

# 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](http://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<sup>1</sup>

ID	Name	Affiliation	Question/Comment	Response
8.1	<b>Ben Williams</b>	<i>Friends of French Prairie</i>	<p>On the slide titled “Input Received on the Preferred Alternatives” you stated that no-build is a non-started relative to meeting future demand?</p> <p>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.</p>	<p><b>David Miller, CWE:</b> 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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>There are some issues with the data but the master plan forecasts are 20-year projections, where short-term fluctuations are normal.</p> <p>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.</p>
8.2	<b>Bruce Bennett</b>	<i>Positive Aurora Airport Management</i>	<p>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</p>	<p><b>David Miller, CWE:</b> 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</p>

<sup>1</sup> Live responses are included, along with additional information/clarification, as needed.  
PAC Meeting #8 Summary

		<p>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.</p> <p>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</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p><b>Tim House, FAA:</b> 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.</p>
--	--	---	---

			<p>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.</p> <p>There are some on this call that will donate, so it would be a huge net savings after the construction costs.</p>	<p><b>Kenji Sugahara, ODAV:</b> Hey Bruce, are you willing to donate? Good to know.</p> <p><b>Tim House, FAA:</b> 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.</p> <p><b>David Miller, CWE:</b> 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.</p>
<p>8.3</p>	<p><b>Aron Faegre</b></p>	<p><i>HTS</i></p>	<p>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.</p>	<p><b>Kenji Sugahara, ODAV:</b> 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.</p> <p><b>David Miller, CWE:</b> I can clarify a bit. Going back to the facility requirements chapter, we looked at the current fleet mix and the forecast.</p>

			<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p>
<p>8.4</p>	<p><b>Aron Faegre</b></p>	<p><i>HTS</i></p>	<p>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</p>	<p><b>Tim House, FAA:</b> 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</p>



			<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>Our standards are safety as well.</p> <p><b>David Miller, CWE:</b> 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.</p> <p>See <b>FAA Order 5300.1G</b> – Modification to Agency Airport Design, Construction, and Equipment Standards (9/29/17), Section 11. The MOS Process. See also <b>FAA AC 150/5300-13B</b>, change 1 – Airport Planning and Design (8/16/24), Sections 2.8 - 2.8.3, Modification of Standards.</p>
--	--	--	---	--



			<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	
<p>8.5</p>	<p><b>Aron Faegre</b></p>	<p><i>HTS</i></p>	<p>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</p>	<p><b>Kenji Sugahara, ODAV:</b> 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.</p>

			<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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?</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>It's a worry that the ODAV would go through condemnation process. Is that the biggest concern?</p> <p><b>James Kirby, CWE:</b> 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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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</p>
--	--	--	--	---

			<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>We showed how with geofabric it does (work). Maybe you've never used the geofabric.</p>	<p>carry aircraft objectively. AS far as discussion, there was an email chain that just kind of dead ended without any additional information from NV5.</p> <p>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.</p>
<p>8.6</p>	<p><b>Tony Helbling</b></p>	<p><i>Aurora Airport Improvement Association</i></p>	<p>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.</p> <p>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</p>	<p><b>Kenji Sugahara, ODAV:</b> We have kept the meetings virtual for accessibility.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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</p>

			<p>can't even provide input. This isn't productive.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>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</p>
--	--	--	---	--

				<p>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.</p>
<p>8.7</p>	<p><b>Tony Helbling</b></p>	<p><i>Aurora Airport Improvement Association</i></p>	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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</p>	<p><b>Tony Beach, ODAV:</b> 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.</p>

			<p>we started threatening to condemn hangars.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Two points. First, people have already volunteered their private property for</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

			<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	
<p><b>8.8</b></p>	<p><b>David Waggoner</b></p>	<p><i>Willamette Aviation</i></p>	<p>Tony Beach, maybe I can clarify your question about how the internal circulation road ties into the master</p>	<p><b>Tony Beach, ODAV:</b> When we're getting feedback about including a vehicle service road in the master</p>



