is responsible for managing operations and coordinating with applicable local jurisdictions as well as state and federal agencies. Much of the day-to-day operations and maintenance for the Aurora State Airport are completed by full-time ODAV staff with additional staff resources (part-time or contracted), as needed. ODAV currently has six FTE employees assigned to the daily maintenance and operation of the Aurora State Airport.

AIRPORT FINANCE

Based on a review of the recent financial records presented in Chapter 2 – Existing Conditions Analysis, the Airport's revenues only slightly exceed expenses for normal operations and day-to-day maintenance. Based on the current level of operating revenues and expenses, ODAV is dependent on state and federal grants to fund major capital improvements and ongoing pavement maintenance projects.

An analysis of revenues generated at the Airport indicates that TTF access fees account for 18.5% of total airport operating revenue and fuel flowage fees (all aircraft) account for approximately 43% of airport revenues. It is worth noting that TTF-based aircraft account for 82% of the Airport's based aircraft total, but contribute a significantly lower percentage of total airport revenues. A review of current airport business planning may be considered to evaluate support of increased operations, maintenance, and capital costs required to satisfy future user demand.

FAA GRANT ASSURANCES AND COMPLIANCE OVERVIEW

Upon a review of local, state, and federal regulations, ODAV is understood to be in compliance with all requirements related to the Aurora State Airport. A detailed discussion of the applicable regulations is presented in Chapter 2 – Existing Conditions Analysis.

- FACILITY GOAL. Maintain current efforts to work with state and federal partners to ensure continued compliance with state and federal regulations.

From: House Timothy <Timothy.A.House@faa.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, March 26, 2024 3:57 PM
To: BEACH Anthony
Cc: Samantha Peterson; THOMAS Alex R; David Miller
Subject: Potential for MOS related to runway extensions at UAO

Facility requirements chapter comments were provided earlier today. A question was asked of me when the Facility Requirements chapter was provided for review and I wanted to make sure it was answered concurrently with my review comments of the chapter.

The question was related to the likelihood of the FAA issuing a MOS for existing non standard conditions or allowing future projects to be constructed with MOS.

The question was asked to both Regional level management and ADO level management. The answer provided was consistent. The Region and ADO would not be in support of issuing MOS related to the extension of the runway. Standards would have to be met for ROFA and RSA requirements.

Please let me know if you need any additional information on this topic. We are aware this will have a significant impact on your next chapter, alternatives.

Tim A. House
Lead Planner, SEA Airports District Office
FAA Northwest Mountain Region
206-231-4248
405-607-9949 (mobile)



World leaders in creating a safe and efficient system of airports!
We value Integrity, Collaboration and Innovation

Join me at the 2024 Annual Conference



2024 ANM/NWAAAE Airports Conference. April 2-4. Bellevue, WA

U.S. Department
of Transportation
**Federal Aviation
Administration**

Northwest Mountain Region
Colorado · Idaho · Montana · Oregon · Utah
Washington · Wyoming

Seattle Airports District Office
2200 S 216th Street, Rm 1W-422
Des Moines, WA 98198

November 15, 2023
*Corrected January 23, 2024

Tony Beach
State Airports Manager
Anthony.BEACH@odav.oregon.gov
Oregon Department of Aviation

Federal Aviation Administration (FAA)
Aurora (UAO) Aviation Activity Forecast Approval
Airport Improvement Program Grant Number 3-41-0004-022-2021

The FAA Airports District Office has reviewed the aviation forecast for the Aurora (UAO) Airport Working Paper No. 1 (latest revision dated November 2023). The FAA approves these forecasts for airport planning purposes, including Airport Layout Plan (ALP) development, in addition to the existing and future critical aircraft. The FAA approval is based on the information submitted in Chapter 3, summarized as follows:

Airport Planning and TAF Forecast Comparison

	Year	Airport Forecast	TAF	AF/TAF (% Difference)
Passenger Enplanements				
Base yr.	2021	0	0	0.0%
Base yr. + 5yrs.	2026	0	0	0.0%
Base yr. + 10yrs.	2031	0	0	0.0%
Base yr. + 15yrs.	2036	0	0	0.0%
Commercial Operations				
Base yr.	2021	2,006	1,727	16.2%
Base yr. + 5yrs.	2026	2,056	1,845	11.4%
Base yr. + 10yrs.	2031	2,108	1,967	7.1%
Base yr. + 15yrs.	2036	2,160	2,097	3.0%
Total Operations				
Base yr.	2021	76,028	76,794	-1.0%
Base yr. + 5yrs.	2026	79,354	78,053	1.7%
Base yr. + 10yrs.	2031	82,825	79,109	4.7%
Base yr. + 15yrs.	2036	86,449	80,198	7.8%

Note: TAF data is on a U.S. government fiscal year basis (October through September).

*Highlighted cells corrected to correspond to values from Table 3-23 Forecast Summary.

Based on the approved forecast, the FAA also approves the C-II family of aircraft, for the existing and future critical aircraft.

Our approval is based on the following:

- The forecast is supported by reasonable planning assumptions and current data
- The forecast appears to be developed using acceptable forecasting methodologies
- The difference between the FAA Terminal Area Forecast (TAF) and the Airport's forecast for total operations is within the 10 percent and 15 percent allowance for the 5 and 10 year planning horizons.

Approval of this forecast does not automatically justify any of the capital improvements shown on the ALP or recommended in the master plan. All future projects will need to be justified by current activity levels at the time of proposed implementation. Lastly, the approved forecasts may be subject to additional analysis, or the FAA may request a sensitivity analysis if this data is to be used for environmental or Part 150 noise planning purposes.

This forecast was prepared at the same time as the evolving impacts of the COVID-19 public health emergency. Forecast approval is based on the methodology, data, and conclusions at the time the document was prepared. However, consideration of the impacts of the COVID-19 public health emergency on aviation activity is warranted to acknowledge the reduced confidence in growth projections using currently-available data.

Accordingly, FAA approval of this forecast does not constitute justification for future projects. Justification for future projects will be made based on activity levels at the time the project is requested for development. Documentation of actual activity levels meeting planning activity levels will be necessary to justify AIP funding for eligible projects.

If you have any questions about this forecast approval, please call me at (206) 231-4248.

Sincerely,
Tim House

Lead Planner
SEA Airports District Office

cc: (Samantha Peterson)

Memo

To:	**Ben Mello, FAA SEA-ADO**
From:	**Century West Engineering**
Date:	**5/19/2022**
Project:	**Aurora Airport Master Plan**
Re:	**Corrections to Working Paper #1 (Chapters 1, 2, and 3)**

This memorandum is to acknowledge the following changes to draft Working Paper #1 and a request for official FAA review of the Aviation Activity Forecasts.

CHAPTER 2, EXISTING CONDITIONS

A summary of the 2012 Airport Master Plan study, fuel services, and emergency services was added to the draft chapter. Below is a copy of the additional sections in the draft chapter.

CHAPTER 3, AVIATION ACTIVITY FORECASTS

In a letter from the City of Wilsonville dated April 12, 2022, "RE: Comments on Draft 2022 Aurora State Airport Master Plan Chapters 1-3", the City noted a discrepancy between annual TFMSC operations numbers listed in the 2019 Constrained Operations Runway Justification Study, and those listed in Working Paper #1 of the 2022 Airport Master Plan. In response to this comment Century West investigated and identified a procedural error in how the data were queried from the TFMSC website that resulted in monthly operations totals being split between two or more records in the TFMSC data output files. The split monthly totals resulted in additional operations being generated in the data normalization calculations. We have updated our procedures, and redownloaded and renormalized the operations data.

As the preferred operations forecast is based on a 20-year trend derived from TFMSC data, that forecast model was impacted and has been revised. The revised forecast has a compound annual growth rate (CAGR) of 2.36% (rounded to 2.4% in the text and tables) compared to 2.30% as previously reported. The increased growth rate resulted in 121,253 annual operations in the year 2041, an increase of 1,344 operations (+1.1%) over the previously reported 119,909 operations.

While investigating the City's comment, the planning team also noted differences in Airport Reference Code (ARC) classifications assigned to six aircraft in the two studies. The previous version of Working Paper #1 as well as the 2019 study used a combination of the TFMSC, the FAA Aircraft Characteristics

Database (https://www.faa.gov/airports/engineering/aircraft_char_database/), and individual aircraft flight manuals to determine the ARCs of these specific aircraft. However, the two studies did not assign ARCs to these aircraft consistently. In the interest of simplicity and transparency, the planning team has elected to instead use a single data source, TFMSC, to determine the ARC of individual aircraft.

