

## **Meeting Summary – PAC Meeting #1 – October 15, 2024**

Airport Manager Tristan Witham started the meeting at 2:00 PM as scheduled and handed the meeting over to Mike Dane from the consulting team. Mike facilitated a discussion with the PAC members in attendance. No members of the public were present. After introductions and general housekeeping items, consultants provided an overview of the planning process, project schedule, project funding, and why the project is being completed. It was explained that the focus of this meeting was to discuss the existing conditions and aviation activity forecasts.

### Regional Setting

During the presentation of the Regional Setting the conversation was mostly focused on topics such as local socio-economic conditions, aircraft operations, based aircraft, hangar demand, potential for Medevac Base, BLM/USFS fire operations, and the County zoning ordinance. The following bullet points provide a summary of the discussion topics:

- **Aircraft Operations**
  - Discussed the existing operations estimate of 6,200 based on approved methodology and previous estimates developed.
  - Discussed the existing design aircraft of King Air B200 depicted on the previous Airport Layout Plan and the proposed updated design aircraft of AT-802 which accounts for nearly 436 annual operations according to estimates provided by BLM.
  - Coupled with the operations of the AT-802 and TFMSC data of B-II or larger aircraft, it is expected that B-II (the previous airport reference code) is likely to remain.
- **Based Aircraft** - Discussed the existing based aircraft count and validated based aircraft count which identifies 14 aircraft.
- PAC discussed the importance of not taking money from the General Fund to support the Airport, and desire to explore opportunities for increasing Airport revenues and continue moving towards financial self-sufficiency.
- PAC members expressed strong support for the continued designation of the BLM/USFS fire base and how they can continue to support these operations. Members discussed the distance of other airports in the region and the importance LKV has for General Aviation in the region.
- Medevac operations and the potential to relocate the Klamath Falls Medevac Base to LKV were discussed.
- One PAC member mentioned it could be advantageous to consider construction of a new FBO facility that also provided a base for BLM/USFS fire operations and Medevac operations.
- PAC members expressed interest in pursuing additional hangar space.
- PAC members discussed the County zoning ordinance and understood that it needs to include provisions for the airport airspace surfaces and compatible zoning.

### Airside Elements

During the presentation of the Airside Elements the conversation was primarily focused on the runway length, runway width, justification for a cross-wind runway, taxiway system, and airside support facilities such as fuel. The following bullet points provide a summary of the discussion topics:

- Runway length was discussed, and the group discussion indicated that there may be some demand for additional runway length. The extension depicted in the 2013 ALP was based on potential business jet activity that never materialized and is difficult to justify given present conditions. A BLM/USFS representative on the PAC indicated that the SEAT aircraft can't depart

with full loads on hot summer days. The planning team said they would coordinate with BLM/USFS representatives to better understand their unmet need for runway length.

- Runway width was discussed and consultants explained how confirming the airport reference code/runway design code as B-II would result in the runway being narrowed from 100' to 75' at some point in the future. It was explained that the FAA would not participate at any width beyond 75' if the County wanted to maintain the runway at 100'.
- The future parallel taxiway concept vs. the existing "Triangle" taxiway system (which functions as a parallel taxiway) issue was discussed at some length with the PAC. The consultant team mentioned that this issue will be explored further in the Development Alternatives section of the project.
- PAC member representing airport users indicated that an unpublished infield grass landing area is used by some of the smaller "big-wheel" aircraft located on the Airport.
- The need for a cross-wind runway was discussed. Airport users and PAC members expressed strong interest in the need for a cross-wind runway. Consultants indicated that preliminary analysis suggests a cross-wind runway is not justified and therefore not eligible for federal funding. PAC members indicated that Klamath Falls and Alturas both have cross-wind runways. Upon further discussion, consultants explained they would conduct additional analysis to identify any potential opportunities to justify a cross-wind runway.

#### Landside Elements

During the presentation of the Landside Elements the conversation was primarily focused on the future construction of an FBO facility, hangar condition and future hangar demand, and airport perimeter fencing. The following bullet points provide a summary of the discussion topics:

- The PAC discussed the future construction/improvements of an FBO facility that also housed BLM/USFS and Medevac operations. Members of the PAC indicated this conversation has been in the works for some time now and that they envisioned a facility similar to what was recently constructed at the Grant County Regional Airport.
- While there is no official waitlist, PAC members speculated that if additional hangar space was available for rent, they would likely fill up with new aircraft. There is currently one location on the Airport where a conventional box hangar could be constructed. Otherwise, there are no other options available for hangar construction and this issue should be addressed as part of this planning process.
- The PAC discussed perimeter fencing and indicated that it was not a high priority but would be nice to have. Airport manager indicated that some business jet aircraft have decided against remaining overnight due to the lack of fencing.

After some general conversation and questions, PAC Members closed the meeting at approximately 4:30 PM.