			<p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p>
8.9	<b>Ted Millar</b>	<i>AABC/TLM Holdings</i>	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p><b>Tony Beach, ODAV:</b> 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.</p>
8.10	<b>Ted Millar</b>	<i>AABC/TLM Holdings</i>	<p>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</p>	<p><b>David Miller, CWE:</b> 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</p>

			<p>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.</p>	<p>the concept and its perceived added benefit to the overall Airport.</p>
<p>8.11</p>	<p><b>Tony Helbling</b></p>	<p><i>Aurora Airport Improvement Association</i></p>	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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</p>	<p><b>Tim House, FAA:</b> 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.</p> <p>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.</p>

			to be reflected as a property acquisition in the master plan.	
8.12	<b>Ted Millar</b>	<i>AABC/TLM Holdings</i>	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p>
8.13	<b>Jamie Stickel</b>	<i>City of Canby</i>	<p>Good evening, everyone. I'm Jamie Stickel, the Director of Economic Development for the City of Canby.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment.</p>

			<p>I'll read the letter as part of our public comment because I believe it supports much of what has been discussed tonight:</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>opportunity for stakeholders to meet in person and develop a plan that benefits all.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>I'd love to see your faces in person. Thank you very much.</p>	
<p><b>8.14</b></p>	<p><b>Jon Bickford</b></p>	<p><i>Atlantic Aviation</i></p>	<p>Kudos to the young lady from Canby! Getting together in Canby sounds great, and snacks are always a plus!</p> <p>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</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment.</p>

			<p>main way for airplanes to access the ramp, and my pilots started getting written up automatically.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	
<p><b>8.15</b></p>	<p><b>Patrick Donaldson</b></p>	<p><i>Wilsonville Chamber of Commerce</i></p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment.</p>

			<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	
8.16	<p><b>David Waggoner</b></p>	<p><i>Willamette Aviation</i></p>	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p><b>Kenji Sugahara:</b> 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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>However, based on the feedback we’ve received today, there’s room to</p>



			<p>It's unacceptable to force these people out of their homes.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>explore and analyze potential refinements. So, we're listening and will continue to evaluate options. Thanks.</p>
<p><b>8.17</b></p>	<p><b>Ted Millar</b></p>	<p><i>AABC/TLM Holdings</i></p>	<p>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</p>	<p>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'</p>

			<p>documents, and it clearly shows the internal circulation road proposed back in the 2012 master plan.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p>
8.18	<b>Alvin Klausen</b>	<i>Marion County</i>	No comment	Thank you for participating in the PAC.
8.19	<b>Bill Graup</b>	<i>Aurora CTE, Inc</i>	No comment	Thank you for participating in the PAC.
8.20	<b>Chris Neamztu</b>	<i>City of Wilsonville</i>	No comment	Thank you for participating in the PAC.
8.21	<b>Dave Mauk</b>	<i>Charbonneau Country Club</i>	No comment	Thank you for participating in the PAC.
8.22	<b>Dave Tibbetts</b>	<i>Columbia Helicopters</i>	No comment	Thank you for participating in the PAC.
8.23	<b>Melissa Ahrens</b>	<i>Oregon Dept of Land Conservation and Development</i>	No comment	Thank you for participating in the PAC.
8.24	<b>Naomi Zwerdling</b>	<i>ODOT</i>	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	<b>Pam Barlow Lind</b>	<i>Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians</i>	No comment	Thank you for participating in the PAC.
8.26	<b>Whitney Stewart</b>	<i>Oregon Department of Emergency Management</i>	No comment	Thank you for participating in the PAC.

<p><b>8.27</b></p>	<p><b>Tony Helbling</b></p>	<p><i>Aurora Airport Improvement Association</i></p>	<p>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.</p> <p>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?</p> <p>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.</p> <p>That's my two cents.</p>	<p><b>David Miller, CWE:</b> 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.</p> <p>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</p>
--------------------	-----------------------------	--	---	---

				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	<b>Aron Faegre</b>	<i>HTS</i>	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>I also hope there’s time to address and answer some of the other important questions raised today.</p>	<p><b>Tony Beach, ODAV:</b> 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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Thank you all for your comments and thoughtful discussion on the preferred alternatives.</p>
8.29	<b>Ted Millar</b>	<i>AABC/TLM Holdings</i>	<p>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.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. There are no plans to add additional PAC meeting to the schedule at this time.</p>
8.30	<b>Bruce Bennett</b>		<p>I'll keep it brief. I just want to clarify that the internal circulation road, as</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment.</p>