The revised historical TFMSC operations data, and forecasted operations projections impacted several tables and figures included in Chapter 2 and Chapter 3 of Working Paper #1. The tables and figures affected are listed on the following pages with the updated information provided as presented in the revised Working Paper #1. Sources and notes for the impacted tables will be maintained as previously shown in the updated working paper.

After further review, Table 3-8 was removed from the revised *Chapter 3, Aviation Activity Forecasts* in Working Paper #1, as the summary of a select list of aircraft is not pertinent to the forecast discussion which should look at the fleet as a whole. This table is relevant to the Facility Requirements discussion in *Chapter 4, Facility Goals and Requirements*, and may be included in that chapter instead. Since the table was removed, the tables previously numbered 3-9 through 3-21 have been renumbered 3-8 through 3-20 to reflect the change.

It should be noted that the above-discussed revisions do not impact the selection of the design aircraft (C-II Jet similar to Canadair 600). The revised data continue to show more than 500 annual operations by AAC C and D aircraft, and ADG II or larger aircraft.

CHAPTER 2 EXISTING CONDITIONS

2012 Aurora State Airport Master Plan Update

The 2012 Airport Master Plan Update (AMPU) updated the 2000 Airport Master Plan with the goal of assessing the Airport's role and capabilities and identifying a plan for development needed to accommodate anticipated activity levels over the 20 year planning horizon. The 2012 AMPU included analysis of the following issues:

- Runway Extension
- Air Traffic Control Tower (ATCT)
- Impact of Airport Expansion on Surrounding Areas
- Calm Wind Runway Change
- Precision Instrument Approach
- Helicopter Operations (located on public property)

The preferred alternative included the following improvements:

- Construction of an ATCT
- A 1,000' runway and parallel taxiway extension to the south
- Development of additional hangar and apron areas on ODAV property
- Property acquisitions and avigation easements

The validity of the AMPU (Aurora Master Plan Update, 2012) was recently questioned as part of a petition for review made to the Oregon Land Use Board of Appeals (LUBA). In that land use action, the petitioners sought review of a 2019 Oregon Aviation Board (OAB) Decision made pursuant to OAR 138-103-0055 in which the Board found that the AMPU was compatible with the Marion County Comprehensive Plan. Petitioners also filed in state Circuit Court as a precautionary measure in the event LUBA dismissed the matter for lack of jurisdiction. LUBA did conclude that it lacked jurisdiction to hear this matter, but was overturned on appeal on that issue. Following the instructions of the Court of Appeals, LUBA found that it did have jurisdiction and remanded the decision back to OAB, finding that it could not review the matter until certain records from the 2012 adoption process were provide to LUBA. The circuit court cases remain pending but are expected be dismissed or otherwise resolved consistent with LUBA's order of remand.

Fuel Services


On airport fuel sales are provided by Atlantic Aviation, which has an above-ground 12,000-gallon aviation gasoline (AVGAS/100LL) tank and an above-ground 20,000-gallon Jet A tank located on leased ODAV property immediately southwest of the Atlantic Aviation building. Atlantic Aviation operates two mobile fuel trucks to ferry fuels from their tanks to aircraft parked on the apron. Additional off-airport fuel storage and service is available on surrounding private properties with TTF agreements. There are no known underground fuel storage tanks on airport property.

Emergency Services

Marion County Sheriff Department provides emergency service and response to the Aurora State Airport. A single dedicated deputy is assigned to the Aurora community, which includes the Airport. The Aurora Fire District provides fire suppression, rescue, emergency medical response, and hazardous material response. The nearest district fire station is in the City of Aurora, less than two miles from the Airport. The Aurora Airport Water Control District was formed in 2002 and installed a 247,800-gallon fire suppression system to assist the Aurora Fire District in protecting the Airport in the event of fire.

Figure 2-3 TFMSC IFR Operations Data

Updated to reflected revised TFMSC numbers



	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Total	7,700	7,908	8,378	8,904	10,214	10,054	10,632	9664	8462	10284
Smaller than B-I Aircraft	2,796	3,138	3,524	4,040	4,568	4,728	5,278	3,618	3,092	3,736
B-I and Larger Aircraft	4,904	4,770	4,854	4,864	5,646	5,326	5,354	6,046	5,370	6,548
Total C and D Aircraft	738	780	838	656	668	712	698	578	454	622

Figure 3-5 Operations Forecast Models

Updated to reflect corrected TFMSC operations numbers used to develop growth rate.

Growth rate increased to 2.4%




Table 3-7 Aurora State Airport Instrument Flight Operations

Updated to reflected revised TFMSC numbers and TFMSC ARC classifications

Historical operations counts for B-II, C-I, C-II, and D-III differ from counts presented in the 2019 study due to the change in ARC classification source.

Added row to summarize ADG II and larger operations

TFMSC IFR OPERATIONS BY ADG - Calendar Year Data											
Airport Reference Code (ARC)	2012 Operations	2013 Operations	2014 Operations	2015 Operations	2016 Operations	2017 Operations	2018 Operations	2019 Operations	2020 Operations	2021 Operations	Average Annual Operations
A-I	2,372	2,638	2,414	2,482	2,750	2,752	3,428	2,458	2,162	2,334	2,579
A-II	410	494	1,108	1,554	1,814	1,966	1,844	1,158	930	1,398	1,268
A-III	14	6	2	4	4	10	6	2	0	4	5
A-IV	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
B-I	1,496	1,368	1,422	1,194	1,198	1,126	1,134	1,190	1,024	1,154	1,231
B-II	2,222	2,232	2,214	2,620	3,270	3,110	3,146	3,798	3,448	4,166	3,023
B-III	0	0	0	2	0	2	4	8	2	0	2
B-IV	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
C-I	360	374	514	438	340	306	274	286	170	274	334
C-II	348	378	294	208	316	368	358	226	242	242	298
C-III	18	10	6	8	0	14	50	54	10	0	17
C-IV	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	0
C-V	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D-I	2	8	16	0	4	10	8	4	2	14	7
D-II	4	0	4	0	2	6	2	8	26	84	14
D-III	6	10	4	2	6	8	4	0	4	6	5
D-IV	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D-V	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Unknown	448	390	380	392	510	376	372	472	442	606	439
Total	**7,700**	**7,908**	**8,378**	**8,904**	**10,214**	**10,054**	**10,632**	**9,664**	**8,462**	**10,284**	**9,220**
Operations by AAC C and D Aircraft	**738**	**780**	**838**	**656**	**668**	**712**	**698**	**578**	**454**	**622**	**674**
Operations by ADG II and Larger	**3,022**	**3,130**	**3,632**	**4,398**	**5,412**	**5,484**	**5,416**	**5,254**	**4,662**	**5,902**	**4,631**

Table 3-8 Historical TFMSC Activity by ARC (Select Jets) (REMOVED)

This table has been removed from Working Paper #1 since it does not add relevant information to the forecast discussion and the information presented fits better in the Facility Requirements discussion.

Since this table was specifically referenced in the City's comments, the updated data are presented below to demonstrate that the comments were addressed. However, it is not included in the revised Working Paper #1 and is included in this memo only for the sake of transparency and for FAA reference.

The 2018 operations for the C560 presented in the revised table show two more operations for that aircraft compared to the 2019 Study (706 vs 704). We believe this is due to a typographical error in the 2019 study, as that table column was manually updated in the report when the complete 2018-year data became available.

