

# AURORA STATE AIRPORT



## PLANNING ADVISORY COMMITTEE (PAC)

### MEETING #9 SUMMARY

**Date:** Tuesday, February 11, 2024  
**Time:** 5:00-8:00 pm  
**Location:** Zoom Webinar

### In Attendance

#### PAC Members Present

Aron Faegre, *alternate, Helicopter Transport Service; AABC/TLM Holdings*  
Austin Barnes, *Marion County Planning Dept. Planning Organization*  
Ben Williams, *Friends of French Prairie*  
Bill Graupp, *Aurora CTE, Inc*  
Bruce Bennett, *Positive Aurora Airport Management*  
Brian Asher, *City of Aurora*  
Cathryn Stephens, *ODAV Board*  
Councilor Anne Shevlin, *alternate, City of Wilsonville*  
David Waggoner, *Willamette Aviation*  
Dave Mauk, *Charbonneau Country Club*  
Jamie Stickel, *City of Canby*  
Jon Bickford, *Atlantic Aviation*  
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

Alvin Klausen, *Marion County*  
Beth Wytoski, *Regional Solutions*  
Cheryl Pouley, *Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde Community of Oregon*  
Chris Neamtzu, *City of Wilsonville (Attended part of the meeting as member of Public; see below)*  
Commissioner Danielle Bethel, *Marion County*  
Commissioner Tootie Smith, *Clackamas County*  
Dave Tibbetts, *Columbia Helicopters*  
Don Hardy, *alternate, City of Canby*  
Greg Hughes, *alternate, Vans Aircraft*  
Ken Ivey, *Aurora Butteville Barlow Community*  
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

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

Bobby Meyer

Brett Pondrocker

Bruce Bergman

Chris Gage

Chris Neamtzu (*Wilsonville primary PAC member, stated he was unable to attend; alternate attended instead. Chris attended part of the meeting as a member of public.*)

### **Audience / Members of the Public, continued**

George Buley

George Van Hoomissen

Greg Leo

Jake Farrens

Jason Paolo

Joseph Schaefer

Kaelyn Cahill

Kevin O'Malley

Larry Shadle

Luiza H

Lukas Nickerson

Mark Ottenad

Peter Rempp

Richard Langsen

Rick Olmsted

Rod

Shannon Colebank

Shawn O'Neil

Toni Whitler

Wendie Kellington

## **Overview**

Planning Advisory Committee (PAC) members reviewed the refined preferred alternative, the Airport Layout Plan (ALP), and Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) for the Airport Master Plan (AMP) project. *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 project team and PAC membership list. 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 refined preferred alternative, ALP, and CIP. **Tony Beach and Kenji Sugahara, ODAV**, reviewed the Airport Master Plan (AMP) process and PAC Meeting #9 Summary

explained that it took longer for the public comments and meeting summaries to be posted to the project website because ODAV wanted to ensure all comments had responses and the meetings were accurately summarized. The technical team reviewed and incorporated PAC feedback as it was received.

## **Presentation - Refined Preferred Alternative**

**David Miller, Century West**, said that the refined preferred alternative, published on January 6th, would be explained and reviewed, but no changes were made since then. Questions on other topics should be submitted in writing for reference.

David explained that the refined alternative resulted from feedback from previous PAC meetings. Key concerns included considering a no-build alternative, eliminating options impacting hangars, and reassessing the need for a parallel taxi lane and vehicle service road. Significant changes to the refined preferred alternative included removing the parallel taxi lane and vehicle service road and eliminating the need for certain property acquisitions. Other refinements involved reconfiguring helicopter parking and aircraft tie-down positions.

Elements that remained unchanged from prior versions of the preferred alternative included the proposed north runway extension, removal of drain fields from the runway safety area, shifting the Hubbard Highway while maintaining ODOT's right-of-way, and clearing the object-free area. The refined preferred alternative image included priority property acquisitions along Hubbard Highway and the east side of the runway, with a willingness-based acquisition approach for additional areas.

*Comments and responses are provided in [the table](#) below.*

## **Capital Improvement Plan**

David reviewed the Capital Improvement Program (CIP), outlining the breakdown of projects tied to meeting FAA standards. He noted that the overall costs initially were around \$185 million, with significant property acquisition on the east side. Key projects which are expected to be completed within the next five years include runway rehabilitation, obstruction removal, and easement acquisitions.

Long-term projects (beyond five years) include reconstruction of the parallel taxiway, drainage ditch mitigation, and the Hubbard Highway project, which involves property acquisition and right-of-way considerations. Further runway extensions and parallel taxiway improvements were also listed. The total long-term costs are just under \$100 million, with major expenses related to shifting right-of-way and road construction.

David stated that while routine maintenance costs like pavement sealing are not included, those tasks are considered essential and would fall under the maintenance category. While property acquisition is not fully costed out, it remains a possibility if the airport needs to purchase land for future projects.

FAA funding for these projects is typically up to 90%, though this can vary depending on congressional authorizations. Such large-scale projects may require a regional evaluation from the FAA, as they represent a rare scale of upgrades needed to meet standards.

## **Airport Layout Plan**

David reviewed the Airport Layout Plan (ALP), outlining the details of the plan and how they would be included in the final Airport Master Plan. The airport layout plan includes the previously presented improvements. Key

Aurora State Airport Master Plan – Planning Advisory Committee (PAC) elements include runway and parallel taxiway upgrades, Keil Road alignment, road extensions, and property acquisitions (marked in yellow).

The ODAV terminal area, control tower, and circulation roads connecting off-airport access were also shown. Additional details cover future apron improvements, reconfigurations of tie-downs and taxi lanes, and hangar development. The north end of the runway and parallel taxiway require property acquisition to control the object-free area.

Please see the [presentation](#) under the PAC 9 meeting on the [project website](#) for the ALP.

## PAC Questions and Comments

Brandy began the PAC discussion. *Comments and responses are provided in [the table](#) below; responses provided during the meeting include the speakers name. 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 two public comments. 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 tables below.

## Next Steps

David stated that the chapters and forecast will be updated and packaged into a full final report. The next steps for the project include:

- Finalizing the ALP, which will include additional content (airspace and approach surface drawings).
- ODAV will submit the ALP draft to the FAA for their review, which typically takes about 90 days, although this may extend depending on their workload. While the FAA doesn't formally approve the master plan, they do approve the ALP. Once the FAA is satisfied, the plan will be signed off, and the project will be closed out.
- The public review period will be open throughout this process, and the public participation details will be included in the report. The draft final report will be submitted by May, and assuming the FAA review goes smoothly, the project will close out by the end of May.
  - The local adoption process will follow after that.

Brandy, Tony, and Kenji thanked the PAC and public attendees for their time and input throughout the project, then ended the meeting.

## PAC Member Questions/Comments and Responses<sup>1</sup>

ID	Name	Affiliation	Question/Comment	Response
9.1	<b>Ben Williams</b>	<i>Friends of French Prairie</i>	What are the plans or proposals for the relocation of the drain field?	<p><b>David Miller, CWE:</b> Our plan recommends relocating the drain field outside the runway safety area, as we discussed in the last meeting and presented to the board last week. The FAA has weighed in and supports this relocation due to two key issues: the grade at the end of the runway and the drain field's inability to support the weight of an aircraft or emergency vehicle.</p> <p>The final decision on where to relocate the drain field will be up to its owner. Currently, it sits on leased airport land but services buildings off the airport. Since our plan is limited to ODF property, it does not propose alternative locations off airport grounds, and so far, no proposals have been made to relocate it elsewhere on the airport.</p>
9.2	<b>Tony Helbling</b>	<i>Aurora Airport Improvement Association</i>	I kind of disagree with the on airport vs. off airport because it strikes me as odd that the master plan can consider off airport items like the relocation of the highway, but cannot consider the internal circulation road since it's only on airport. Portions of the internal circulation road would off the airport just as the highway is. Why can we consider one but not the other?	<p><b>David Miller, CWE:</b> The main focus of the master plan is to evaluate facility needs within the boundaries controlled by ODAV, both now and in the future. Anything beyond the official airport boundary, such as addressing off-airport infrastructure like the through-the-fence area or vehicle service roads, falls outside the scope recognized by the FAA.</p> <p>Property acquisition and related improvements are considered because those areas would become part of the airport itself. For example, shifting the Hubbard Highway requires adjusting its right-of-way to meet FAA standards, particularly for the runway's object-free area.</p> <p>As it stands, the plan recommends relocating the drain field out of the runway safety area to satisfy FAA requirements. However, the final decision on its new location will ultimately be up to the responsible parties.</p>

<sup>1</sup> Live responses are included, along with additional information/clarification, as needed.  
PAC Meeting #9 Summary