			<p>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.</p>	
<p>8.31</p>	<p><b>Tony Helbling (chat)</b></p>		<p>It has been started that “The FAA is requiring that non-standard conditions be brought into compliance.”</p> <p>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.</p> <p>It <i>*sounds*</i> 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?</p> <p>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?</p> <p>Has a law been passed within Congress of FAA funding that changes past practice? Or is this an ADO leader’s personal position?</p>	<p><b>David Miller, CWE:</b> 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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>See <b>FAA Order 5300.1G</b> – Modification to Agency Airport Design, Construction, and Equipment Standards (9/29/17), Section 11. The MOS Process. See also <b>FAA AC 150/5300-13B</b>, change 1 – Airport Planning and Design (8/16/24), Sections 2.8 - 2.8.3, Modification of Standards.</p>

8.32	<b>Tony Helbling (chat)</b>	<p>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.</p> <p>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!</p>	Thank you for your comment.
------	-----------------------------	--	-----------------------------

## Attendee Questions/Comments and Responses<sup>2</sup>

ID	Name	Question/Comment	Response
8.33	<b>Jeff Lewis</b>	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 <a href="https://aspm.faa.gov/tfms/sys/main.asp">https://aspm.faa.gov/tfms/sys/main.asp</a> .
8.34	<b>Jeff Lewis</b>	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 <a href="https://aspm.faa.gov/tfms/sys/main.asp">https://aspm.faa.gov/tfms/sys/main.asp</a> .
8.35	<b>Jeff Lewis</b>	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?	<p>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.</p> <p>The no-build alternative has been considered and eliminated as it does not address the operational and safety needs of the airport.</p>
8.36	<b>Jeff Lewis</b>	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.

<sup>2</sup> Live responses are included, along with additional information/clarification, as needed.  
PAC Meeting #8 Summary



		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?	<b>Bruce Bennett:</b> All the aircraft businesses and hangars are not airport land? I cannot agree. The are properties zoned, developed, and used strictly for aviation. <b>CWE:</b> 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?	<b>David Miller, CWE:</b> 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 <b>FAA Order 5300.1G</b> – Modification to Agency Airport Design, Construction, and Equipment Standards (9/29/17), Section 11. The MOS Process. See also <b>FAA AC 150/5300-13B</b> , change 1 – Airport Planning and Design (8/16/24), Sections 2.8 - 2.8.3, Modification of Standards.
<b>8.40</b>	<b>Jeff Lewis</b>	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.
<b>8.41</b>	<b>Jeff Lewis</b>	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.
<b>8.42</b>	<b>Jeff Lewis</b>	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.
<b>8.43</b>	<b>Jeff Lewis</b>	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	<b>Julie Fitzgerald</b>	Clarification: My question above was meant to refer to Highway 551. Thank you.	Thank you for the clarification.
8.50	<b>Jeff Lewis</b>	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	<b>Doug Wilson</b>	<p>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.</p> <p>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</p>	<p><b>David Miller, CWE:</b> 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.</p> <p>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</p>

		<p>meet compliance standards but have been managed through deviations.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>See <b>FAA Order 5300.1G</b> – Modification to Agency Airport Design, Construction, and Equipment Standards (9/29/17), Section 11. The MOS Process. See also <b>FAA AC 150/5300-13B</b>, change 1 – Airport Planning and Design (8/16/24), Sections 2.8 - 2.8.3, Modification of Standards.</p>
<p><b>8.52</b></p>	<p><b>Lukas Nickerson</b></p>	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p><b>David Miller, CWE:</b> 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.</p>
<p><b>8.53</b></p>	<p><b>Wendie Kellington</b></p>	<p>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,</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment.</p>

		<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	
<p><b>8.54</b></p>	<p><b>Doug Wilson</b></p>	<p>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</p>	<p><b>Tim House, FAA:</b> 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.</p>

