

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 Responses¹

ID	Name	Affiliation	Question/Comment	Response
7.1	Councilor Dr. Joanne Linville	<i>City of Wilsonville</i>	<p>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?</p> <p>Is Alternative 2's replacement runway included in the cost?</p>	<p>We have not allocated shares of the project at this point, and this is the total cost of the project at a planning level.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
7.2	Tony Helbling	<i>Aurora Airport Improvement Association</i>	<p>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</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>Tim House, FAA: I am not an attorney, and there is not a legal department at</p>

¹ Live responses are included, along with additional information/clarification, as needed.
PAC Meeting #7 Summary

			<p>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.</p> <p>Is your response a legal response, that the FAA is saying that there will be no modifications to standard?</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>This proposal is destroying investment.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p><i>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.</i></p>
--	--	--	---	--

			<p>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.</p>	
7.3	Ben Williams	<i>Friends of French Prairie</i>	<p>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??????</p>	<p>“They” in reference to Tim House’s comment are ODAV and their consultant Century West.</p> <p><i>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.</i></p>
7.4	Bill Graupp	<i>Aurora CTE, Inc</i>	<p>Are these 2025 cost estimates or is there some CPI index cost based on a 10-year outlook?</p>	<p>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.</p>
7.5	Dave Mauk	<i>Charbonneau Country Club</i>	<p>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?</p>	<p>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</p>

				Capital Improvement Projects completed in Oregon and Washington may be made to FAA SEA ADO.
7.6	Councilor Dr. Joanne Linville	<i>City of Wilsonville</i>	Have the cost estimates been presented to the ODAV Board and if so, what has been their concerns?	<p>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.</p> <p>The cost estimates were developed in coordination with ODAV and we expect additional comments from PAC members and the public.</p>
7.7	Dave Tibbetts	<i>Columbia Helicopters</i>	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Why isn't the RPZ located at the southern end of the airport where there are no buildings?</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>The cost estimates for alternatives do not include property acquisition within the RPZ, as there are other solutions to address FAA concerns.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>

<p>7.8</p>	<p>Ben Williams</p>	<p><i>Friends of French Prairie</i></p>	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
<p>7.9</p>	<p>Ben Williams</p>	<p><i>Friends of French Prairie</i></p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>Tim House, FAA: No one at the FAA is putting together this plan. Please reference the email from March.</p>

7.10	Ben Williams	<i>Friends of French Prairie</i>	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	<i>Aurora Airport Improvement Association</i>	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 taxiway. 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	<i>City of Wilsonville</i>	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	<i>Positive Aurora Airport Management</i>	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>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 taxiway. 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.</p> <p>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</p>

				<p>ground vehicles to operate. Locations where the VSR crosses active taxiways or taxilanes will include appropriate markings to warn drivers of the active surfaces.</p> <p>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.</p>
7.14	Dave Mauk	<i>Charbonneau Country Club</i>	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	<i>Aurora Airport Improvement Association</i>	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	<p>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.</p> <p>Regarding modifications to standards, as Tim mentioned, the FAA has indicated that they are not open to</p>

			<p>guidance mentions that these modifications are meant for pre-existing structures with economic and historical significance.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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</p>	<p>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.</p>
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>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.</p>	
<p>7.16</p>	<p>Tony Helbling</p>	<p><i>Aurora Airport Improvement Association</i></p>	<p>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?</p> <p>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</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>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</p>

			<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>preferred alternative that is capable of meeting C-II standards.</p> <p>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.</p>
7.17	Tony Helbling	<i>Aurora Airport Improvement Association</i>	<p>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?</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
7.18	Tony Helbling	<i>Aurora Airport Improvement Association</i>	<p>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</p>	<p>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</p>

			<p>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?</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p>
7.19	Councilor Dr. Joann Linville	<i>City of Wilsonville</i>	<p>Where is the data that the FAA used to get to the C-II rating?</p>	<p>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.</p>
7.20	Tony Helbling	<i>Aurora Airport Improvement Association</i>	<p>So ODAV's consultants says that their "refined preliminary alternatives" are based on what</p>	<p>As stated earlier, Alternative 1A has been selected as the preferred alternative by ODAV. The decision</p>

			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 taxiway. ODAV believes that implementing the preferred alternative over the 20-year planning period is realistic and feasible.
7.21	Dave Mauk	<i>Charbonneau Country Club</i>	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	<i>City of Wilsonville</i>	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.