			<p>Good. The drain field issue has to do with taking (them) because there is an easement in perpetuity on the south drain field. If the state pursues the taking of that easement, then it becomes incumbent on the state to find a new location for the drain field. And as we've suggested, the acquired area to the east of the current Keil Road would be a logical place to put it. I'm not sure why we're not depicting that.</p>	<p><b>David Miller, CWE:</b> Any future decisions about relocation will need to be addressed outside the master plan. The primary focus of the master plan is to clear the runway safety area to meet FAA standards. While there will likely be ongoing discussions during implementation, those details are beyond the scope of the plan itself. ODAV is fully aware of the input received throughout the process, including from recent meetings, and has taken it into account in their final decisions.</p>
<p>9.3</p>	<p><b>Aron Faegre</b></p>	<p><i>Helicopter Transport Service; AABC/TLM Holdings</i></p>	<p>We hear a lot of interpretations about what the FAA rules are, but I think we need to pay close attention to what other airports are allowed under those rules. To my knowledge, I've never seen any ruling stating that a drain field isn't allowed in a runway safety area. The key issue is whether it can support an aircraft.</p> <p>We've already submitted a detailed study from NV5 showing how modern materials could make the site capable of supporting even a Gulfstream 550. So my question to David is, why wouldn't the master plan at least explore potential solutions? If not in the plan itself, then at least in the narrative. The FAA circular on master planning explicitly states that options should be presented, including modifications of standards. You should be discussing them.</p> <p>I've spoken with FAA headquarters, and the modification of standards program exists precisely for situations like this. They've even removed the five-year resubmission requirement. It's designed for multi-phase projects and the process is meant to be applied for before seeking grants, so airports know what's possible before applying.</p> <p>I feel like Oregon is getting the short end of the stick here. We've provided two FAA-approved methodologies for keeping the drain fields in place. Even if ODAV isn't in favor, they should at least present an alternative solution. Some argue it can't be placed in EFU</p>	<p><b>David Miller, CWE:</b> Thanks, Aron. I won't go through all the details again, but as I mentioned earlier, discussions about the drain field have involved ODAV staff, FAA staff, and the Seattle ADO. Century West's role hasn't been so much in the master planning process but rather in evaluating the engineering side of things.</p> <p>From the information provided to our team so far, we haven't seen evidence that the proposed options are feasible. Others may disagree, but based on the available data, the FAA made its decision on the refined preferred alternative accordingly.</p> <p>There are gradient issues, as James Kirby has pointed out in past discussions—portions of the drain field rise above the runway safety grade, creating a non-standard condition. Additionally, the inability to taxi an aircraft or drive an emergency vehicle over it is another non-standard issue.</p> <p>While modification of standards may be an option in some cases, runway safety areas are not considered modifiable, even under the FAA's more project-specific approach. Their standards for these areas are stricter than for other protected areas.</p>

		<p>land, which makes it even more critical for the ALP or the plan to clearly define the airport boundary from a land use standpoint. The courts have ruled that without this, EFU land conversion isn't possible.</p> <p>So my main question is: why can't the master plan at least acknowledge and discuss the alternative solutions that have already been submitted? It seems short-sighted, and I don't see why Oregon should have fewer rights than other states, where these things are routinely allowed</p> <p>I agree that modification of standards doesn't apply to a runway safety area. However, we submitted a highly detailed geotechnical report, and to our knowledge, the state's Geotech firm, GRI, was never even given a chance to review it or provide specific comments. That was before Kenji's time, but it's frustrating that there wasn't a real discussion.</p> <p>NV5 is one of the largest geotechnical firms in Oregon and operates nationally—why would we question their findings? They analyzed the issue in depth, yet their work never seemed to get a fair review. It felt like the discussion was cut off before it could be seriously considered.</p> <p>More recently, we submitted the EMAS option, which is a standard FAA approach for a C-II airport. It's strange that it wasn't even acknowledged, especially since other C-II airports have used it successfully.</p> <p>I would say to Tony that I really wish there was an opportunity to meet on this issue and have our Geotech team and your Geotech team work together. It feels like the issue is being intentionally avoided without giving the specialists, who are most knowledgeable, a chance to talk. Our request to have our Geotech team speak with yours was refused, and it feels like a negative approach to solving the problem. I would still ask that we reconsider this and allow NV5 and GRI to be in the room together</p>	<p><b>Tony Beach, ODAV:</b> What David said is correct: we are focused on making the runway safety area standard by removing the drain field, which does not comply with FAA regulations. Currently, the master plan does not propose a new location for the drain field on state property, and we have not evaluated future accommodations for it.</p> <p>Regarding Aron's comments, we have thoroughly reviewed the report he mentioned with our engineers and even made related correspondence available on our project website. However, we remain unconvinced that the drain field can be modified to meet FAA standards, which is why we continue to recommend its removal from the runway safety area.</p> <p>Aron, I really appreciate your comments, and I assure you we have taken a very close look at this. We have gone thoroughly over the report that you've submitted and we had questions that as far as we're aware have not been answered.</p> <p>Again, the drain field has not been proven to meet FAA standards and function at its current location. We need to remove it from the primary safety area.</p>
--	--	--	--

			<p>with everyone involved to discuss it creatively. Modern materials are being used successfully for fire engine access, and I believe this approach could work here as well, but it would require looking at the situation as an opportunity, rather than closing the door on it quickly.</p>	
<p>9.4</p>	<p><b>Bruce Bennett</b></p>	<p><i>Positive Aurora Airport Management</i></p>	<p>I had recommended the acre of land that's available midfield that would connect the taxiway to the state ramp be put on the priority purchase status and I was wondering if I am ahead of myself, or has that change been made to the preferred alternative?</p> <p>I'm confused by this situation. The last plan proposed spending hundreds of millions on a parallel taxiway and vehicle roadway, which I thought was outrageous and absurd because it would involve destroying all the major hangars at the airport. It seemed totally unrealistic. That plan claimed there was a need for both vehicle and aircraft circulation, but really, by adding just 1.07 acres to the state's ramp, the south end of the airport could be connected, which is currently cut off. Right now, only the north half of the airport is accessible from the main state ramp, and I just don't understand why this hasn't been addressed.</p> <p>I did make it an option, which is a step forward. However, part of it is marked with yellow hashes, indicating it's a priority purchase, and I think this is important because it could make a significant difference, like reducing a thousand feet of restricted taxiway. I had recommended multiple times that this be placed on the priority purchase list, not just as a "someday" possibility. It may seem small, but it's a significant</p>	<p><b>David Miller, CWE:</b> The basic change regarding the circulation road is that the proposal presented in PAC meetings 7 and 8 to add a vehicle service road on the airport was removed from the preferred alternative. The connections between the existing off-airport circulation road and the airport remain unchanged in the preferred alternative. The modification involves adjusting the alternative to create connections to the existing off-airport roads.</p> <p><b>Tony Beach, ODAV:</b> The way that the preferred alternative shows potential for property acquisition on all of the property and aeronautical use. We believe that it currently reflects the comments about acquiring the property that I believe you're commenting on.</p> <p><b>David Miller, CWE:</b> The identification of the property in light yellow on the various alternatives which has been identified as reserve, doesn't preclude a more timely acquisition. If the owner of the property approaches ODAV proposing that ODAV acquire it for a specific purpose, there's nothing about reserve designation that would prevent that. I think identifying it is a good example of why identifying aeronautical use lands in the reserve</p>

			<p>improvement for runway access and aircraft flow.</p> <p>I agree that a full-length parallel taxiway would be ideal, but due to space constraints, it's impossible. This compromise would cost far less and is much more achievable in the near future.</p> <p>I also agree with the need to address the septic systems as efficiently and cost-effectively as possible, and I appreciate the steps taken in the refined preferred alternative. It's a significant improvement that avoids removing all the hangars, which is great progress.</p> <p>We need to remember that we are not aiming to be like PDX. It's important to make safety improvements while keeping our operations reasonable and manageable. The goal is to ensure safety without unnecessary growth, focusing on making the airport safer for current aircraft operations, which have been happening since 1976. There's no intent to drastically change or grow, just to improve what we have.</p>	<p>sense is good because it leaves options available and that is part of that evaluation.</p>
<p>9.5</p>	<p><b>Tony Helbling</b></p>	<p><i>Aurora Airport Improvement Association</i></p>	<p>Tony, you mentioned earlier, and I do agree with you, that we do need to bring the RSA into conformity. I don't disagree with that. I think we've suggested two ways to do it. One is the email, and one is the Geotech system that we've suggested. What I've heard you say is that "we" looked at the proposed alternative for the Geotech fabric and decided that it was unacceptable.</p>	<p><b>Tony Beach, ODAV:</b> We've reviewed the information submitted about the drain field, but we haven't received sufficient responses to our questions to feel confident that the proposed improvements will meet standards. We've had many discussions on the issue, and our consultants and engineers, along with the FAA, have agreed that the drain fields need to be removed from the runway safety area.</p> <p><b>Brandy Steffen, JLA:</b> It sounds like there's some clarification needed, and we'll circle back and get you an answer. The details you're asking about might be available in the materials posted on the project website.</p> <p><b>David Miller, CWE:</b> Aurora State Airport is owned and managed by ODAV, a Department of the State of Oregon. Decisions and determinations made regarding the</p>