		<p>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.</p>	<p><b>Kenji Sugahara, ODAV:</b> 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.</p> <p><b>Tim House, FAA:</b> It sounds like what he (Doug) is saying is to give us a modification of standards while we're planning it.</p>
<p>8.55</p>	<p><b>Doug Wilson</b></p>	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p><b>Tim House, FAA:</b> Have you been a part of the master planning process?</p> <p><b>Doug Wilson:</b> 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?</p> <p><b>David Miller, CWE:</b> 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.</p> <p><b>Doug Wilson:</b> Got it. And I want to clarify about FAA's process for filing</p>



			<p>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.</p> <p><b>Tim House, FAA:</b> 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.</p>
<p>8.56</p>	<p><b>Doug Wilson</b></p>	<p>So FAA is withholding AIP funding for airports not in compliance, except for maintenance?</p>	<p><b>Tim House, FAA:</b> Exactly. If an airport isn't progressing toward meeting standards, we'd only provide maintenance funding, not upgrades or extensions.</p> <p><b>Doug Wilson:</b> Understood. But for full compliance, should we be thinking of moving directly to compliance, rather than incremental progress?</p> <p><b>Tim House, FAA:</b> Yes, the preferred alternatives show the airport in compliance once completed. But "progress" means making steps toward meeting the standards.</p> <p><b>Doug Wilson:</b> 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.</p>
<p>8.57</p>	<p><b>Wendie Kellington</b></p>	<p>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</p>	<p><b>Kenji Sugahara (ODAV):</b> Wendy, remember what I said at the beginning?</p> <p><b>Wendie Kellington:</b> I heard it, and I believe it's probably true. I've never heard such a positive olive branch at</p>



		<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>If we let this chance slip away and end up with the preferred alternative as it is, then shame on us.</p>	<p>the end of a public meeting as I've heard today.</p>
<p><b>8.58</b></p>	<p><b>Aron Faegre, HTS</b></p>	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p><b>Kenji Sugahara, ODAV:</b> We've been discussing phasing for a while.</p>

## Additional Emailed Comments

ID	Name	Question/Comment	Response
8.59	Eric Winston 11/24/2024	<p>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.</p>	Thank you for your comment.
8.60	Peter Kincart ATP, CFII 11/25/2024	<p>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.</p> <p>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).</p> <p>I recommend airport safety improvements but only with no destruction of any hangars.</p>	Thank you for your comment.
8.61	Jeff Oerding, Columbia Aviation Association Historian	<p>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.</p>	Thank you for your comment.

	<p>11/24/2024</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>I ask you to reconsider ODA’s position on this financially debilitating project.</p>	
<p><b>8.62</b></p>	<p><b>James W. North</b> <b>Cindy Iseli</b> 11/29/2024</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>Instead of the current plan we urge you to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Move the vehicle lane farther east from the runway or use the current Airport Road NE</li> <li>2. The parallel taxi lane on the west side of the runway is not needed</li> </ol> <p>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.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment.</p>
<p><b>8.63</b></p>	<p><b>Gary J. Turel</b> 12/02/2024</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>The hangers possibly slated for destruction are imperative for the safe storage of aircraft. These hangers are very valuable to the</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment.</p>

		<p>Oregon flying community.</p> <p>Alternatives to the hangers destruction:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Create a vehicle lane as far away from the taxiway as possible.</li> <li>2. The parallel taxi-lane is unnecessary.</li> </ol> <p>Very similar results could be achieved by ODAV purchasing one acre from a willing seller.</p> <p>I recommend the airport safety improvements; but only without the destruction of any hangers. Thank you.</p>	
<p>8.64</p>	<p><b>Mark Ottenad</b>  12/04/2024</p>	<p>Hello Alex and Brandy,</p> <p>Can you please explain why the following direction is given to members of the public to attend the Dec 10 PAC meeting?</p> <p>“Others can join using the link on the website: <a href="https://publicproject.net/AuroraAirport">https://publicproject.net/AuroraAirport</a> (on the "meetings" page)”</p> <p>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?</p> <p>Why not just say here’s the meeting link: <a href="https://us02web.zoom.us/j/85045246628">https://us02web.zoom.us/j/85045246628</a> ??</p> <p>The meeting announcement says: “<b>Materials:</b> The agenda is posted to the website.”</p> <p>Why not just provide a link to the meeting agenda, which also has the Zoom link: <a href="https://publicproject.net/files/UAOAMP/ua-amp-pac8agenda-111924.pdf?e0208a471d">https://publicproject.net/files/UAOAMP/ua-amp-pac8agenda-111924.pdf?e0208a471d</a>?</p> <p>Thank you.</p> <p>- Mark</p>	<p><b>Brandy Steffen:</b> Hi Mark,</p> <p>Thanks for your comments and questions. I hope the following answers your questions, but please let us know if you need anything else.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Regarding the PAC member email that included a link to the website, not the direct "public" link:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>2. We previously had some confusion by PAC members about which Zoom link to use. Each PAC member receives a</li> </ol>