TFMSC IFR Data - Select Jet Aircraft with Maximum Certificated Takeoff Weight of More than 12,500 Pounds and Select Jet Aircraft over 60,000 Pounds														
	ARC	Aircraft Based at UAO	Aircraft Designator	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	Average Annual Operations
Cessna 550 Citation	B-II	x	C550	210	134	162	224	260	158	212	174	138	162	183
Cessna 560 Citation	B-II	x	C560	362	496	460	580	688	772	706	618	546	622	585
Cessna 650 Citation	B-II	x	C650	90	90	118	144	118	114	98	68	66	42	95
Cessna 680 Citation	B-II	x	C680	64	52	68	72	64	90	138	150	138	250	109
Cessna 750 Citation	B-II		C750	60	74	90	94	90	94	104	92	84	38	82
Falcon 20	B-II	x	FA20	90	84	28	14	98	74	76	68	66	82	68
Falcon 2000	B-II	x	F2TH	2	14	6	4	6	4	34	130	108	346	65
Falcon 50	B-II	x	FA50	10	18	96	220	310	316	276	284	216	302	205
Falcon 900	B-II		F900	180	144	48	8	54	80	68	100	26	16	72
Hawker Horizon	B-II		HA4T	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	6	2
Phenom 300	B-II	x	E55P	14	102	96	92	86	122	56	80	256	430	133
Hawker 800	C-I	x	H25B	224	210	310	118	42	28	34	20	8	32	103
Lear 31	C-I		LJ31	4	2	0	0	6	54	92	110	32	22	32
Lear 45	C-I	x	LJ45	110	148	180	236	240	208	110	136	122	204	169
Lear 55	C-I		LJ55	0	2	0	0	2	0	4	2	0	0	1
Lear 60	C-I	x	LJ60	2	4	10	82	36	14	30	14	6	10	21
Astra 1125	C-II		ASTR	178	152	164	114	160	162	96	14	0	4	104
Challenger 300	C-II	x	CL30	32	90	64	72	78	104	88	78	62	54	72
Challenger 600	C-II	x	CL60	126	122	36	12	64	80	58	52	90	68	71
Embraer ERJ 135	C-II		E135	0	4	6	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	1
Galaxy 1126	C-II		GALX	8	10	16	0	2	4	0	4	2	2	5
Gulfstream 150	C-II		G150	2	0	0	2	2	6	80	22	4	2	12
Lear 75	C-II		LJ75	0	0	0	0	4	10	12	0	2	4	3
Bombardier Global Express*	C-III		GLEX	18	10	4	8	0	14	50	52	10	0	17
Lear 35	D-I		LJ35	2	8	16	0	4	6	8	4	0	12	6
Gulfstream IV/G400*	D-II		GLF4	4	0	4	0	2	6	2	8	26	84	14
Gulfstream V/G500*	D-III		GLF5	6	10	4	2	0	4	2	0	4	6	4
Gulfstream VI/G600*	D-III		GLF6	0	0	0	0	6	4	2	0	0	0	1
Total				**1800**	**1982**	**1988**	**2098**	**2424**	**2530**	**2436**	**2282**	**2014**	**2800**	**2235**
B-II				1084	1210	1174	1452	1774	1824	1768	1766	1646	2296	1599
B-III				0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
C-I				340	366	500	436	326	304	270	282	168	268	326
C-II				346	378	286	200	312	368	334	170	160	134	269
C-III				18	10	4	8	0	14	50	52	10	0	17
D-I				2	8	16	0	4	6	8	4	0	12	6
D-II				4	0	4	0	2	6	2	8	26	84	14
D-III				6	10	4	2	6	8	4	0	4	6	5
Operations by AAC C and D Jets				716	772	814	646	650	706	668	516	368	504	636
Operations by ADG II and III Jets				1458	1608	1472	1662	2094	2220	2158	1996	1846	2520	1903

Table 3-14 Aircraft Operations Forecast Models (Previously Table 3-15)

Updated to reflect revised forecast numbers

Operations Forecasts						
	CAGR	2021	2026	2031	2036	2041
Historic Tower Counts Trend	3.6%	76,028	95,039	114,646	134,254	153,862
TFMSC Historic Trend (20-Year) - Preferred Forecast	**2.4%**	**76,028**	**85,438**	**96,013**	**107,898**	**121,253**
Marion County Population Correlation	2.9%	76,028	96,244	112,162	124,981	135,506
National Aerospace Ops (w/ ATCT)	0.8%	76,028	78,939	81,966	85,114	88,388
State Fed Contract Tower TAF	0.6%	76,028	81,924	82,972	84,046	85,151

Table 3-15 Operations Fleet Mix (Previously Table 3-16)

Updated to reflect revised operations forecasts

Operations Fleet Mix Forecast					
Aircraft Type	**2021**	**2026**	**2031**	**2036**	**2041**
Total Airport Operations	**76,028**	**85,438**	**96,013**	**107,898**	**121,253**
Single Engine*	60,823	67,838	75,562	84,377	93,971
Multi Engine Piston	760	769	768	647	606
Turbo Prop	3,041	3,588	4,321	5,071	6,063
Jet	5,322	6,408	7,681	9,171	10,913
Helicopter	6,082	6,835	7,681	8,632	9,700
Fleet Mix Percentages					
Single Engine*	80.0%	79.4%	78.7%	78.2%	77.5%
Multi Engine Piston	1.0%	0.9%	0.8%	0.6%	0.5%
Turbo Prop	4.0%	4.2%	4.5%	4.7%	5.0%
Jet	7.0%	7.5%	8.0%	8.5%	9.0%
Helicopter	8.0%	8.0%	8.0%	8.0%	8.0%

* *Includes Experimental/LSA*

Table 3-16 Local and Itinerant Activity (Previously Table 3-17)

Updated to reflect revised operations forecast

Local and Itinerant Activity					
Aircraft Operations	**2021**	**2026**	**2031**	**2036**	**2041**
Itinerant					
Itinerant Air Taxi	2,006	2,254	2,533	2,847	3,199
Itinerant GA	36,390	40,904	45,977	51,677	58,083
Itinerant Military	79	79	79	79	79
Itinerant Total	38,475	43,237	48,589	54,603	61,361
Local					
Local GA	37,488	42,136	47,360	53,230	59,826
Local Military	65	65	65	65	65
Local Total	37,553	42,201	47,425	53,295	59,891
Total Operations	**76,028**	**85,438**	**96,013**	**107,898**	**121,253**

Table 3-17 Aircraft Operations Peaking (Previously Table 3-18)

Updated to reflect revised operations forecast numbers

Peak Operations					
	2021	**2026**	**2031**	**2036**	**2041**
Annual Operations	76,028	85,438	96,013	107,898	121,253
Peak Month Operations (11%)	8,363	9,398	10,561	11,869	13,338
Design Day Operations (Average Day in Peak Month)	274	308	346	389	437
Busy Day Operations (Assumed 150% of design day)	411	462	519	584	656
Design Hour Operations (Assumed 20% of design day)	55	62	69	78	87

Table 3-19 Forecast Summary (Previously Table 3-20)

Updated to reflect revised operations forecast

ADG and AAC group forecasts were updated to use preferred operations forecast growth rate (2.4%).

Forecast Summary						
	CAGR	**2021**	**2026**	**2031**	**2036**	**2041**
Based Aircraft						
Single Engine*	0.9%	216	229	240	250	259
Multi Engine Piston	0.0%	6	6	6	6	6
Turbo Prop	1.1%	13	14	15	15	16
Jet	2.3%	36	40	45	50	56
Helicopter	1.4%	10	11	11	12	13
Total Based Aircraft	**1.1%**	**281**	**300**	**317**	**333**	**350**
Aircraft Operations						
Itinerant						
Itinerant Air Taxi	2.4%	2,006	2,254	2,533	2,847	3,199
Itinerant GA	2.4%	36,390	40,904	45,977	51,677	58,083
Itinerant Military	0.0%	79	79	79	79	79
Itinerant Total	2.4%	38,475	43,237	48,589	54,603	61,361
Local						
Local GA	2.4%	37,488	42,136	47,360	53,230	59,826
Local Military	0.0%	65	65	65	65	65
Local Total	2.4%	37,553	42,201	47,425	53,295	59,891
Total Operations	**2.4%**	**76,028**	**85,438**	**96,013**	**107,898**	**121,253**
Aircraft Operations Fleet Mix						
Single Engine*	2.1%	60,823	67,838	75,562	84,377	93,971
Multi Engine Piston	-1.2%	760	769	768	647	606
Turbo Prop	3.5%	3,041	3,588	4,321	5,071	6,063
Jet	3.6%	5,322	6,408	7,681	9,171	10,913
Helicopter	2.3%	6,082	6,835	7,681	8,632	9,700
Total Operations	**2.4%**	**76,028**	**85,438**	**96,013**	**107,898**	**121,253**
Operations By C-II (Critical Aircraft)	2.4%	242	272	306	343	386
Operations by AAC C & D	**2.4%**	**622**	**699**	**785**	**883**	**992**
Operations by ADG II & Larger	**2.4%**	**5,902**	**6,632**	**7,452**	**8,374**	**9,410**
Instrument Operations	**2.4%**	**9,658**	**10,853**	**12,196**	**13,390**	**15,402**

* Includes Experimental/LSA

Table 3-20 Airport Planning and TAF Forecast Comparison (Previously Table 3-21)

Updated to reflect revised operations forecast.

Airport Planning and TAF Forecast Comparison				
	Year	Airport Forecast	TAF	AF/TAF (% Difference)
Passenger Enplanements				
Base yr.	2021	0	0	0.0%
Base yr. + 5yrs.	2026	0	0	0.0%
Base yr. + 10yrs.	2031	0	0	0.0%
Base yr. + 15yrs.	2036	0	0	0.0%
Commercial Operations				
Base yr.	2021	2,006	1,191	68.4%
Base yr. + 5yrs.	2026	2,254	1,731	30.2%
Base yr. + 10yrs.	2031	2,533	1,848	37.1%
Base yr. + 15yrs.	2036	2,847	1,973	44.3%
Total Operations				
Base yr.	2021	76,028	64,035	18.7%
Base yr. + 5yrs.	2026	85,438	65,371	30.7%
Base yr. + 10yrs.	2031	96,013	66,303	44.8%
Base yr. + 15yrs.	2036	107,898	67,262	60.4%
Note: TAF data is on a U.S. government fiscal year basis (October through September).				