			<p>For the record, I need you to define who “we” are and what their qualifications were to make that determination.</p> <p>I understand your position, but I’m asking who made the decision to reject the geotextile fabric solution. We submitted the report recently, and we haven’t received any questions from ODAV. I’d like to know who made the subjective decision about the fabric’s acceptability, because I’m not hearing who exactly determined it was unacceptable.</p>	<p>Airport are made by the Agency. The individuals with specific management responsibilities, including the Director and agency managers, represent the decisions made on behalf of the agency. These individuals are also tasked with coordination with the ODAV board.</p> <p><b>Tony Beach, ODAV:</b> I just wanted to make sure we’re clear about the drain field topic. The information on the drain field improvements and the GeoWeb technical overview is available on the public project website, specifically under PAC meeting number eight. This includes the attachments and email correspondence regarding the issues, including where the conversation left off in February 2022 with the lessee and their engineer, as well as discussions between ODAV staff and Century West engineers.</p> <p>I also want to point out that the correspondence details the questions that were asked and not answered, so it’s clear we have been actively seeking answers, but some were still left unresolved.</p>
<p>9.6</p>	<p><b>Patrick Donaldson</b></p>	<p><i>Wilsonville Chamber of Commerce</i></p>	<p>Since the beginning, we’ve been under the impression that the airport master plan would include an assessment of the economic impacts, including the displacement of businesses and employees, whether temporarily or permanently. This would be in line with the financial and economic considerations mentioned in the original documents. Despite our repeated requests and a letter sent on January 21st, we haven’t seen this analysis. We’ve been told these discussions would happen, but they haven’t, and we haven’t been included in any talks about it.</p> <p>Because of this, the Wilsonville Area Chamber of Commerce cannot endorse the final report in its current form, as it lacks credible analysis on the economic impact to our regional businesses and communities.</p>	<p><b>David Miller, CWE:</b> Economic impact analysis is not typically included in FAA master plan scopes of work, and it wasn’t part of our FAA-approved scope for this project. As for the impact of things like the Hubbard highway shift, we’ve evaluated property acquisition at a conceptual level, which is appropriate for a master plan. The more detailed analysis, such as environmental evaluations and right-of-way assessments, will happen during the ODOT highway design process. The master plan simply outlines a path forward to meet FAA standards, but the specifics of design adjustments are yet to be determined.</p> <p>Regarding the drain field, until an alternative location is identified, we can’t fully evaluate or quantify the potential impacts on tenants or users. If the drain field is relocated off ODAV property, it’s difficult to assess</p>

			<p>I feel like this is a simple question: why haven't we received an economic impact analysis? We were promised it would happen, but it hasn't. I'm concerned that something isn't as transparent as it should be, and as we were promised, and that this process is repeating the mistakes of previous efforts, where too many questions went unanswered. So, I just want to know: will we receive that analysis or not?</p> <p>Just to clarify, I believe you're saying that the details and impacts will be forthcoming, but we're not at a point where we can identify them yet. I understand that, but I want to confirm: if we get to the end of this process and those impacts and costs haven't been addressed, would that be a misrepresentation of what was initially communicated in the original covenant</p>	<p>any economic impact on adjacent property owners or tenants, and it's not part of the master plan to evaluate this.</p> <p>That being said, for FAA-funded projects, each element is subject to environmental review, which does include some economic impact analysis. Once the concepts are further developed, more detailed analyses will come, but they will be part of the implementation process, not the current phase. So, while we understand the concern, the detailed economic impact analysis will come later.</p> <p>I would say it's not a misrepresentation. In any master plan, there are practical limitations defined by the FAA-approved scope. Economic analysis and business plans typically aren't funded by the FAA as part of the master plan. Does this mean the analysis won't be needed later for project design? No, it just means that the level of analysis required will be determined by decision-makers like the FAA for NEPA assessments or ODOT for highway impacts.</p> <p>The purpose of the master plan is to identify key issues for the future, and many require action in later phases. As for the economic impact analysis, the final alternative did consider business and employee impacts, but not in the level of detail you're asking. It's common for master planning to not have this level of detail upfront, it's something that becomes clearer during the design and implementation phases.</p> <p>Thank you. One last thing is that perhaps you've been involved with environmental assessments or environmental impact statement documents. It's important to point out that when a project that's proposed from a master plan is being implemented, the first stage of implementation might be</p>
--	--	--	---	--

			<p>between this project and the participants, public and panelists?</p> <p>Well, when things become more real, I would respectfully request that we all return back to the original commitment that was made at the process about what is an airport master plan, what was represented and whether or not we have met that test. At this point, I would suggest that the chamber does not believe that covenant has been fulfilled. So, I'll leave it at that.</p>	<p>environmental evaluation. That process is entirely separate from an airport master planning process and the evaluation is specific to the contemplated design for that project. The FAA is not bound by the recommendation of the master plan. They must reach an independent finding that the project will not create significant impacts on communities or areas so that level of analysis is not typically found in the airport master plan. When projects are going forward with the environmental process, the FAA will be involved and we'll cover some of those same issues.</p>
9.7	<b>Bruce Bennett</b> (in the chat)	<i>Positive Aurora Airport Management</i>	<p>It sounds like something very technical is being decided anecdotally, regarding the drain fields?</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment</p>
9.8	<b>Tony Helbling</b> (in the chat)	<i>Aurora Airport Improvement Association</i>	<p>Where in the previous meeting notes are questions from ODAV to anyone regarding of the geo tech fabric information submitted into testimony in the last few months? And why would ODAV only tell us tonight they've not received answers to questions they've asked so they are moving forward with a plan to remove the drain fields?</p>	<p>Comment continued below. See response to Comment 9.9.</p>
9.9	<b>Tony Helbling</b> (in the chat)	<i>Aurora Airport Improvement Association</i>	<p>For the record - I now understand you are referring to questions discussed in 2021. That entire discussion was tabled by Betty Stansbury on phone call with me because she asked for help gathering data for a Century West survey to ALL the airport users. Now using that thread and the unanswered questions that were tabled to make a based decision on a submittal in the last two months... that is a weak argument and I don't accept it. the submitted study needs to be considered in this master plan process.</p>	<p>The documentation submitted has been evaluated and found to be missing pertinent details which have been requested but not received. Until the time when the requested information is provided, ODAV is reserving judgment in order to evaluate a complete proposal.</p>
9.10	<b>Ben Williams</b>	<i>Friends of French Prairie</i>	<p>What is the normal planning horizon for an FAA approved master plan? Once it is reviewed by the FAA and approved, how long does it take to go into effect and become adopted?</p>	<p><b>David Miller, CWE:</b> FAA master plans have a 20-year planning horizon. Since this process has taken longer, the forecast was based on an earlier year. The plan's timeline extends 20 years from the approval of the forecast, placing it into the</p>

			<p>Your last statement was incorrect. The 2012 master plan was never officially adopted, according to the Oregon Court of Appeals. Given the typical 20-year planning horizon for a master plan, why does the capital improvement plan include another master plan listed for funding beyond 2023?</p> <p>Are you saying that, based on your mention of 10 years, you expect all the long-term projects listed in the table to be completed within that timeframe?</p>	<p>early 2040s (e.g., 2021–2041 or 2024–2044).</p> <p>Most airports, especially one the size of Aurora State Airport, typically update their master plans more frequently than every 20 years as conditions and standards change. This new master plan will replace the previous one adopted in 2012.</p> <p>The expectation is that within the next 20 years, another master plan update will be required, likely beyond 10 years. The exact timing depends on priorities and project progress. It is just a reflection of the fact that that an airport like Aurora needs master planning to be done on a fairly regular basis, so funding is allocated accordingly. While the plan covers 20 years, FAA and ODAV will need to set aside funds for updates before then.</p> <p>No, there's no assumption that all long-term projects will be completed within 10 years. Master plans outline a broad list of projects, but due to funding constraints and implementation challenges, many long-term projects often get pushed beyond the 20-year horizon. This is common in airport planning, as priorities shift and funding availability affects timelines. The current master plan identifies projects based on forecasted demand and updated standards, but when the next update happens will depend on evolving conditions and coordination with the FAA.</p>
9.11	<b>Brian Asher</b>	<i>Mayor, City of Aurora</i>	Thanks for all the work over the 4 years.	Thank you for your participation in the PAC.
9.12	<b>Ted Millar</b>	<i>AABC/TLM Holdings</i>	<p>It's my understanding that ODAV needs to expand the airport boundary on the ALP to include improvements like Keil Road. However, I don't see the airport use boundary shown on the new master plan.</p> <p>Does the boundary for through-the-fence access and future purchases</p>	<p><b>David Miller, CWE:</b> The FAA requires the airport layout plan (ALP) to show the existing airport property line based on ownership, not use. ODAV's grant obligations extend to this boundary. When property acquisitions are planned, a future airport property line is also shown, as</p>