			<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
<p><b>8.65</b></p>	<p><b>Philip L. Miller</b> 12/03/2024</p>	<p>Sirs,</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Airport safety can be improved without destruction of any hangars.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment.</p>

<p><b>8.66</b></p>	<p><b>Ben Williams</b>  12/06/2024</p>	<p>Brandy, et al;</p> <p>Your last email re: PAC meeting 8 scheduled for next Tuesday states:</p> <p>We are looking forward to seeing you at the <b>next meeting (VIRTUAL) on Tuesday, December 10, 2024 from 5:00-8:00 p.m.</b> 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.</p> <p>Please see attached comments from Friends of French Prairie.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>It is our hope that this reality will be discussed at next week's PAC meeting.</p> <p><b><u>Attachment</u> comment from Friends of French Prairie</b></p>	<p><b>Brandy Steffen:</b> 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.</p>
<p><b>8.67</b></p>	<p><b>Tony Helbling</b>  12/10/2024</p>	<p>Tony and Brandy,</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Please acknowledge receipt.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. The referenced documents are included.</p>

		<p><a href="#">Attachment 1</a></p> <p><a href="#">Attachment 2</a></p> <p><a href="#">Attachment 3</a></p> <p><a href="#">Attachment 4</a></p> <p><a href="#">Attachment 5</a></p>	
<p><b>8.68</b></p>	<p><b>George Van Hoomissen</b> 12/10/2024</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p><b>David Miller, CWE:</b> The precise sequencing of some proposed improvements, particularly the parallel taxiway 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.</p>
<p><b>8.69</b></p>	<p><b>George Van Hoomissen</b> 12/10/2024</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>It seems obvious that, out of all the work</p>	<p>See previous response.</p>



		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?	
<b>8.70</b>	<b>Tony Helbling</b> 12/10/2024	<p>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?</p> <p>Please let me know ASAP.</p>	<b>Kenji Sugahara:</b> Sorry man, it has to be during public comment. That would open the door to litigation.
<b>8.71</b>	<b>Tony Helbling (to David Waggoner)</b> 12/10/2024	<p>Dave,</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Thanks for doing this...</p>	No response necessary.
<b>8.72</b>	<b>David Waggoner</b> 12/12/2024	<p>Master Planning Committee,</p> <p>I would like to appoint Betsy Johnson as my alternate for the PAC meeting this evening.</p> <p>Please confirm receipt of this email and the appointment has been made.</p> <p>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.</p>	<b>Tony Beach:</b> 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

	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>If the current Preferred Alternate is adopted, the EOC building would be demolished, forcing the EOC to be closed. This would</p>	<p>organizations that we have requested representation on the PAC for this master plan.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Thank you for your understanding</p>
--	---	--