Samantha Peterson

From: Samantha Peterson
Sent: Friday, May 20, 2022 11:07 AM
To: benjamin.J.mello; Key, Kathryn E (FAA)
Cc: PECK Heather; BEACH Anthony; CLARK Cathy RB; David Miller; W. Matt Rogers; Brandy Steffen; Mike Dane; Mark Steele
Subject: Aurora AMP - Working Paper #1 - Request for FAA Review
Attachments: CWE to FAA_Working Paper #1 Data Revisions (5.19.2022).pdf

Good morning Ben,

This is a formal request for FAA review of Working Paper #1 including draft Chapter 3, Aviation Activity Forecasts. We have prepared a consolidated package with a memorandum outlining the updates to Working Paper #1 based on PAC review, as well as the received PAC letters including the Planning Team's responses. Additionally, we've included the PAC and Open House meeting summaries that include PAC comments with Planning Team responses.

The attached review package will be uploaded to the project website for public information.

Please let us know if you have any questions as you review Working Paper #1.

Thank you,

CENTURY WEST ENGINEERING
Samantha Peterson | Aviation Planner/Project Manager
509.933.2472 (O) | 509.833.4526 (M) | speterson@centurywest.com
www.centurywest.com

FAQs

AURORA STATE AIRPORT

FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS

We know you have questions, and we will be addressing them throughout the duration of the project. As this project progresses, the Oregon Department of Aviation (ODAV) will continue to add to this list of Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs). This list is not exhaustive but is intended to give you a basic understanding of airport planning.

ODAV only endorses/supports data and statements that are released from this study and posted to the project website. All other statements by members of the Planning Advisory Committee and public are personal opinions. Other documents may not be endorsed by the ODAV because they are out of date, unless otherwise noted.

This FAQ is organized by topic as shown in the table of contents below.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Airport Master Planning FAQs 2

- Why is ODAV doing a master plan? 2
- What is the public process for this project and will input be considered? 3
- What is Airport Planning? 4
- What is an Airport Master Plan? 4
- What is the difference between an Airport Master Plan and an Airport Master Plan Update? 5
- Does the FAA approve the Airport Master Plan? 5
- What Guidance will ODAV follow for preparation of the Master Plan? 5
- Why is Aurora State Airport completing an Airport Master Plan? 5
- What constitutes the Aurora State Airport? 6
- Who is preparing the Airport Master Plan? 6
- What is a Scope of Work and who approved it for this project? 6
- Who is funding the Airport Master Plan; is it taxpayer funded? 6
- Is a runway extension being proposed? 7
- Will there be other infrastructure projects discussed? 7
- Will vehicular surface transportation congestion around the Airport be addressed? 7
- What is the Master Plan Process? 7
- What comes after the master plan? 8
- Can you explain the validity of the 2012 Airport Master Plan (AMP)? 8

Environmental Considerations FAQs 9

Is the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) applicable to the Airport Master Plan? 9
When is the NEPA applicable at the Aurora State Airport? 9
I'm concerned about leaded fuel. Does the Master Plan address this? 9
Land Use FAQs 9
What land use processes and approvals are required for the Master Plan? 9
Are private heliports under ODAV jurisdiction? 10
Noise FAQs 10
What noise abatement procedures are in place at Aurora State Airport? 10
What controls are there for aircraft in flight? 10
How is aircraft noise measured? 10
What is the limit on aircraft noise? How loud is loud? 11
Can a loud aircraft be fined? 11
How can I report noise concerns? 12
Will a noise study be included in the AMP? 12
Will noise from private facilities be included in a noise study for the Aurora State Airport? 12
Will I have noise monitors in my area if a noise study is done? 12
Has the airport ever done a Part 150 study? 12
What can be done about low flying aircraft and helicopters? 12
How does an airport get a curfew? 13
Which State Agency regulates Noise? 13

Airport Master Planning FAQs

Why is ODAV doing a master plan?

The Airport Master Plan (AMP) and process is guided by the FAA and ultimately results in projections of future activity and the preparation of an Airport Layout Plan (ALP).

- FAA funding requirement
- Plan for the future
- Reflects current FAA airport design standards
- Updated ALP plans set
- Final AMP will replace prior planning

AMPs are a 20-year document but are typically updated on a more frequent timeline as conditions change (often 7-10 years).

What is the public process for this project and will input be considered?

ODAV has invited a robust and varied membership to the Planning Advisory Committee (PAC), which is in accordance with their State Agency Coordination (SAC) agreement. Committee members represent a wide array of organizations, including interested cities/counties, various state agencies, potentially affected tribal communities, adjacent property and business owners, developers, residents and community groups. This diverse range of viewpoints will provide ODAV multiple perspectives at key decision points as a sounding board. No recommendations will be made by the committee; it is highly unlikely this wide-ranging group would be able to form consensus. Rather, the group will be asked for feedback during PAC meetings through poll questions and break out room discussions. All PAC members, as well as members of the public, are welcome to submit written comments at any point of the project.

ODAV only endorses/supports data and statements that are released from this study and posted to the project website. All other statements by members of the Planning Advisory Committee and public are personal opinions.

All PAC members have the opportunity to assign an official Alternate, in the event the primary PAC member is unable to attend a meeting. It is requested that this Alternate attend all PAC meetings, so as to stay well-informed of the project. However, while the primary PAC member is in attendance, it is requested the Alternate refrain from engaging. As the PAC is quite large, having two members from one organization speaking could impose upon other member's time.

As the airport sponsor, ODAV staff will be the final decision-making authority. This is necessary because ODAV is responsible for developing a plan that ensures that the facility safely accommodates airport operations, is financially sustainable, and complies with Local, State, and Federal standards. The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) reviews all components of a Master Plan as it is prepared to provide input and guidance. However, the FAA only reviews and formally approves these components: Forecasts of aviation activity (based aircraft, operations, and peak activity); Selection of critical aircraft; and Airport Layout Plan (ALP). It is from these listed elements that the FAA makes a determination regarding eligibility of Airport Improvement Program (AIP) funding for any proposed development.

When will meeting materials be posted on the project website for PAC and public review?

Depending on content, materials may be posted prior to the PAC meeting or immediately following the PAC meeting. For content that requires additional explanation for better public understanding, materials will be posted following the PAC meeting where they are presented.

What is Airport Planning?

General airport planning is a systematic process used to establish guidelines for the efficient development of airports that is consistent with local, state and national goals. A key objective of airport planning is to assure the effective use of airport resources in order to satisfy aviation demand in a financially feasible manner.

Airport planning projects may be as broad based as the national system plan or more focused as an airport master plan for a specific airport. All airports that receive federal funding are required to perform Master Plan projects.

What is an Airport Master Plan?

Airport Master Planning is conducted for a specific airport facility. It is a Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) requirement if an airport is listed in the National Plan of Integrated Airport System (NPIAS) and has received FAA Airport Improvement (AIP) funding. Airport Master Plans are prepared for an individual airport, and allow airport sponsors (owners) to more closely identify their airport facility and its needs. An airport master plan represents the airport's "blueprint" or plan for long-term development, mid-range and short term development on the airport. The Master Plan for the Aurora State Airport will have a 20-year planning horizon based on FAA-approved aviation activity forecasts. A few of the goals of a master plan are:

- To provide the framework needed to guide all future airport development that will keep safety at the forefront and cost-effectively satisfy aviation demand, while considering potential environmental and socioeconomic issues.
- To provide a graphic representation of existing airport features, future airport development, and anticipated specific land use as it pertains to the local governing jurisdiction.
- To establish a realistic schedule for implementation of the proposed development.
- To identify a realistic financial plan to support the development.
- To validate the plan technically through an overview investigation of concepts and alternatives on technical, economic and environmental grounds. (Specific project-related Environmental Studies are NOT part of an Airport Master Plan. However, Environmental Studies may be associated with projects that result from the master planning process.)
- To prepare and present a plan to the public (and interested parties) that adequately addresses all relevant issues that arise from the scope of work of the project and satisfies local, state and federal regulations related to the facility plan and the FAA-approved scope of work.
- To establish a framework for a continuous facility planning process.