			<p>include the entire area between the roadway boundary and the newly indicated acquisition areas? It's my understanding that those have to be included in the airport boundary to be able to be eligible. Is that correct?</p> <p>All buildings on the airport, which are under private ownership through the "through the fence" agreement, are not shown within the airport use boundary. These areas should be included in the airport use boundary, as they make up 56% of the airport land and are essential for airport operations, even though they are privately owned.</p> <p>To be able to purchase areas like the Keil Road and aeronautical reserve in the future, they must be shown within the airport use boundary on the master plan to meet the requirements and avoid legal issues.</p> <p>It should be more clearly labeled to reflect future airport boundaries or airport use. Showing it as potential acquisition is insufficient without clearly identifying it as part of the airport boundary for eligibility.</p>	<p>seen in the yellow areas. The aeronautical use areas to the east are noted in the drawing and data sheet, but the FAA prioritizes the official property line.</p> <p>The future property acquisitions will be identified in a reserve capacity but not as part of the current airport boundary. These acquisitions depend on willing sellers and do not require identifying specific parcels in advance. The plan acknowledges these areas as potential future acquisitions.</p> <p>The area (on the ALP) is marked by a magenta line. This line borders the parcels in question, and a note on the plan acknowledges that these parcels are captured within the airport layout plan, meeting the necessary requirements.</p> <p><b>Tony Beach, ODAV:</b> The airport boundary Ted is referring to is a state-level distinction, which is not the same as what is shown on the federally prescribed airport layout plan. The magenta line on the plan indicates areas for potential property acquisition.</p> <p><b>David Miller, CWE:</b> The magenta line and the notes on the plan indicate the areas as reserves that meet the FAA's requirements for acquisition in cases where there's a willing seller. ODAV is covered with the current depiction of these boundaries, including developed and undeveloped areas as part of the plan's provisions.</p>
<p>9.13</p>	<p><b>Tony Helbling</b></p>	<p><i>Aurora Airport Improvement Association</i></p>	<p>The CIP is not showing a runway extension until 2030, correct?</p>	<p><b>David Miller, CWE:</b> The runway extension project is expected to start around 2030 or later, as there are several factors at play. Right now, the priority is rehabilitating the existing runway, which the FAA will fund for maintenance but not upgrades. The current runway will be maintained and its strength will be preserved, but no extension will happen at this stage. The FAA's expectation is that the non-standard conditions for the current runway will</p>

			<p>I don't appreciate how ODAV has controlled this process. It is not collaborative.</p> <p>I'm concerned that the Environmental Assessment might not start until 2030, and with potential opposition and lawsuits, it could push things out to 2035 or even later. This is a safety issue that needs to be addressed sooner. Also, I want to clarify something about the drain field easements and issues. The questions Tony Beach mentioned were tabled back in 2021 before this master plan even began. Those questions weren't relevant to this plan or the recent submission. Betty Stansbury asked me, as chair of HDSE, to table the discussion on geotextile fabric, and I agreed. At the time, Century West was managing separate septic work, not even involving James Kirby or Dave Miller's group. It was the Spokane group. They sent out a survey to assess how much effluent the airport was producing, but no one responded. I worked with Betty to gather that data for Century West. There was a discussion about porting all the effluent from the airport and the drain field going away, but it eventually disappeared. Now, to claim that those old technical questions are the reason we're not considering the geotextile fabric in the master plan doesn't make sense. Betty, the previous Director at ODAV, tabled those questions. It's absurd to say that's the reason for not considering it</p>	<p>be corrected before a project is considered for extension. The implementation phase is in itself complicated.</p> <p>Tim House at the FAA has stated that they're looking for a plan with clear targets and understand that it will be a multi-step process taking many years. If progress is made toward meeting standards, it could affect the timing for the runway extension. There's a lot of work to be done before the FAA would seriously consider funding an extension.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

			and not even define who made that decision. This master plan is being pushed through without addressing the drain field issue properly. I won't just sit back and let this go through without ensuring it's on the record that it's unjustified and unconscionable.	
9.14	<b>Tony Helbling</b> (in the chat)	<i>Aurora Airport Improvement Association</i>	Identifying land use needs including adjacent property is an FAA requirement!  That was not my entire question!!! unmute me please.	Airport land use and surrounding property land use was identified in Chapter 2 and evaluated in Chapter 4. The existing and future land use of the airport and surrounding area will also be depicted on the Land Use Plan sheet of the ALP.
9.15	<b>Austin Barnes</b>	<i>Marion County Planning Dept. Planning Organization</i>	Nothing to add.	Thank you for your participation in the PAC.
9.16	<b>Bill Graupp</b>	<i>Aurora CTE, Inc.</i>	None.	Thank you for your participation in the PAC.
9.17	<b>Brian Asher</b>	<i>Mayor, City of Aurora</i>	What percentage of these projects have been adjusted for inflation?	<b>David Miller, CWE:</b> Yes, the engineering cost estimates for the capital improvement program (CIP) were based on 2024 dollars. The common method for accounting for inflation in airport master plans is to use these 2024 dollars as a starting point. Airport management can then adjust the costs based on the change in the Consumer Price Index (CPI) when projects are planned in future years, whether that's 3, 10, or 15 years down the road. We can't precisely predict future inflation, so a base year (2024) CPI value allows costs to be adjusted in the future.  The general expectation is that 2024-based costs will increase over time. As projects are implemented in the future, the (future) CPI will reflect these adjustments. It is reasonable to assume that over the next seven to ten years, and beyond, inflation will continue to push cost increases.
9.18	<b>Cathryn Stephens</b>	<i>ODAV Board</i>	I am the Oregon Aviation Board liaison. We've been having updates on a regular basis at our board	Thank you for your participation in the PAC.

			meetings and look forward to having additional updates as this process moves forward. Thanks to everyone.	
9.19	<b>Councilor Anne Shevlin</b>	<i>City of Wilsonville</i>	<p>As a newly elected counselor for the city of Wilsonville, I'm honored to serve in this position. I wanted to express that the city is disappointed with the outcome of a four-year process that recommended spending \$185 million for a runway extension, which could increase to \$200-220 million. This includes the condemnation of private properties, relocation of State Highway 550, and improvements aimed at making the airport safer, but ultimately benefiting only a small number of interests while negatively impacting the surrounding communities.</p> <p>The process overlooked key issues, including municipal governance concerns, surface water and groundwater contamination, inadequate wastewater treatment, DEQ violations, FAA standards, stormwater pollution affecting endangered fish, toxic chemical pollution, and PFAS accumulation. Additionally, there were no studies on firefighting capacity or noise complaints from residents about low-flying aircraft.</p> <p>As we move into the next phase of this process, I want to thank the FAA for their participation and express that the city will continue to monitor the situation to ensure safety improvements and airport operations are addressed appropriately.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments and participation in the PAC.</p> <p>Many of the concerns that you site are evaluated as part of the federal NEPA environmental process that precedes individual federally funded projects. However, they are outside the scope of this airport master plan.</p>
9.20	<b>Dave Mauk</b>	<i>Charbonneau Country Club</i>	<p>Thanks to Councilor Shevlin for her comments that she just made. How many acres does ODAV control now at the airport? How many acres are they conceivably going to control at the airport using the dotted lines that Ted Millar was walked through?</p>	<p><b>David Miller, CWE:</b> The preliminary breakouts of property had identified approximate acreages, which will be shown on the draft airport layout plan.</p> <p><b>Tony Beach, ODAV:</b> The existing property acreage and the future acquisition details can be found in the inventory chapter and the preferred alternative, which is number four.</p> <p>I was looking through the refined preferred alternative and found on</p>

				<p>page 19 out of 30 in tonight's presentation that it shows 25 acres for priority property acquisition and 153 acres in property acquisition reserves. I just wanted to close the loop on that.</p> <p><b>Tony Beach, ODAV</b> (in the chat): The state has 140 acres at the Aurora State Airport, as explained on page 2-4 of Draft Working Paper 1.</p>
9.21	<b>David Waggoner</b>	<i>Willamette Aviation</i>	<p>While the Aurora Airport is a major economic driver for the surrounding areas, including Wilsonville, Canby, and Aurora, its impact is undeniable. However, despite this, I find it completely unacceptable that we would even consider taking private property from owners and businesses on the west side of Hubbard Cutoff Highway. I believe we need to explore alternative options to avoid this.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments and participation in the PAC.</p> <p>As has been stated throughout the planning process. FAA has been consistent and clear in their guidance that there must be a plan to bring the ROFA and RSA up to FAA standards before any further runway improvements will be eligible for federal funding assistance. The alternatives evaluated options to bring the ROFA into standards, which all options had an impact to an adjacent property. Through the alternatives evaluation and the input provided by the PAC and public, ODAV has selected the option that was least impactful.</p>
9.22	<b>Jamie Stickel</b>	<i>City of Canby</i>	<p>Thanks for your presentation, David. I know there's a lot of information, and I appreciate how clearly you laid it all out. My question is, you mentioned that the percentage eligible for FAA funding could be up to 90%, depending on the project. I just want to clarify, is the local match through ODAV, or who would be responsible for that match?</p> <p>My second point is more of a comment. I understand there have been requests to hold these meetings in person, but since that's not possible, I think it would help if the ODAV representatives kept their cameras on and felt more engaged in the meeting. It might help bridge the gap between the PAC and ODAV, rather than just jumping in with an answer and then turning their video off.</p>	<p><b>David Miller, CWE:</b> That would be the owner of the airport, in this case ODAV. The local match doesn't always have to come from just one source. Depending on the project, other funds could contribute, such as tenant-related improvements. Some airports are run by cities or towns, while others are owned by counties. In those cases, the local match could come from local governments or the State Department of Aviation. And in terms of the percentage, 90% is typically what we see for FAA funding.</p>

