



Re: Aurora State Airport Master Plan Website Comments - Wendie Kellington

From Brandy Steffen <brandy.steffen@jla.us.com>
Date Tue 2024-10-15 5:15 PM
To Wendie Kellington <wk@klgpc.com>
Cc BEACH Anthony <Anthony.BEACH@odav.oregon.gov>

Hi Wendie,

Thanks for your email. We only allow the main PAC representative to be on the panelist side, the alternates are on the attendee side, since we have such a large group. Since Ted is the main member, he is in the panelist area. Feel free to send in comments via the QA section throughout the meeting or through email.

Thanks,

BRANDY STEFFEN | JLA PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

Partner + Senior Program Manager

brandy.steffen@jla.us.com » [Schedule a 30 minute meeting](#)

From: Wendie Kellington <wk@klgpc.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 15, 2024 4:59 PM
To: Brandy Steffen <brandy.steffen@jla.us.com>
Subject: RE: Aurora State Airport Master Plan Website Comments - Wendie Kellington

I represent a PAC member and cannot get into the panel. Will you please admit me to the panel. Thank you. Wendie Kellington

From: Brandy Steffen <brandy.steffen@jla.us.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 15, 2024 1:39 PM
To: Wendie Kellington <wk@klgpc.com>
Cc: BEACH Anthony <Anthony.BEACH@odav.oregon.gov>
Subject: Aurora State Airport Master Plan Website Comments - Wendie Kellington

Hello Wendie,

We have received your comments and questions. We will get back to you as soon as possible.

Thank you,

BRANDY STEFFEN | JLA PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

Partner + Senior Program Manager

brandy.steffen@jla.us.com » [Schedule a 30 minute meeting](#)

From: Wendie Kellington <noreply@jotform.com>

Sent: Tuesday, October 15, 2024 9:03 AM

Subject: Re: Aurora State Airport Master Plan Website Comments - Wendie Kellington

Aurora State Airport Master Plan Website Comments

Name	Wendie Kellington
Organization	Kellington Law Group
Comments or questions?	<p>We represent TLM holdings. (1) ODAV's alternatives first presented 7/31/24 stated they were all premised on the claim that FAA said no runway extension could occur unless the Highway 551 ROFA design standard was first met. That is incorrect and that incorrect premise drove all of ODAV's binary 7/31 alternatives. Further, the highway is just 32 feet off of perfect ROFA compliance and ODAV appears to have been unaware that there is plenty of room in the ROW to move the highway to meet the ROFA without taking homes or businesses, because the binary choice ODAV presented was either taking a bunch of homes/businesses to move Hwy 551 west or wiping out significant aeronautical uses at the airport by moving the RW east. Both of those draconian alternatives ODAV presented are wholly unnecessary. (2) FAA never said that no r/w extension can occur without the ROFA first being met. They will absolutely allow the RW to be extended without perfect ROFA concurrent compliance. They just want the master plan to show the ROFA being met by the end of the planning period if funding becomes available. (3) The airport's aeronautical stakeholders presented an airport MP alternative that extended the RW north in the short term to serve the decade-plus long need for safe existing aircraft operations, provided a fully documented MOS demonstrating unequivocally that MOS standards were met, contemplated HWY 551 be moved the 32 ft west after the RW extension happens, and later in the MP planning period and within the existing ROW (taking no homes/businesses), if funding is available. (4) FAA will in fact allow the r/w to be extended without perfect prerequisite ROFA compliance, and ODAV mistakenly presented alternatives premised on the opposite conclusion it attributed to</p>

FAA. ODAV must present alternatives to the PAC that are in fact consistent with FAA directives. Otherwise, ODAV fails to comply with its citizen involvement/stakeholder involvement obligations. The aeronautical stakeholders alternative with fully justified MOS must be included as an option in a suite of real properly premised alternatives returned to the PAC for comment. (4) Respectfully, there is no justification for any alternative that wipes out any aeronautical uses. Hwy 551 can be moved west within the existing ROW at the end of the MP planning period with minimal private property impacts. Wiping out any aeronautical uses is simply unacceptable and is contrary to ORS 836.640-642 governing ODAV and the entire point of this master planning effort to serve aeronautical uses. Relatedly, there is no justification for each alternative demanding that the septic drainfield to the south be moved to some unknown location that may not even feasibly exist. As the geotechnical report in the record demonstrates, modest improvements to that drainfield make it comply with FAA standards. Nothing justifies moving it. Thank you. I would like to receive email updates.

If you would like a response, please tell us the best way to contact you:

Email	wk@klgpc.com
Phone Number	(503) 804-0535

You can [edit this submission](#) and [view all your submissions](#) easily.