The recommendations contained in an Airport Master Plan do not necessarily represent the views of FAA, and acceptance of the Airport Master Plan by FAA does not constitute a commitment on the part of FAA to participate in any development depicted in the Airport Master Plan or indicate that the proposed development is environmentally acceptable. Rather, the Airport Master Plan is essentially a facility planning study that sets forth a conceptual framework for possible future airport development. An Airport Master Plan is NOT a Land Use Comprehensive Plan nor a Land Use Regional Plan. An Airport Master Plan IS an Airport Facility Plan.

What is the difference between an Airport Master Plan and an Airport Master Plan Update?

According to the FAA (Advisory Circular 150/5070-6B), an airport master plan is a comprehensive study of the airport and typically describes short-, medium-, and long-term plans for airport development. Master planning studies that address major revisions are commonly referred to as “Master Plans,” while those that change only parts of the existing document and require a relatively low level of effort tend to be known as “Master Plan Updates.” In common usage, however, the distinction refers to the relative levels of effort and detail of master planning studies.

ODAV is conducting an Airport Master Plan project for the Aurora State Airport.

Does the FAA approve the Airport Master Plan?

FAA reviews all components of a Master Plan as it is prepared to provide input and guidance. However, the FAA only reviews and formally approves these components:

- Forecasts of aviation activity (based aircraft, operations, and peak activity)
- Selection of critical aircraft
- Airport Layout Plan (ALP)

It is from these listed elements that the FAA makes a determination regarding eligibility of AIP funding for any proposed development.

What Guidance will ODAV follow for preparation of the Master Plan?

There are many guiding documents used in the preparation of an FAA-driven Master Plan process. The most relevant federal guidance documents are:

- FAA Advisory Circular (AC) 150/5070-6B, Airport Master Plans
- FAA AC 150/5300-13, Airport Design
- FAA Order 5100.38D, Airport Improvement Program Handbook
- FAA Order 1050.1E, Environmental Impacts: Policies and Procedures

Additionally, state resources, such as the Oregon Aviation Plan and Land Use Compatibility Guidebook, will be consulted throughout the planning process. We encourage all participants to familiarize themselves with these documents.

Why is Aurora State Airport completing an Airport Master Plan?

The FAA requires Airport Master Plans and recommends that NPIAS public-use airports, such as Aurora State Airport, prepare a new Airport Master Plan approximately every 10 years or as local aviation conditions change. This Master Plan has been recommended to address the local aviation needs at the airport. It is also important to note that the statewide system of airports also plays a role in determining local aviation needs.

Throughout the last several years, the following area general aviation airport master plans have been completed: Scappoose, Troutdale, Mulino and Hillsboro.

What constitutes the Aurora State Airport?

The Aurora State Airport constitutes the land owned by the State of Oregon and is operated by the Oregon Department of Aviation. Adjacent lands may operate aviation services and businesses, which gain access to the airport through agreements (known as Through the Fence). Through the Fence land is not considered part of the Aurora State Airport facility. In fact, “through the fence” property is privately owned property paid for and maintained by private ownership and adjacent to state owned airport facility property.

Who is preparing the Airport Master Plan?

Following qualifications-based selection processes for the Aurora State Airport, Century West Engineering Corp. was selected as the general planning and engineering consultant for the airport. Century West Engineering Corp. will be responsible for the Planning deliverables of this project. JLA Public Involvement has been hired to facilitate the Planning Advisory Committee and Public Meetings and complete the deliverables associated with the public involvement portion of the scope of work.

What is a Scope of Work and who approved it for this project?

A Scope of Work (SOW) is a formal document that outlines what deliverables are to be prepared within a specific project. The scope of work is prescribed from the FAA Advisory Circular 150/5070-6B, Airport Master Plans, and each SOW is tailored to fit an airport’s unique situation.

The FAA approves all Master Planning Project Scopes of Work. The Master Planning Project Scope of Work for the Aurora State AMP was approved by the FAA Seattle Airport District Office.

Who is funding the Airport Master Plan; is it taxpayer funded?

This project is fully funded by the FAA through the Airport and Airway Trust Fund (commonly known as the Aviation Trust Fund). The FAA typically provides 90 percent of all Airport Improvement Plan (AIP) project eligible funding, with the remaining 10 percent coming from the local sponsor (Oregon Department of Aviation for Aurora State Airport). However, in this case the FAA is providing 100% funding due to pandemic relief funding appropriations. The Aviation Trust Fund finances FAA investments in the airport and airway system by collecting aviation-related excise taxes on passengers, cargo, and fuel. Inasmuch, it is based on user fees rather than general taxpayer funds. Read more about the Trust Fund in the Airport & Airway Trust Fund (AATF) Fact Sheet (PDF).

As a note of clarity, while ODAV is not financing any portion of this project, ODAV receives all of its revenue from aviation system user fees and taxes. No General Fund revenue is used. Following is a list of funding sources:

- Other Funds (State)
    - 3 cent per-gallon tax on jet fuel
    - 11 cents-per gallon tax on aviation gasoline
    - Annual aircraft Registration Fees
    - Aircraft dealer license fees

    - Leases and agreements at state-owned airports
- Other Revenue (Federal)
    - 100% of the federal funds received for airport projects are from the FAA via the Aviation Trust Fund

Is a runway extension being proposed?

As a result of previous planning studies, a Runway Extension has been proposed previously as a development alternative. If the current air traffic levels and capacity are still the same, it is likely that a Runway Extension could be proposed and justified in this plan as a development alternative and even considered as a preferred alternative. Any proposed runway pavement improvements considered in the alternative process to the north or the south, would be built on land already owned by the airport (ODAV). Any additional property needed would be used for the Runway Safety areas.

Will there be other infrastructure projects discussed?

There may be infrastructure projects discussed that will take place on the current airfield that may involve geometry improvements, reconstruction of existing pavement, or system upgrades.

Will vehicular surface transportation congestion around the Airport be addressed?

No, the Master Plan is a facility plan for the Airport. Any projects that may be proposed in the Plan will undergo Marion County permitting, which may require a traffic impact analysis. Funding for off-airport transportation facilities is the responsibility of the applicable City, County, or Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) and is beyond the scope of this project.

Future highway or local roadway improvements surrounding the airport are the responsibility of the jurisdiction that owns and maintains the road.

Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT)

- Interstate 5 (I-5)
- Hubbard Highway (OR-551)

Marion County

- Airport Road NE
- Arndt Road
- Keil Road

Proposed development projects at the Airport may require transportation studies for permit approval based on Marion County code.

What is the Master Plan Process?

A master plan commonly includes these key elements: Inventory, Aviation Activity Forecasts, Facility Requirements, Alternatives, Recommended Development Concept, and Capital Improvement Program. The

Scope of Work (SOW) for the Aurora State Airport Master Plan Project includes the elements listed above and many others (please see the final FAA approved scope of work as attached). As you will see in the SOW, the consultant will be presenting all information as it is prepared to the PAC and public during all meetings.

1. Existing Conditions. The first element is an inventory of both the airside (runway and taxiway system, navigational aids) and landside (buildings, hangars, etc.) facilities. This is simply an information-gathering exercise to determine the current condition of the airport.
2. Aviation Activity Forecasts. Next are the aviation activity forecasts where data collected during the inventory is used to project the future condition of the airport in terms of based aircraft, operations, enplanements, and critical design aircraft. The FAA reviews and officially approves this work product.
3. Facility Goals and Requirements. The facility requirements element is a gap analysis of what facilities are needed in the future, per the activity forecasts, compared to what is currently available.
4. Development Alternatives. The Alternatives chapter explores different options and projects the airport could pursue to meet the projected facility requirements.
5. Development Concept. After an evaluation of all alternatives, a recommended development concept is put forth that outlines the long-range development plan for the airport.
6. Implementation Plan. Recommended projects are broken out individually so that a cost evaluation can be made and a Financial Plan developed within the capital improvement program element.
7. Airport Recycling, Reuse, and Waste Reduction. As a required Master Plan element, this chapter is specific to enhancing airport recycling, reuse, and waste reduction programs as core objectives of airport planning. All airports that have or plan to prepare a master plan, and that receive Airport Improvement Program (AIP) funding for an eligible project, must ensure that the new or updated master plan addresses issues related to solid waste recycling at the airport. This includes: the feasibility of solid waste recycling; minimizing the generation of solid waste; operation and maintenance requirements; review of waste management contracts; and the potential for cost savings or the generation of revenue.
8. Airport Layout Plan (ALP) Drawing Set. The ALP and associated drawings are a pictorial culmination of the planning process, prepared in accordance with FAA SOP 2.0 and 3.0. The FAA reviews and formally approves the ALP.

What comes after the master plan?

Once the master plan project is complete, ODAV will begin implementing the capital improvement plan (CIP). For each project on the CIP, there will be additional planning, identification of funding, environmental analysis, design, and ultimately construction.