			<p>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?</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
<p>7.23</p>	<p>Councilor Dr. Joann Linville</p>	<p><i>City of Wilsonville</i></p>	<p>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</p>	<p>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</p>

			<p>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.</p> <p>Are these decisions being made by pilots or are they relying on waivers?</p>	<p>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.</p>
7.24	Dave Mauk	<i>Charbonneau Country Club</i>	<p>What's the level of design aircraft use that determines need?</p> <p>We have actual data everyday & it's well below that. Well below.</p>	<p>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.</p>
7.25	Tony Helbling	<i>Aurora Airport Improvement Association</i>	<p>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?</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>I understand that this might not be what people want to hear, but the message</p>

				<p>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.</p>
7.26	Tony Helbling	<i>Aurora Airport Improvement Association</i>	<p>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.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment.</p>
7.27	Ted Millar	<i>AABC/TLM Holdings</i>	<p>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.</p> <p>I also want to emphasize that Highway 551 can be moved west</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>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</p>

			<p>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.</p>	<p>already be part of the record; if not, it could be added.</p>
<p>7.28</p>	<p>Ted Millar</p>	<p><i>AABC/TLM Holdings</i></p>	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>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</p>

			<p>comment letter, which is fine, but it should be accessible to everyone.</p>	<p>requires compliance to get the airport layout plan approved.</p>
<p>7.29</p>	<p>Tony Helbling</p>	<p><i>Aurora Airport Improvement Association</i></p>	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>

			<p>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.</p>	
<p>7.30</p>	<p>Tony Helbling</p>	<p><i>Aurora Airport Improvement Association</i></p>	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>

			<p>collaboration is concerning, and the ideas being presented seem contrary to the ORS statute that ODAV is supposed to uphold to protect private investment.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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</p>
--	--	--	--	--

				<p>balancing community interests and FAA requirements.</p> <p>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.</p>
7.31	Ted Millar	AABC/TLM Holdings	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>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</p>

				impacted properties to be eligible for FAA funding.
7.32	Tony Helbling	<i>Aurora Airport Improvement Association</i>	<p>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?</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p>
7.33	Brian Asher	<i>Mayor, City of Aurora</i>	<p>I want to point out that throughout this process, the City of Aurora has been excluded from discussions among airport officials and</p>	<p>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</p>

			<p>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.</p>	<p>PAC members is encouraged to provide comment in the meetings and/or outside the meetings through the project website or an alternate means.</p> <p>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.</p>
7.34	Tony Helbling	<i>Aurora Airport Improvement Association</i>	<p>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!!!</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment.</p>
7.35	Dave Mauk	<i>Charbonneau Country Club</i>	<p>Who is in the room when the alternative plans are considered & decided upon?</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>The consulting team provided a briefing to the aviation department board in September, which also informed their decision-making process.</p> <p>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</p>

				<p>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.</p>
<p>7.36</p>	<p>Tony Helbling</p>	<p><i>Aurora Airport Improvement Association</i></p>	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p>

7.37	Ted Millar	<i>AABC/TLM Holdings</i>	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	Thank you for your comment.
7.38	Dave Mauk	<i>Charbonneau Country Club</i>	Decision making not process	Thank you for your comment.
7.39	Tony Helbling	<i>Aurora Airport Improvement Association</i>	<p>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</p>	<p>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</p>

			<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Strongly recommend ODAV and the Consultants take a long hard look at the ORS statute that is being flat out being ignored.</p>	<p>continue to take PAC and public comments through this process.</p>
<p>7.40</p>	<p>Councilor Dr. Joann Linville</p>	<p><i>City of Wilsonville</i></p>	<p>Isn't there supposed to be an environmental study or analysis?</p>	<p>A "desktop" environmental review of the existing site was completed as part of the existing conditions analysis in Chapter 2 of the Draft Working Paper. Further environmental investigations will precede future development projects.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The noise analysis will be completed based on the current/future runway</p>

			configuration in the preferred airside alternative.
--	--	--	---

Attendee Questions/Comments and Responses²

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.
PAC Meeting #7 Summary

		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

	<p>be improved to meet FAA standards. Therefore, there's no legal justification for ODAV to threaten or propose its removal elsewhere.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>grading standards and could impede the function of the drain field.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
--	--	---

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>