		<p>significantly Oregon’s emergency preparedness response.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p>	
8.73	<p><b>Trent Brownlee</b> 12/10/2024</p>	<p>Hi Brandy,</p> <p>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.</p>	<p><b>Brandy Steffen:</b> Hi Trent,</p> <p>I apologize for not responding yesterday, I was preparing for the meeting.</p> <p>Currently Jon Bickford is the Atlantic Aviation representative on the PAC and no alternate is listed.</p> <p>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.</p>
8.74	<p><b>Wendie Kellington</b> 12/10/2024</p>	<p>Brandy,</p> <p>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 <b>a lot</b>) of smaller batches? Please advise. Thank you. Best, Wendie</p>	<p>Please send any exhibits or comments to ODAV to be included in the record.</p>
8.75	<p><b>Wendie Kellington</b> 12/10/2024</p>	<p>Brandy,</p> <p>Please see the attached submitted on behalf of TLM Holdings LLC for tonight’s proceeding. Please confirm receipt. Regards, Wendie Kellington</p> <p>Brandy,</p> <p>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</p>	<p><b>Brandy Steffen:</b> Thank you Wendie. I have received two emails from you with attachments today.</p> <p><b>Brandy Steffen:</b> Hi Wendie,</p> <p>Thank you for clarifying! Yes, I see that you sent 23 emails with attachments yesterday, all nested under the same</p>

		<p>one exhibit? If so which one? Please advise. Thank you. Best, Wendie</p> <p>Brandy, will you please respond when you get a chance today? Thank you. Best, Wendie</p> <p>Please see <a href="#">website Public Records</a> for all attachments</p>	<p>email subject line. These have been received.</p>
<p><b>8.76</b></p>	<p><b>Tony Helbling</b> 12/11/2024</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p><b>Tony Beach:</b> Hi Tony,</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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: <a href="https://publicproject.net/auroraairport#">https://publicproject.net/auroraairport#</a></p> <p>Thanks for your comments and input in the PAC meeting,</p> <p><b>Kenji Sugahara:</b> Tony H. - your recollection is incorrect.</p> <p>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</p>

			<p>public comment to accommodate former Sen. Johnson if she so wished.</p> <p>We are looking to prevent process issues that would likely result in litigation from those opposing the master plan.</p>
<p><b>8.77</b></p>	<p><b>Kristen Newbury</b> 12/13/2024</p>	<p>I logged into the Master Plan presentation last Tuesday evening.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment.</p>

		<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	
<p><b>8.78</b></p>	<p><b>Bruce Bennett</b> 12/16/2024</p>	<p>Dear Kenji, Tony, and Alex,</p> <p>Thank you three for all the time spent on the FAA-required master plan for the KUAO airport.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>I request that this potential addition to ODAV's ramp and taxi lane be added to the master plan that is underway.</p> <p>I believe that this addition will accomplish much of the benefits of the currently planed parallel taxiway and roadway without the</p>	<p><b>Tony Beach:</b> Hi Bruce, we have received this email, and the follow up email with the attachment. I've forwarded them to the master plan team.</p>

		<p>huge costs and legal challenges of that very unpopular plan.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Again, thank you and please contact me with any questions.</p> <p><a href="#">Attachment</a></p>	
<p><b>8.79</b></p>	<p><b>Dave Mauk</b> 12/16/2024</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments.</p>



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

		<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	
<p><b>8.80</b></p>	<p><b>Ted Davis</b> 12/18/2024</p>	<p>Dear ODAV c/o Alex Thomas,</p> <p>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</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments.</p>

		<p>consider the condemnation and destruction of any aircraft hangars.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>There is more than ample access to KUAO via Airport Rd NE for vehicles. There is no need to add an internal roadway.</p>	
8.81	<p><b>Itamer Reuven</b> 12/17/2024</p>	<p>Dear ODAV c/o Alex Thomas,</p> <p>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 hangars and this will make things worse.</p>	Thank you for your comments.
8.82	<p><b>Steve Brenneke</b> 12/18/2024</p>	<p>Mr. Alex R Thomas:</p> <p>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.</p>	Thank you for your comments.
8.83	<p><b>Aric Krause</b> 12/18/2024</p>	<p>Dear ODAV/ Alex Thomas,</p> <p>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.</p> <p><b>1. Displacement of Residents and Businesses:</b> Both Alternative 1A and 1B involve significant property acquisitions that</p>	Thank you for your comments.

		<p>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.</p> <p>2. <b>Traffic and Infrastructure Strain:</b> 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.</p> <p>3. <b>Issues with Alternative 2:</b> 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.</p> <p>4. <b>Community Engagement and Feedback:</b></p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>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.</p> <p><b>5. FAA Compliance vs. Community Needs:</b></p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	
--	--	---	--