9.23	<b>Jon Bickford</b>	<i>Atlantic Aviation</i>	No answer.	Thank you for your participation in the PAC.
9.24	<b>Melissa Ahrens</b>	<i>Oregon Dept of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD)</i>	No questions or comments, thank you.	Thank you for your participation in the PAC.
9.25	<b>Naomi Zwerdling</b>	<i>ODOT</i>	I also have no comments, thank you.	Thank you for your participation in the PAC.
9.26	<b>Pam Barlow Lind</b>	<i>Confederated Tribes of the Siletz Indians</i>	No comments, thank you.	Thank you for your participation in the PAC.
9.27	<b>Patrick Donaldson</b>	<i>Wilsonville Chamber of Commerce</i>	<p>Looking at the chart for the capital improvement plan, I see both short-term projects for the next four to five years and long-term projects for 30 years or more. I've already commented on the economic displacement this will cause in people's lives, homes, businesses, and communities. This will happen over an extended period, not overnight. Economists can quickly calculate the impact, so it's not difficult to determine.</p> <p>Also, I noticed in the second chart about long-term projects, there's an estimate of \$1 million for the next airport master plan. I remember from our first meeting that the cost for the contract between the FAA, ODAV, and the consultants was around \$900,000, but I've heard that those costs have gone up. My question is, how much has been spent on this project so far, beyond the original estimate? And does the \$1 million estimate on the chart now seem too low?</p> <p>Finally, I want to echo a quote I've heard before, "What FAA has joined together, let no person put asunder." It's interesting that although there were differences of opinion at the start of this process, ODAV has brought all these opposing forces together towards a common conclusion. Unfortunately, it feels like this project is heading off course. I'm really</p>	<p><b>Tony Beach, ODAV:</b> I don't have the exact total amount for the grant, but it was discussed in previous meetings. What I can say is that we've definitely gone over both the time and the budget for this project. This is because we wanted to have such a thorough discussion, which included additional meetings beyond what was initially planned for the project. The goal was always to make sure we had a robust discussion.</p> <p><b>Kenji Sugahara, ODAV:</b> A lot of the money that was spent beyond the original budget was to gather additional public comment and get more information to make sure we had a more robust discussion. I just want to clarify that this was all to enhance public involvement.</p>

			disappointed that we've invested so much time, effort, and money into it, and I agree with the concerns raised by others. There's still an opportunity to get this back on track.	
9.28	<b>Whitney Stewart</b>	<i>Oregon Office of Emergency Management</i>	For the CIP and Master Plan, was there any consideration given to seismic improvements or general resiliency of the airport, particularly in terms of emergency preparedness? I was wondering if that was included in any of these potential plans.	<b>David Miller, CWE:</b> I'd say that when any engineering analysis is done for reconstruction, whether it's a runway, taxiway, or any other facility, resiliency is certainly considered. However, at this stage, I don't think specific seismic upgrades were included, though I could be wrong. As a project unfolds over the next 5, 10, or 15 years, the regulatory requirements and design standards may change, and whatever is applicable and appropriate at that time will likely be included in the effort.
9.29	<b>Aron Faegre</b>	<i>Helicopter Transport Service; AABC/TLM Holdings</i>	<p>I wanted to clarify that both drain fields being discussed here have DEQ licenses and are regularly inspected. There are no violations, and they are fully functional. During a major earthquake, urban sewer systems are expected to be down for about a year. Aurora is an important airport with capabilities recognized by agencies like DOGAMI and it plays a key role in disaster response, like in California fires, where it's needed for aviation operations. Many of the helicopters fighting these fires come from Aurora. Additionally, I want to clarify that there are no violations at these drain fields.</p> <p>To clarify a previous point, some questions weren't answered because the previous director put it on hold, and I had suggested bringing in the two Geotechs for their expertise. They would likely agree, as they share staff between their companies, GRI and NV5.</p> <p>I hope this issue stays alive for further discussion, as I believe there are good solutions using modern technology. I'm also disappointed that the EMAS system, which works at other airports, was dismissed without much explanation. It would allow us to keep the drain fields in place. Lastly, the modification of standards seems to go</p>	Thank you for your comments.

			<p>against national advisory circulars, and I hope Oregon is not being singled out for some reason. I just want to ensure that what works for other airports can be applied here as well. Thank you.</p>	
9.30	<b>Ben Williams</b>	<i>Friends of French Prairie</i>	<p>I noticed there are two empty signature blocks at the bottom of the ALP. To follow up on my earlier comment about the Court of Appeals ruling the 2012 master plan invalid because it wasn't properly adopted and approved by the aviation board, the ALP that went with that plan was signed by Mitch Weipert, the then Director of the aviation department. However, the department couldn't provide documentation showing that the aviation board delegated authority to Mitch Swecker to sign the ALP on their behalf before submitting it to the FAA.</p> <p>Also, the project timeline shows the final document being delivered after FAA review in May. What's the plan for approval and adoption by the aviation board after that? Specifically, who will sign the ALP on behalf of Oregon? I understand there's a section on next steps, but I want to make sure these questions are addressed.</p>	<p>The remaining steps in the airport master plan process were outlined in the presentation available on the project website. Those steps are also listed below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prepare the Draft Final Report</li> <li>• Submit Draft ALP to FAA for Obstruction Evaluation/Airport Airspace Analysis (OE/AAA) review &amp; post on project website for public information</li> <li>• Submit Draft Final Report to FAA for review &amp; post on project website for public information</li> <li>• Once ALP &amp; report are reviewed and approved, FAA and ODAV will sign ALP</li> <li>• Project Closeout with FAA</li> <li>• ODAV Board Adoption Process</li> </ul>
9.31	<b>Bruce Bennett</b>	<i>Positive Aurora Airport Management</i>	<p>There's a huge problem right next to a possible huge solution. The runway lengthening is needed for safety, especially for our neighbors, and it's been part of the plan since 1976. Originally, it was 1,000 feet, but now it's been reduced to 500 feet; still a significant compromise, but an improvement. This should be the top priority, and for it not to be included in the capital improvement plan is criminal. We've discussed safe, approved ways to avoid disrupting the neighbors and spending excessive money, such as moving the road, which is more economical.</p> <p>The airport will only ever be developed on one side due to that highway, so moving the road and taking that property isn't necessary. Getting the runway lengthening and</p>	<p>FAA has consistently stated that before runway improvements would be eligible for funding, the non-standard ROFA and RSA must be addressed. The proposed CIP prioritizes projects that will mitigate those nonstandard conditions. Timing of runway improvements will be based on the timing for completion of the nonstandard conditions.</p>

			the ASAP done in the next few years is imperative.	
9.32	<b>Ted Millar</b>	<i>AABC/TLM Holdings</i>	<p>I have two questions. First, is it possible to add the internal circulation road on private property that was shown in the 2012 master plan and has been submitted multiple times for this plan? It's not about who pays for it, but I believe there are ways to fund it that minimize the expense for ODAV or the FAA. It's a safety issue because this isn't like Portland International—this is a collaborative, commercial service airport where different entities need to work together without having to go out onto the highway.</p> <p>Second, I understand that ODAV needs to expand the airport boundary to include the Keil Road area and the entire aeronautical reserve. Just marking it as a future boundary isn't enough, and I'd like to see that addressed. If we don't have time tonight, I'd like to request one additional PAC work session so we can discuss these solutions collaboratively. I believe we're not that far apart, and we can find a win-win solution if we just sit down and talk through the options.</p>	<p><b>Tony Beach, ODAV:</b> In our last meeting on December 10th, we discussed the vehicle service road and clarified some points. We asked the PAC for clarification regarding the internal circulation road after receiving a lot of feedback against the vehicle service road due to its impact on the existing hangars. We also explained that, as David mentioned, we can't show off-airport improvements like those that ODAV would undertake without property acquisition. Right now, what we're showing is the potential for property acquisition, which could allow us to proceed with something like the proposed internal circulation road if there's a willing seller. We believe this approach can work.</p>
9.33	<b>Tony Helbling</b>	<i>Aurora Airport Improvement Association</i>	<p>I have a different opinion on the airport boundary issue. My understanding is that the FAA won't provide funding for anything outside the defined airport boundary. This creates a catch-22. The FAA won't fund it unless it's within the airport boundary, but you don't want to include it because you don't own the property yet. I disagree with this approach, especially considering the potential for internal circulation roads that could save a lot of money. It doesn't make sense to me.</p> <p>Regarding the airport boundary, as Ben Williams pointed out, the state treats the ALP as a land use document. What we do now impacts future land use laws in Oregon. It doesn't make sense why the state wouldn't include properties you plan to purchase as part of the airport boundary. This would ensure you own</p>	<p><b>Tony Beach, ODAV:</b> I think there's a bit of a misunderstanding here. The airport layout plan is showing both the current airport property and the future property acquisition, as required by FAA standards. What I believe you're referring to is a different issue. We're showing the current property line and the future line for property acquisition to meet FAA requirements. So, I think we're talking about two different things—current and future property configurations over the 20-year planning period.</p>

		<p>everything you consider part of the airport, and I don't understand why that's being avoided.</p> <p>The challenge we're facing is that this process feels less collaborative, as we're being presented with the airport layout plan for the first time and then expected to defend it. We can't see the details properly, especially when it's on small screens. You're asking us to comment on something we can't fully digest or understand, and it's frustrating. I also want to point out the yellow area on the east side of the current Ehlman Road. Where is the state airport boundary depicted there? We need to be able to see the full layout, not just presented at the last minute during a Zoom meeting and posted online during the meeting. It's hard to make informed comments when we don't have time to fully review the plan. Even Ben Williams agrees with me.</p> <p>What's frustrating is that we've talked about this several times, and this is the third meeting in a row where the materials aren't presented to us beforehand. Instead, we see them during the meeting and are then asked to give feedback right after. In previous master plans, we had the chance to study things beforehand and work with our teams to form meaningful discussion. This current discussion isn't meaningful because we haven't had time to review the material. Also, I don't understand the difference between the future Keil Road line and the aeronautical reserve near Airport Road, as both need to be acquired, and we want the FAA to fund them. From what I've heard, if it's not in the airport boundary, the FAA won't pay for it.</p> <p>Can somebody show me on the ALP that is sitting on the computer in front of me right now, the difference between the line that is going to run on the future Keil Road and the aeronautical reserve line.</p> <p>If we had received this beforehand, we could have plotted it out on a large</p>	<p><b>Brandy Steffen, JLA:</b> I understand your concerns, Tony. That's why we decided to keep the comments open until the 25th, to give everyone more time to review. I hear you that the layout plan wasn't presented beforehand, and we tried to post it during the meeting so you could access it as quickly as possible and take a look.</p> <p><b>Tony Beach, ODAV:</b> To clarify, this airport layout plan is a technical drawing that we submit to the FAA for their review and approval to ensure it meets their standards. It's based on the refined preferred alternative we've been sharing with the PAC since June 2024, including updates in July, October, and January. The FAA reviews this plan to verify that the airport meets all necessary standards, and all the overlays and information included reflect the details we've shared with the PAC over the last six months.</p> <p><b>David Miller, CWE:</b> The resolution of this large image makes it difficult to distinguish details clearly. We have multiple lines competing for space, such as the realigned access road, which is positioned along the future property line. To clarify, the acquisition is necessary to move that</p>
--	--	--	---

			<p>piece of paper, understood it better, and made more effective recommendations or decisions. My question for David is, why wouldn't we extend the airport boundary from the yellow area to the east all the way to Airport Road and down to Arndt Road, including all of that in the airport boundary? Why wouldn't we do that?</p>	<p>section of Keil Road out of the object-free area. The property line would run along the outer perimeter of the realigned road. A full-size plot or enlarged view would make this clearer.</p> <p>The distinction here is that the priority property acquisition, shown in yellow, is necessary to meet FAA design standards. The other property identified as reserve isn't. If ODAV were to consider acquiring the entire magenta area, there would likely be significant pushback. Some PAC members even debated whether the reserve property should be included at all. The priority is to acquire property needed to meet FAA standards, while other potential acquisitions, like adjacent properties or pieces of land, are not necessary for those standards but could be pursued if they become available. This process allows for the possibility of FAA funding, though it's not guaranteed. Additionally, updates to the airport layout plan can be made between master plan cycles, allowing for adjustments as opportunities arise, such as if an individual hangar owner wanted to sell.</p> <p><b>Tony Beach, ODAV:</b> David, you've touched on it, and we've discussed this in earlier PAC meetings and in the first couple of chapters. ODAV is the airport sponsor for Aurora State Airport, which has federal grant assurances for airport operation and master planning. Having an up-to-date airport layout plan is a key part of those requirements. This master plan is focused on the state facility at Aurora State Airport, and while we don't control changes outside state property, the layout plan reflects the current and future configurations for that state facility. That's why it's presented this way.</p>
<p>9.34</p>	<p><b>Ben Williams</b></p>	<p><i>Friends of French Prairie</i></p>	<p>The resolution on the screen version of the ALP is so bad, even when you zoom in, you can't read the fine print. (Response to Tony Helbling) Absolutely. We're all in the same boat</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment.</p>

			now. Everybody hates the master plan.	
9.35	<b>Brian Asher</b>	<i>Mayor, City of Aurora</i>	I will be leaving the meeting for our council meeting	Thanks for your participation in the PAC.
9.36	<b>Tony Helbling</b>	<i>Aurora Airport Improvement Association</i>	Please let the record show the presentation was not made available on the web site till 6:32... 1.5 hours into the PAC meeting!!!!	Thank you for your comment.
9.37	<b>Patrick Donaldson</b> (in the chat)	<i>Wilsonville Chamber of Commerce</i>	Thank you and Senator Johnson for focused and articulate comments. As Gregg Clapper used to say, “Shine a little light on them and see how they scamper.”	Thank you for your comment.
9.38	<b>Tony Helbling</b>	<i>Aurora Airport Improvement Association</i>	<p>I see a conflict here. What I hear from the consultants and ODAV is that the area outside the state property line is not the airport boundary.</p> <p>But in previous chapters, we’ve based aircraft there. George Van Hoomisson pointed out that we’re excluding hangars where those aircraft are actually parked.</p> <p>So how do we justify calling them based aircraft at Aurora when they aren’t sitting on state property?</p> <p>I know the answer you’re going to give me, but my point is: Aurora is a through-the-fence airport. We need a collaborative effort that includes those properties in the airport boundary.</p> <p>I get what a master plan is, but there’s a breakdown—we’re counting aircraft for runway justification and safety, but then saying we can’t count the hangars where those based aircraft sit.</p> <p>How can they be based at the airport if you’re telling me they’re not at the airport?</p> <p>Also, David keeps referring back to nine meetings ago, but we submitted significant information two meetings ago. Tony mentioned it in the record, but it seems like consideration was already given to this issue before the master plan even started.</p> <p>The timeline doesn’t match in my head. The drain field technical questions; our submission from two</p>	<p>This question was answered in the meeting. Please see response to comment 9.40 below.</p> <p>It appears that you are referring to the runway length justification. Runway length is justified using documented operations counts by all aircraft that use the runway. Based aircraft counts are not considered in justifying runway length, nor in determining other airside requirements.</p> <p>Previously addressed. Please see comment 9.9 and response.</p>

			<p>months ago, was essentially dismissed because of questions that were unanswered before this master plan began.</p> <p>That doesn't make logical sense, and I want that on the record. I don't expect an answer to either one.</p>	
9.39	Ted Millar	AABC/TLM Holdings	<p>Is there any reason we couldn't include all of the through-the-fence property since the legislature has designated this as a through-the-fence airport?</p> <p>This is a cluster of airport businesses, which is completely different from a Portland International-type airport.</p> <p>Why can't all the through-the-fence properties be designated as part of the airport, even if they aren't owned by ODAV?</p>	<p><b>David Miller, CWE:</b> In general, the FAA wants to see access points for through-the-fence development on the ALP. They don't expect details or dimensional standards for those properties since they aren't subject to FAA rules or eligible for FAA funding.</p> <p>One thing to be added to the ALP is the location of through-the-fence areas according to the agreements tenants have with ODAV. This will identify those locations, including common access points used by multiple property owners.</p> <p>Regarding the counting of based aircraft off airport property, the FAA allowed this for a time but typically does not count those aircraft, making an exception for the significant number of aircraft based off ODAV property.</p>
9.40	Tony Helbling	Aurora Airport Improvement Association	<p>I appreciate the chance to speak. The point I'm making is that we're a unique airport because we're through the fence. The FAA's decision to count based aircraft from through the fence properties shows they recognize those properties as important to the airport. This goes back to Ted's question—if the FAA considers those aircraft as based at the airport, why can't we just extend the airport boundary to include the through the fence properties? You've basically answered that question already.</p> <p>The point I'm making is that if this process were truly collaborative, we could all work together, you (David), Tim, Ben, and everyone else, to figure this out. Instead, we're presented with a document only after the meeting starts, and then we're expected to review it on a screen. If we had discussions like this earlier, we could propose potential solutions to the FAA</p>	<p><b>David Miller, CWE:</b> I want to clarify that while the FAA allowed the inclusion of through-the-fence aircraft in our base aircraft count, this did not change the scope of the master plan. The plan was always intended to be a facility plan for ODAV-owned property, and while the FAA recognized the importance of those aircraft, they made it clear there would be no facility planning for those through-the-fence properties. We've adhered to that. However, the master plan will include detailed descriptions and notations about these areas, and their significance and limitations according to FAA rules will be clearer when you review the final report.</p> <p>Note: FAA sent an email dated 12/9/2021 to ODAV stating "An aircraft that is stored off airport property but has access to the airfield via a through-the-fence (TTF)</p>

			<p>together. The cost of this project is significant: \$99 million compared to the \$18 million from the 2012 AOP with a smaller runway extension. Given ODAV's current funding, I don't see how they can match the required \$10 million to even get this project started.</p>	<p><i>agreement is not considered "based" on the airport. However, the operations (takeoffs and landings) by these aircraft are included in the airport operations counts."</i></p>
9.41	<b>Ted Millar</b>	<i>AABC/TLM Holdings</i>	<p>I just want to add that part of the through the fence agreement is that all the private enterprise airplanes and hangars pay a monthly fee per airplane to comply with FAA requirements. Additionally, we have a public-private partnership where the entire airport, including private and state property, is fenced, and the private property owners have paid their fair share. This arrangement has been in place for 25 years and goes beyond just FAA funding, as it includes the monthly fees paid by the through the fence airplanes.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment.</p>
9.42	<b>Ben Williams</b>	<i>Friends of French Prairie</i>	<p>I want to point out a key issue from the last slide. Earlier in the meeting, Tony Beach stated that the ALP follows the master plan and is the final facility plan, but now it seems the ALP is being presented ahead of the master plan. This shift is concerning because, according to Oregon Administrative Rule 738-130-0055, the Aviation Board must adopt the final facility plan and ensure compatibility with local comprehensive plans and statewide goals before adopting the ALP. The situation mirrors a previous issue in 2012 where the Court of Appeals found the Department of Aviation at fault for putting the ALP ahead of the master plan, undermining their responsibility to properly adopt and approve both. This is a serious concern that needs to be addressed.</p> <p>Thanks for clarifying that. Is the implication then that the aviation board will approve and adopt both the master plan and the ALP before it's countersigned by Oregon?</p>	<p><b>David Miller, CWE:</b> To clarify, the intention is that the draft final master plan report and the draft airport layout plan set will be submitted to the FAA simultaneously. The report will include the draft airport layout plan as one of its chapters. From our perspective, these two are connected. If adjustments are made to the airport layout plan during the public or FAA review, those will be reflected in the full plan set and carried forward to the master plan. I don't see any disconnect between this process and the requirements for Oregon rules on local coordination.</p> <p>Our approach assumes that we're working with staff who report to the board, and that any clarification on roles will be determined before documents are submitted to the FAA. By that point, there should be no disconnect between staff and the board, the sequence is as we've laid it out.</p>

9.43	<b>Dave Mauk</b>	<i>Charbonneau Country Club</i>	I just want to reiterate the need for consideration, clarification, and enforcement of mitigating overflights in Charbonneau and Wilsonville. If another IFR could be established for takeoffs and landings—or approaches, technically—we would really like that to be considered. This has been our request from day one, but unfortunately, it hasn't been incorporated into the plan. I'd be remiss if I didn't bring it up again and push a little for our community. We've tried to be fair in this process, and we ask for the same in return. Thanks.	<b>Tony Beach, ODAV:</b> Dave, I appreciate your comments and all the correspondence we've had with Charbonneau and other neighboring communities. Airport noise has been a major topic throughout this master plan process, and we look forward to continuing those discussions.
------	------------------	---------------------------------	--	---

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

ID	Name	Question/Comment	Response
9.44	<b>Wendie Kellington</b>	The current draft of the master plan includes "off airport" improvements re Keil Road acquisition area, and the MP designated aeronautical reserve - these are all off airport property and yet are a part of the MP. How is it accurate to say it is a facility plan for the current airport only? It seems more accurate to say that the master plan is a long-term plan for the airport and includes all airport related features and development	The improvements to Keil Road would occur after acquisition of the properties needed to bring the ROFA onto airport property and up to standards. When the necessary property is acquired, it will be brought into the "airport property boundary". Prior to acquisition, identified properties are depicted on the ALP within the "future airport property boundary".
9.45	<b>George</b>	If you consider "the airport" to be only the land area that is owned by ODAV, then what do you call all of the other land area that is not owned by ODAV, but is zoned for airport use and is currently in active aeronautical use (for taxilane, hangars, and ramps), and which is identified as being for aeronautic reserve. Is that other area that is not ODAV owned NOT a part of "the airport"? If so, are you saying that both FBOs and most of the aircraft hangars are NOT located on "the airport"???	<b>David Miller, CWE:</b> Yes, that's correct. As we discussed at the beginning of this process, about nine PAC meetings ago, this master plan is specifically a facility plan for ODAV-owned property.  We recognize that there are aeronautical use facilities adjacent to the airport, and nothing in this plan diminishes that reality. However, projects eligible for funding will be limited to property controlled by ODAV.  This is simply an aspect of the airport layout plan process and the FAA approval process. It doesn't change the fact that the airport's operation is unique and complex due to the adjacent private property.
9.46	<b>Jason Paolo</b>	What considerations were made for current property owners that would lose their homes	<b>David Miller, CWE:</b> This is a preliminary assessment. ODOT has not yet weighed in on their design

<sup>2</sup> Live responses are included, along with additional information/clarification, as needed.  
PAC Meeting #9 Summary

		<p>and/or property as a result of the latest plan preferred by ODAV?</p>	<p>requirements, and it's entirely possible that as the process moves forward, ODOT may change its requirements, potentially lessening the impacts on adjacent properties.</p> <p>We don't know that yet, and we didn't want to presume any outcomes. This is simply an initial look at areas that may be affected.</p> <p>We've approximated the acreage that could be impacted, but until there's a final design, and more importantly, a thorough environmental and design review, this remains a conceptual plan. No specific actions or property owner contacts have been made at this stage.</p> <p><b>Tony Beach, ODAV:</b> The state does have a process for property acquisition and that includes independent appraisals and compensation at a fair market value.</p>
<p>9.47</p>	<p><b>Jason Paolo</b></p>	<p>I find it hard to believe that the FAA and/or ODAV can spend millions of taxpayer dollars without an economic study and impacts to the surrounding public.</p>	<p>Economic and public impact studies are beyond the scope of this airport master plan. Social and environmental impacts of individual projects may be evaluated in the respective environmental processes.</p>
<p>9.48</p>	<p><b>Jason Paolo</b></p>	<p>Why aren't these meetings being held in person?</p>	<p>Virtual (Zoom) meetings were chosen as the platform to hold the PAC meetings as they provide increased accessibility and allow the most people, in the PAC and in the public, to attend and participate in the public process.</p>
<p>9.49</p>	<p><b>Wendie Kellington</b></p>	<p>I agree with Patrick, well said. There are several problems with the current version of the MP. (1) there is no difference between this version and the last in fact because ODAV condemns the hangars just as thoroughly by taking away the septic drain field as condemning the hangars directly. They cannot function. This version is wholly illusory. (2) The state absolutely must pay for the taking of the drain field easement and is responsible to move it to a viable location. It has failed. (3) State is obliged to base its decision on substantial evidence. The assertions that the proposed RSA drain field improvements are not good enough is not supported by substantial evidence. There is no evidence ODAV has considered any of the significant testimony and legal authorities and technical data regarding the proposed RSA</p>	<p>The refined preferred alternative does not condemn any hangars, directly or indirectly. Depicting the removal of the drain fields in the RSA does not mean that the TTF hangars cannot have drain fields. It means that the drain fields cannot be located in the RSA as they are unable support the weight of aircraft and emergency response equipment. Current users of the existing drain fields may consider other sites outside of the RSA (on or off ODAV property) and/or other methods of sewage management.</p>

		improvements to the existing drain field in place. The only evidence in the record is that a G-6 could run over the drain field as it is proposed to be improved. That is hardly inadequate.	
9.50	George VH	Do you do any analysis regarding the “bang for the buck” on potential capital improvements? I would think that it would be in the public interest for ODAV to prioritize the potential improvements that can be accomplished most quickly and most cost-effectively in order to provide safety benefits as soon as possible. Does ODAV agree with that strategy?	Projects listed in the CIP are prioritized by need and order of operations. A “bang for the buck” evaluation was not performed.
9.51	George VH	Are the ALP and other slides in tonight’s presentation on your website? If so, please advise us where they can be found. If not, please post them. Thank you.	The presentation slides are available on the project website.
9.52	George VH	Do you do any analysis regarding the “bang for the buck” on potential capital improvements? I would think that it would be in the public interest for ODAV to prioritize the potential improvements that can be accomplished most quickly and most cost-effectively in order to provide safety benefits as soon as possible. Does ODAV agree with that strategy?	Duplicate comment. See response to Comment 9.50 above.
9.53	George VH	Isn't the current runway length itself a non-standard condition? (It is shorter than required for the current airport designation.). Why does ODAV want to delay addressing the one non-standard condition that is the MOST important to all airport users, until it first addresses every other non-standard condition?	<p><b>David Miller, CWE:</b> The justification for runway length follows FAA methodology, outlined in Chapter 4 of the facility requirements. There’s a difference between a hard standard (like a runway safety area) and a justified runway length.</p> <p>An airport with a shorter-than-justified runway isn’t out of compliance; it just hasn’t achieved the length it could support. Various reasons can account for that.</p> <p>The FAA won’t fund a runway extension until non-standard items identified in the plan are mitigated or addressed. That’s why the sequencing of improvements is structured this way.</p>
9.54	Chris	Why can't these meeting be held in person?	Virtual (Zoom) meetings were chosen as the platform to hold the PAC meetings as they provide increased accessibility and allow the most people, in the PAC and in the public to attend and participate in the public process.

9.55	<b>Wendie Kellington</b>	Brandy, there is more than one person using my computer to participate in this matter. I will speak and then the other person will speak.	Thank you.
9.56	<b>Bruce Bergman</b>	What is the reason to acquire the narrow strip of property at the Wylee area. And how will that affect our drain field?	<b>David Miller, CWE:</b> The small bump out in that area is due to the proposed aircraft holding area being added to the extension of the parallel taxiway at the Runway 17 end. There is currently no holding area at that end, so that accounts for the slight extension beyond the OFA line for the runway.
9.57	<b>Jason Paolo</b>	At what point does the overwhelming opposition to the Aurora airports plans and planning process have any magnitude with the current "planning operatives"?	Thank you for your comment.
9.58	<b>Brett</b>	It seems that open community conversation affecting adjacent property owners has been limited on purpose. Many of the adjacent property owners I've talked to are not even aware that the airport is actively planning and working to implement a plan that directly affects their homes, business, and economic viability. To say you need a plan in place first seems to assume the outcome and forceful acceptance of this land grab.	<p><b>David Miller, CWE:</b> The process used by ODOT for state highway right of way acquisition is driven by a series of formal steps including detailed evaluations of environmental and design factors and impacts on affected property owners. As noted previously, the conceptual road layout depicted on the ALP is intended to demonstrate the ability to meet FAA runway object free area design standards. The planning assumptions used in the airport master plan regarding maintaining the width of the existing ODOT ROW and decisions about the future configuration of lanes, signals and other highway components will be evaluated and determined by ODOT in their design process.</p> <p>As noted earlier, the state does have a process for property acquisition and that includes independent appraisals and compensation at a fair market value.</p>

## Verbal Public Comment

ID	Name	Question/Comment	Response
9.59	<b>Wendie Kellington</b>	<p>I have one more person sharing my computer, but I'll go first.</p> <p>I can't tell you how disappointed I am in this process and this ALP. I don't think ODAV has been honest with participants, and I don't think Century West has either because I believe you</p>	

	<p>know better. So, here's what I think you already know.</p> <p>First, this master plan is no different from the prior version. It still condemns the hangars and businesses, just not directly. Instead, it plans to take the drain field so they can't operate, which is just as much a taking as before. So the idea that we've made progress? No, we haven't.</p> <p>Second, I heard today that we should stop bringing up the drain field issue because the decision is already made. If that's the case, why are we here until 8 p.m. talking about what's supposed to be a public process? This is a state agency making a decision that must be based on substantial evidence, not just ODAV saying, "We think it doesn't meet standards." That's not good enough. There's no actual reason given why the drain field improvements wouldn't meet federal standards. The only evidence in the record says they do meet the standards. ODAV just dismissing that with no justification isn't acceptable.</p> <p>Third, the easement HDOC has for the drain field is a property right. ODAV can't just say, "That's your problem." No, ODAV owes just compensation and severance damages, which could include wiping out all the hangars relying on it. You haven't even considered that. You'd better increase your budget because this is going to be expensive.</p> <p>Next, this idea that ODAV doesn't have to plan for areas outside of its land ownership, or that there's a distinction between the land-use boundary and the federal boundary, just doesn't hold up. ODAV cannot seek or spend federal money on uses not allowed under zoning. That's a grant assurance requirement. Everyone knows it.</p> <p>If ODAV wants to move Keil Road into that EFU-zoned area, you should either increase your litigation budget because you will get sued, or you should expand the state land-use airport boundary. The same goes for the aeronautical reserve—federal money can't be used unless it's zoned correctly. You know this. The legislature gave you a roadmap: expand the land-use boundary. And yes, that has to be reflected in this plan because you are trying to use it for federal funding eligibility.</p> <p>Finally, I want to preserve for the record that I sent a letter objecting to Tony Beach's refusal to allow me to serve as an alternate. Other</p>	<p>Previously addressed. See response to comment 9.49.</p> <p>The existing drain fields in the RSA currently do not meet standards for surface gradient, obstructions, and weight-bearing capacity. The proposal submitted by the users and their consultant has been evaluated and found to be missing pertinent details which have been requested but not received. The master plan identifies the nonstandard condition and needed improvements to meet standards. Coordination on the drain field mitigation will continue beyond the planning process into implementation.</p>
--	---	---

		<p>substitutions have been allowed—like Councilor Shevlin and Aaron Fegri. But when I requested to be an alternate more than a week ago, I was refused—not because it wasn’t allowed, but because my message isn’t preferred. That’s not okay. There are laws against that, and I want my letter included in the record. Thank you.</p>	
<p><b>9.60</b></p>	<p><b>Betsy Johnson</b></p>	<p>I want to thank the department for moving in a more positive direction regarding the hangars and responding to public input. But we shouldn’t have had to fight so hard for that.</p> <p>What’s unbelievably disappointing is that ODAV is still trying to achieve the same outcome, demolishing the hangars by making them unusable, depriving them of their drain fields. And it’s distressing that ODAV refuses to have a real dialogue about how to mitigate this issue.</p> <p>My request is twofold: First, remove the closure of the south-end drain fields from the preferred alternative. Second, engage in meaningful dialogue about mitigation to allow the drain field to remain until an alternative is identified.</p> <p>It’s ludicrous for ODAV to simply declare that the drain field can never comply with FAA standards without exploring real options. One could even suspect a hidden agenda—forcing annexation into the city of Aurora if no alternative for the drain field is found.</p> <p>On the master plan: The failure to plan for expanding the airport boundary and future FAA-funded land acquisition is short-sighted. This is supposed to be a long-term plan, and this oversight completely misses the point.</p> <p>On the runway: The runway must be lengthened for safety. The idea that adding 500 feet will fundamentally change the airport’s character is mythology—misguided and untrue. The plan delays this extension until after 2030, which compromises safety. ODAV should act now to seek and gain approval for this extension as a safety issue.</p> <p>On finances: This master plan will never be built. David Miller’s claim that finances “shouldn’t matter” is silly. I’ve spoken to ODOT management; they cannot and will not pay to</p>	<p>Previously addressed. See response to comments 9.49 and 9.59.</p> <p>The Refined Preferred Alternative and the ALP depict the existing airport property boundary, and the future airport property boundary based on recommended property acquisition, as required by FAA guidance (AC 150/5070-6B, Airport Master Plans, and ARP SOP 2.00, <i>Standard Procedure for FAA Review and Approval of Airport Layout Plans</i>)</p> <p>Previously addressed. See response to comment 9.31.</p> <p>FAA has reviewed the preliminary alternatives, refined preferred alternative, and cost estimates. FAA has not indicated that the proposed</p>

		<p>move the highway. ODAV can't afford much of anything and is already asking the legislature for permission to raise user fees because their financial model is unsustainable.</p> <p>I'll conclude with this: I lobbied to create ODAV. I ran the agency for five years, managing the Aurora Airport and leading a master planning process. I served 21 years in the legislature. I know what an acceptable public process looks like. And ODAV has failed both in policy and process.</p> <p>ODAV should be embarrassed for their lack of transparency, their willingness to shade the truth, and their discriminatory approach to who may speak, how, and when. This process fails to meet Governor Kotek's expectations for high agency performance in service to Oregonians.</p> <p>If ODAV rams through their preferred alternative, and I believe they will, this process will be a case study in how not to do it. It will result in expensive, endless litigation.</p> <p>Finally, I was asked to be included in the PAC as an alternate due to my unique experience as a former airport manager and agency head. Tony Beach flatly refused. He stated on the record that there would be no proxies or substitutions, yet there were substitutions tonight. This further proves ODAV's arbitrary approach to message control and public participation.</p> <p>This is beyond disappointing, for me personally, as someone who helped create this agency.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	<p>improvements are beyond what can be supported by anticipated future funding.</p>
<p>9.61</p>	<p><b>Betsy Johnson</b></p>	<p>Regarding maintenance of the record - My curiosity is that it's been very difficult to follow your recitation of the questions and any answers. We just don't have access to that.</p> <p>I am looking for assurances from Mr. Beach and Mr. