

From: Samantha Peterson <SPeterson@CenturyWest.com>
Sent on: Tuesday, September 3, 2024 6:23:44 PM
To: W. Matt Rogers <WRogers@CenturyWest.com>; BEACH Anthony <Anthony.BEACH@odav.oregon.gov>; David Miller <dmiller@CenturyWest.com>; THOMAS Alex R <Alex.R.THOMAS@odav.oregon.gov>
Subject: FW: Scope request - Runway Justification / Constrained Operations Report
Attachments: interimLandUseRPZGuidance.pdf (969.64 KB)

This message was sent from outside the organization. Treat attachments, links and requests with caution. Be conscious of the information you share if you respond.

From: PECK Heather [mailto:heather.peck@aviation.state.or.us]
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2019 09:37
To: Matt Rogers <wrogers@centurywest.com.com>; Mike Dane <MDane@CenturyWest.com>; James Kirby <JKirby@CenturyWest.com>
Subject: Fwd: Scope request - Runway Justification / Constrained Operations Report

From: "Tykoski, Robert (FAA)" <Robert.Tykoski@faa.gov>
Subject: RE: Scope request - Runway Justification / Constrained Operations Report
Date: 17 December 2019 15:45
To: "PECK Heather" <heather.peck@aviation.state.or.us>
Cc: "STANSBURY Betty" <Betty.STANSBURY@aviation.state.or.us>, "CLARK Cathy RB" <Cathy.RB.CLARK@aviation.state.or.us>, "MAASS Matthew D" <Matthew.D.MAASS@aviation.state.or.us>, "Dalke, Joseph (FAA)" <joseph.dalke@faa.gov>, "Callahan, Sean (FAA)" <Sean.Callahan@faa.gov>

Heather,

On page 3-6 it calls out two items that need additional coordination with FAA:

RPZ - Extension of the runway will place non-compatible land uses in the RPZ. – To run this to ground and make sure that this is something the FAA can support, a RPZ memo needs to go to FAA HQ. Please see the attached document for additional direction.

ROFA - Wilsonville Hubbard Highway runs parallel to the RWY and the north-bound lane falls within the runway OFA. – A similar analysis to the RPZ needs to be done that includes looking at alternatives to resolve the non-standard conditions, costs, etc. Could the road move west? Could the runway/taxiway move east? The FAA does not provide any permanent modifications to standards; therefore, it is not appropriate to assume further development of a non-standard condition without first exploring options to eliminate the condition.

The document also calls out runway connectors which depending on if a solution to the ROFA can be identified may become part of a RWY extension scope and may also need to be considered (If we are touching the runway/taxiway then we would need to identify solutions for the direct access)

As stated during the call, these questions need to be answered prior to an EA because if physical solutions are identified to resolve any or all of the above mentioned issues, they would have a connected action to the RWY extension and need to be considered in the EA. Proceeding without a full understanding of the scope of a project risks segmentation under NEPA.

Please let me know if you have additional questions.

Regards,

Robert Tykoski

(206)231-4139

From: PECK Heather <heather.peck@aviation.state.or.us>
Sent: Tuesday, December 17, 2019 3:05 PM
To: Tykoski, Robert (FAA) <Robert.Tykoski@faa.gov>