Can you explain the validity of the 2012 Airport Master Plan (AMP)?

The 2012 AMP and Airport Layout Plan (ALP) were approved by FAA and therefore is the current planning document on record. It may be referenced for historical context.

Environmental Considerations FAQs

Is the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) applicable to the Airport Master Plan?

No, however, environmental considerations are included in the Master Plan to aid in the analysis of development alternatives.

When is the NEPA applicable at the Aurora State Airport?

The NEPA nexus is determined for defined projects. All projects to be listed in the Master Plan's Capital Improvement Plan will undergo NEPA review/determination prior to full project design and construction. The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) determines which NEPA analysis is required (i.e., Categorical Exclusion, Environmental Assessment, etc.). FAA Order 1050.1F, Environmental Impacts: Policies and Procedures, serves as the FAA's policy and procedures for compliance with the NEPA and implementing regulations issued by the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ).

I'm concerned about leaded fuel. Does the Master Plan address this?

The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) currently plans to issue a proposed endangerment finding in 2022 regarding leaded fuel, which will undergo public notice and comment. After evaluating comments on the proposal, the EPA plans to issue a final endangerment finding in 2023. The FAA, together with government and industry stakeholders, is in the early stages of developing a multi-layered transition strategy to reduce and ultimately eliminate lead from aviation gasoline. More information about FAA's programs can be found here: https://www.faa.gov/about/initiatives/avgas/

Land Use FAQs

What land use processes and approvals are required for the Master Plan?

The Aurora State Airport is located in unincorporated Marion County. For this reason, no other jurisdiction has land use authority over the Aurora State Airport. Completion of the Aurora State AMP does not require a land use approval process with Marion County. Marion County does not approve the AMP.

However, ODAV will submit the Aurora State AMP to Marion County and request a statement of compatibility with the Marion County Comprehensive Plan. Marion County will identify whether any amendments to the Comprehensive Plan or Transportation System Plan are required for the AMP.

Following receipt of the statement of compatibility by Marion County, the Aurora State Airport AMP will next be submitted to the ODAV State Aviation Board for formal adoption.

ODAV completes this coordination process in accordance with the Department of Land Conservation and Development's (DLCD) State Agency Coordination (SAC) Program. The SAC Program helps assure the Aurora State Airport AMP is completed in compliance with all applicable statewide planning goals and Marion County's comprehensive plan. (ORS 187.180; OAR 660-30 & 31). Oregon's Statewide Planning Program also emphasizes the importance of public involvement, which is a key component of the SAC Program. Accordingly,

ODAV has established a Planning Advisory Committee (PAC) that includes members from all affected Federal, State, Local Special Districts, and Interested Parties. The PAC will meet up to nine times throughout the 18-month Aurora State Airport AMP project timeline. All PAC meetings are open to the public.

Are private heliports under ODAV jurisdiction?

No. Columbia Helicopters and Helicopter Transport Services (HTS) are independent of the Aurora State Airport and are located on private property. Those private heliports operate under Marion County Conditional Use Permits.

Noise FAQs

What noise abatement procedures are in place at Aurora State Airport?

Voluntary noise abatement procedures can be found on ODAV's website at https://www.oregon.gov/aviation/Airports/Pages/AIRPORTS/UAO.aspx. Noise abatement procedures are designed to minimize exposure of residential areas to aircraft noise, while ensuring safety of flight operations. There are communities surrounding the Airport that are noise sensitive, and ODAV wants to minimize the noise impacts on those communities. The procedures are intended for noise abatement and are subject to air traffic control and pilot discretion for reasons of safety.

What controls are there for aircraft in flight?

Aircraft in flight are regulated solely by the FAA. Pilots are responsible for the safe operation of their aircraft. Aircraft movements within the local controlled airspace associated with an operations air traffic control tower (ATCT) are under the control of the ATCT.

How is aircraft noise measured?

Aircraft noise is measured in A-weighted decibels (dBA) which approximates the way humans hear sound. The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) and Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) both recognize and use the same metric for aircraft noise measurement. The industry standard for determining long-term aircraft noise exposure around airports is done using a methodology called Day/Night Average Noise Level (DNL), also known as LDN. The FAA has developed a computer model called the Integrated Noise Model (INM) which integrates the DNL metric to depict the noise exposure levels from aircraft around an airport onto a base map into noise contours of equal DNL, usually, into contour lines of 55, 60, 65, 70, and 75 DNL.

Example: One aircraft event occurs and then another aircraft event occurs 10 minutes later with both events registering a maximum noise level of 75 decibels each. Using the DNL metric, each aircraft noise event is added up and averaged together along with the quiet time or background ambient noise in between the events to arrive at a total DNL. Thus, the total DNL measured will be less than 75 decibels during that time period.

To learn more about aircraft noise measurement, see the Federal Interagency Committee on Aviation Noise (FICAN) document: www.federalregister.gov/documents/2021/01/13/2021-00564/overview-of-faa-aircraft-noise-policy-and-research-efforts-request-for-input-on-research-activities

What is the limit on aircraft noise? How loud is loud?

There is no specific limit on aircraft noise. Aircraft noise levels are federally regulated by the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) under Federal Aviation Regulation (FAR) Part 36. This regulation proscribes the measurement criteria and records the noise level measurements taken on three phases of flight at three different measuring points for landing, takeoff and sideline noise on all manufactured aircraft.

Part 36 also designates Stage ratings for helicopter and jet aircraft. In 1977, three "Stage" categories of jet ratings were developed, Stage 1, 2, 3 and Stage 4. A Stage 1 rating is considered the noisiest, Stage 2 rating less noisy, and a Stage 3 rated jet aircraft being the quieter and the Stage 4 standard adopted in 2006 being the quietest. Stage 1 category jets are pure jet aircraft, such as, military jet aircraft and/or early commercial and corporate jet aircraft built in the 1950's and 1960's. Stage 2 rated jets are also older manufactured jets primarily built in the 1970's and into the early 1980's.

Stage 3 rated jets are those built with the latest technology using quieter turbo-fan jet engines built in the late 1980's and since that time forward. Any jet aircraft certificated and manufactured after January 1, 2006 will have to meet Stage 4 noise standards. Today's modern jet aircraft have made major reductions in the noise they create on both takeoff and landing operations, which has helped to reduce their overall noise impacts to communities surrounding airports.

Under a 1990 Federal law, the Aircraft Noise and Capacity Act of 1990 (ANCA), the U.S. Congress mandated that all Stage 2 rated commercial turbojet aircraft of 75,000 lbs. or greater had to be phased out by Dec. 31, 1999. Thus, all U.S. airlines that operated Stage 2 rated jet aircraft in their fleets, had to replace, sell, or equip these aircraft with engine hush-kits to meet the more stringent and quieter Stage 3 jet rating requirements.

In Feb. 2012, President Obama signed into law the FAA Modernization and Reform Act of 2012. Under this law, the U.S. Congress has mandated the phase out and elimination of Stage 2 rated jet aircraft under 75,000 lbs. by Dec. 31, 2015. The law primarily affects private/corporate operators of older business jet aircraft who will now have to meet the current Stage 3 noise limits by either modifying or selling these aircraft.

Can a loud aircraft be fined?

No, ODAV cannot levy a fine for noise or otherwise penalize an aircraft operator for the amount of noise an aircraft makes. We do not have the legal authority to do so regardless of how noisy it was. However, we can work with operators to assist them in reducing their noise levels, once a noise study is done. A formal study will include formal recommendations for implementation. This would be done through the use of an Airport Noise and Operations Monitoring System (ANOMS) which consists of a certain number of fixed noise monitors around the airport. An outcome of a noise study will recommend final protocols.

How can I report noise concerns?

For off-airport operations, daytime noise related issues can be reported to Code Enforcement at (503) 373-4333. Off-airport operations during nighttime hours can be reported to the Marion County Sheriff's non-emergency number (503) 588-5032. Marion County has a noise complaint website with additional information (https://www.co.marion.or.us/SO/Operations/CodeEnforcement/Pages/NoiseComplaints). The FAA Flight Standards District Office (FSDO) oversees pilots for in-flight activity concerns; Portland FSDO can be reached at (503) 615-3200. For on-airport noise, contact ODAV at (503) 378-2523.

Will a noise study be included in the AMP?

Yes, this plan will include an analysis of noise exposure both for current traffic and forecast periods

Will noise from private facilities be included in a noise study for the Aurora State Airport?

No. FAA has indicated that since the off-airport helicopter bases (HTS and Columbia) do not use airport facilities, the noise modeling should not include HTYS and Columbia activity for the Airport Master Plan.

Will I have noise monitors in my area if a noise study is done?

The airport and project will have noise monitors located within a prescribed radius of the airport as part of a noise study.

Has the airport ever done a Part 150 study?

No, the State or ODAV has never elected or been requested to do a CFR 14 Federal Aviation Regulation (FAR) Part 150 Airport Noise Planning and Land Use Compatibility Study. This is a voluntary program sponsored by the FAA that will provide some Federal funding for noise mitigation projects. If your Part 150 program is approved by the FAA, federal funding could be made available to pay for portions of approved noise mitigation projects around the airport including noise abatement programs and procedures along with any land use control measures.

What can be done about low flying aircraft and helicopters?

Aircraft and helicopter altitudes are regulated by the FAA under Federal Aviation Regulation (FAR) Part 91. Regulation Part 91.119 mandates the minimum safe altitudes for aircraft and helicopters. 91.119 Minimum safe altitudes: General. Except when necessary for takeoff or landing, no person may operate an aircraft below the following altitudes:

a) Anywhere. An altitude allowing, if a power unit fails, an emergency landing without undue hazard to persons or property on the surface.
b) Over congested areas. Over any congested area of a city, town, or settlement, or over any open air assembly of persons, an altitude of 1,000 feet above the highest obstacle within a horizontal radius of 2,000 feet of the aircraft.

c) Over other than congested areas. An altitude of 500 feet above the surface, except over open water or sparsely populated areas. In those cases, the aircraft may not be operated closer than 500 feet to any person, vessel, vehicle, or structure.

d) Helicopters, powered parachutes, and weight-shift-control aircraft. If the operation is conducted without hazard to persons or property on the surface.

(1) A helicopter may be operated at less than the minimums prescribed in paragraph (b) or (c) of this section, provided each person operating the helicopter complies with any routes or altitudes specifically prescribed for helicopters by the FAA; and

(2) A powered parachute or weight-shift-control aircraft may be operated at less than the minimums prescribed in paragraph (c) of this section.

How does an airport get a curfew?

In 1990, the U.S. Congress passed the Airport Noise and Capacity Act of 1990 (ANCA) which made it very difficult for any airport operator to impose a curfew or use restrictions in the future. All U.S. airports which had curfews or use restrictions in place at the time this law was passed were "Grandfathered" in and kept. The U.S. Congress would have to modify and change this law to allow airport owners to impose new restrictions. The airport could also choose to conduct a Part 161 Study (Notice and Approval of Airport Noise and Access Restrictions) under ANCA in an attempt to impose a use restriction pursuant to the Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR) Part 161. This is a legal process setup by the FAA which would require public notification, public input, scientific study, economic cost/benefit analysis and federal documentation. Any proposed changes would have to meet the approval of the FAA before the airport could implement any restriction. Since the ANCA law was passed, only Naples Airport in Naples, Florida has been successful in imposing a ban on Stage 2 noise rated business jets from operating, but only after many years of costly litigation with the FAA over this restriction.

For additional Aviation Industry Information and Best practices please see the following:

https://www.aopa.org/-/media/files/aopa/home/supporting-general-aviation/get-involved/airport-support-network/aopa-resources-for-you/120112asn-airport-noise-compatible-land-use.pdf

Which State Agency regulates Noise?

In the State of Oregon, Noise is regulated by the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) through Oregon Administrative Rule (OAR) 340-035-0045, Noise Control Regulations for Airports. Full text of OAR:

340-035-0045

Noise Control Regulations for Airports

(1) Statement of Purpose:

(a) The Commission finds that noise pollution caused by Oregon airports threatens the public health and welfare of citizens residing in the vicinity of airports. To mitigate airport noise impacts a coordinated statewide program is desirable to ensure that effective Airport Noise Abatement Programs are developed and implemented where needed. An abatement program includes measures to prevent the creation of new noise

impacts or the expansion of existing noise impacts to the extent necessary and practicable. Each abatement program will primarily focus on airport operational measures to prevent increased, and to lessen existing, noise levels. The program will also analyze the effects of aircraft noise emission regulations and land use controls;

(b) The principal goal of an airport proprietor who may be required to develop an Airport Noise Abatement program under this rule should be to reduce noise impacts caused by aircraft operations, and to address in an appropriate manner the conflicts which occur within the higher noise contours;

(c) The Airport Noise Criterion is established to define a perimeter for study and for noise sensitive use planning purposes. It is recognized that some or many means of addressing aircraft/airport noise at the Airport Noise Criterion Level may be beyond the control of the airport proprietor. It is therefore necessary that abatement programs be developed, whenever possible, with the cooperation of federal, state and local governments to ensure that all potential noise abatement measures are fully evaluated;

(d) This rule is designed to encourage the airport proprietor, aircraft operator, and government at all levels to cooperate to prevent and diminish noise and its impacts. These ends may be accomplished by encouraging compatible land uses and controlling and reducing the airport/aircraft noise impacts on communities in the vicinity of airports to acceptable levels.

(2) Airport Noise Criterion. The criterion for airport noise is an Annual Average Day-Night Airport Noise Level of 55 dBA. The Airport Noise Criterion is not designed to be a standard for imposing liability or any other legal obligation except as specifically designated within this section.

(3) Airport Noise Impact Boundary:

(a) Air Carrier Airports. Within 12 months of designation, the proprietor of any Air Carrier Airport shall submit for Department approval, the existing airport Noise Impact Boundary. The data and analysis used to determine the boundary shall also be submitted to the Department for evaluation;

(b) Existing Non-Air Carrier Airports. After an unsuccessful effort to resolve a noise problem pursuant to section (5) of this rule, the Director may require the proprietor of any existing non-air carrier airport to submit for Department approval, all information reasonably necessary for the calculation of the existing airport Noise Impact Boundary. This information is specified in the Department’s Airport Noise Control Procedure Manual (NPCS-37), as approved by the Commission. The proprietor shall submit the required information within twelve months of receipt of the Director’s written notification;

(c) New Airports. Prior to the construction or operation and any required local government land-use approval of any New Airport, the proprietor shall submit for Department approval the projected airport Noise Impact Boundary for the first full calendar year of operation. The data and analysis used to determine the boundary shall also be submitted to the Department for evaluation. The Department shall notify the appropriate local planning unit of the results of their evaluation;

(d) Airport Master Planning. Any airport proprietor who obtains funding to develop an airport Master Plan shall submit for Department approval an existing noise impact boundary and projected noise impact boundaries at five, ten, and twenty years into the future. The data and analysis used to determine the boundaries shall also be submitted to the Department for evaluation;

(e) Impact Boundary Approval. Within 60 days of the receipt of a completed airport noise impact boundary, the Department shall either consider the boundary approved or provide written notification to the airport proprietor of deficiencies in the analysis.

(4) Airport Noise Abatement Program and Methodology:

(a) Abatement Program. The proprietor of an existing or new airport whose airport Noise Impact Boundary includes Noise Sensitive Property, or may include Noise Sensitive Property, shall submit a proposed Airport Noise Abatement Program for Commission approval within 12 months of notification, in writing, by the Director. The Director shall give such notification when the Commission has reasonable cause to believe that an abatement program is necessary to protect the health, safety or welfare of the public following a public informational hearing on the question of such necessity. Reasonable cause shall be based upon a determination that:

(A) Present or planned airport operations cause or may cause noise impacts that interfere with noise sensitive use activities such as communication and sleep to the extent that the public health, safety or welfare is threatened;

(B) These noise impacts will occur on property presently used for noise sensitive purposes, or where noise sensitive use is permitted by zone or comprehensive plan; and

(C) It appears likely that a feasible noise abatement program may be developed.

(b) Program Elements. An Airport Noise Abatement Program shall consist of all of the following elements, but if it is determined by the Department that any element will not aid the development of the program, it may be excluded:

(A) Maps of the airport and its environs, and supplemental information, providing:

(i) Projected airport noise contours from the Noise Impact Boundary to the airport property line in 5 dBA increments under current year of operations and at periods of five, ten, and twenty years into the future with proposed operational noise control measures designated in paragraph (4)(b)(B);

(ii) All existing Noise Sensitive Property within the airport Noise Impact Boundary;

(iii) Present zoning and comprehensive land use plan permitted uses and related policies;

(iv) Physical layout of the airport including the size and location of the runways, taxiways, maintenance and parking areas;

(v) Location of present and proposed future flight tracks;

(vi) Number of aircraft flight operations used in the calculation of the airport noise levels. This information shall be characterized by flight track, aircraft type, flight operation, number of daytime and nighttime operations, and takeoff weight of commercial jet transports.

(B) An airport operational plan designed to reduce airport noise impacts at Noise Sensitive Property to the Airport Noise Criterion to the greatest extent practicable. The plan shall include an evaluation of the appropriateness and effectiveness of the following noise abatement operations by estimating potential reductions in the airport Noise Impact Boundary and numbers of Noise Sensitive Properties impacted within

the boundary, incorporating such options to the fullest extent practicable into any proposed Airport Noise Abatement Program:

(i) Takeoff and landing noise abatement procedures such as thrust reduction or maximum climb on takeoff;

(ii) Preferential and priority runway use systems;

(iii) Modification in approach and departure flight tracks;

(iv) Rotational runway use systems;

(v) Higher glide slope angles and glide slope intercept altitudes on approach;

(vi) Displaced runway thresholds;

(vii) Limitations on the operation of a particular type or class of aircraft, based upon aircraft noise emission characteristics;

(viii) Limitations on operations at certain hours of the day;

(ix) Limitations on the number of operations per day or year;

(x) Establishment of landing fees based on aircraft noise emission characteristics or time of day;

(xi) Rescheduling of operations by aircraft type or time of day;

(xii) Shifting operations to neighboring airports;

(xiii) Location of engine run-up areas;

(xiv) Times when engine run-up for maintenance can be done;

(xv) Acquisition of noise suppressing equipment and construction of physical barriers for the purpose of reducing aircraft noise impact;

(xvi) Development of new runways or extended runways that would shift noise away from populated areas or reduce the noise impact within the Airport Noise Impact Boundary.

(C) A proposed land use and development control plan, and evidence of good faith efforts by the proprietor to obtain its approval, to protect the area within the airport Noise Impact Boundary from encroachment by non-compatible noise sensitive uses and to resolve conflicts with existing unprotected noise sensitive uses within the boundary. The Plan is not intended to be a community-wide comprehensive plan; it should be airport-specific, and should be of a scope appropriate to the size of the airport facility and the nature of the land uses in the immediate area. Affected local governments shall have an opportunity to participate in the development of the plan, and any written comments offered by an affected local government shall be made available to the Commission. The Department shall review the comprehensive land use plan of the affected local governments to ensure that reasonable policies have been adopted recognizing the local government’s responsibility to support the proprietor’s efforts to protect the public from excessive airport noise. The plan may include, but not be limited to, the following actions within the specified noise impact zones:

(i) Changes in land use through non-noise sensitive zoning and revision of comprehensive plans, within the Noise Impact Boundary (55 dBA);

(ii) Influencing land use through the programing of public improvement projects within the Noise Impact Boundary (55 dBA);

(iii) Purchase assurance programs within the 65 dBA boundary;

(iv) Voluntary relocation programs within the 65 dBA boundary;

(v) Soundproofing programs within the 65 dBA boundary, or within the Noise Impact Boundary (55 dBA) if the governmental entity with land use planning responsibility desires, and will play a major role in implementation.

(vi) Purchase of land for airport use within the 65 dBA boundary;

(vii) Purchase of land for airport related uses within the 65 dBA boundary;

(viii) Purchase of land for non-noise sensitive public use within the Noise Impact Boundary (55 dBA);

(ix) Purchase of land for resale for airport noise compatible purposes within the 65 dBA boundary;

(x) Noise impact disclosure to purchaser within the Noise Impact Boundary (55 dBA);

(xi) Modifications to Uniform State Building Code for areas of airport noise impact within the Noise Impact Boundary (55 dBA).

(c) Federal Aviation Administration Concurrence. The proprietor shall use good faith efforts to obtain concurrence or approval for any portions of the proposed Airport Noise Abatement Program for which the airport proprietor believes that Federal Aviation Administration concurrence or approval is required. Documentation of each such effort and a written statement from FAA containing its response shall be made available to the Commission;

(d) Commission Approval. Not later than twelve months after notification by the Director pursuant to subsection (4)(a) of this rule, the proprietor shall submit a proposed Airport Noise Abatement Program to the Commission for approval. Upon approval, the abatement program shall have the force and effect of an order of the Commission. The Commission may direct the Department to distribute copies of the approved abatement program to interested federal, state and local governments, and to other interested persons, and may direct the Department to undertake such monitoring or compliance assurance work as the Commission deems necessary to ensure compliance with the terms of its order. The Commission shall base its approval or disapproval of a proposed Noise Abatement Program upon:

(A) The completeness of the information provided;

(B) The comprehensiveness and reasonableness of the proprietor’s evaluation of the operational plan elements listed under paragraph (4)(b)(B) of this rule;

(C) The presence of an implementation scheme for the operational plan elements, to the extent feasible;

(D) The comprehensiveness and reasonableness of the proprietor’s evaluation of land use and development plan elements listed under paragraph (4)(b)(C) of this rule;

(E) Evidence of good faith efforts to adopt the land use and development plan, or obtain its adoption by the responsible governmental body, to the extent feasible;

(F) The nature and magnitude of existing and potential noise impacts;

(G) Testimony of interested and affected persons; and

(H) Any other relevant factors.

(e) Program Renewal. No later than six months prior to the end of a five-year period following the Commission's approval, each current airport Noise Abatement Program shall be reviewed and revised by the proprietor, as necessary, and submitted to the Commission for consideration for renewal.

(f) Program Revisions. If the Director determines that circumstances warrant a program revision prior to the scheduled five-year review, the Airport Proprietor shall submit to the Commission a revised program within 12 months of written notification by the Director. The Director shall make such determination based upon an expansion of airport capacity, increase in use, change in the types or mix of various aircraft utilizing the airport, or changes in land use and development in the impact area that were unforeseen in earlier abatement plans. Any program revision is subject to all requirements of this rule.

(5) Consultation. The Director shall consult with the airport proprietor, members of the public, the Oregon Departments of Transportation, Land Conservation and Development and any affected local government in an effort to resolve informally a noise problem prior to issuing a notification under subsections (3)(b), (4)(a) and (4)(f) of this rule.

(6) Noise Sensitive Use Deviations. The airport noise criterion is designed to provide adequate protection of noise sensitive uses based upon out-of-doors airport noise levels. Certain noise sensitive use classes may be acceptable within the airport Noise Impact Boundary if all measures necessary to protect interior activities are taken.

(7) Airport Noise Monitoring. The Department may request certification of the airport Noise Impact Boundary by actual noise monitoring, where it is deemed necessary to approve the boundary pursuant to subsection (3)(e) of this rule.

(8) Exceptions. Upon written request from the Airport Proprietor, the Department may authorize exceptions to this rule, pursuant to OAR 340-035-0010, for:

(a) Unusual or infrequent events;

(b) Noise sensitive property owned or controlled by the airport;

(c) Noise sensitive property located on land zoned exclusively for industrial or commercial use.

Statutory/Other Authority: ORS 467

Statutes/Other Implemented: ORS 467.030

History:

DEQ 24-2018, minor correction filed 04/02/2018, effective 04/02/2018

DEQ 5-2018, minor correction filed 02/14/2018, effective 02/14/2018

DEQ 14-2017, amend filed 10/30/2017, effective 11/02/2017

DEQ 7-1983, f. & ef. 4-22-83

DEQ 33-1979, f. & ef. 11-27-79

What is the Status of the 2012 Aurora Master Plan Update?

The validity of the AMPU was recently questioned as part of a petition for review made to the Oregon Land Use Board of Appeals ("LUBA"). In that land use action, the petitioners sought review of a 2019 Oregon Aviation Board Decision made pursuant to OAR 138-103-0055 in which the Board found that the AMPU was compatible with the Marion County Comprehensive Plan. Petitioners also filed in state Circuit Court as a precautionary measure in the event LUBA dismissed the matter for lack of jurisdiction. LUBA concluded that it lacked jurisdiction to hear this matter but was overturned on appeal on that issue by the Court of Appeals. In December of 2021, the Oregon Supreme Court declined to review the Court of Appeal's decision and the matter was remanded back to LUBA. As directed by the Court of Appeals, LUBA ordered ODAV and the Board to submit a copy of the master plan documents that were before the Board in a 2011 adoption hearing. ODAV and the Board are unable to locate a copy of this document, and, based on an incomplete record, LUBA remanded the Board's 2019 Findings that the Board complied with OAR 138-103-0055 when it adopted the AMPU. LUBA further ordered that it was unable to resolve any of the other issues presented by the parties, including whether the Board lawfully adopted the AMPU.

Because of this missing master plan documents, the Board may be unable to demonstrate in a legal proceeding that the AMPU was lawfully adopted. However, there has been no decision by a court or the Board that the AMPU was not lawfully adopted and the time in which that decision may be challenged has passed under state law. Moreover, the studies and information conducted to support the AMPU were funded and required by FAA and did not require adoption under state law to be valid for FAA purposes. The circuit court cases remain pending but are expected be dismissed or otherwise resolved consistent with LUBA's order of remand.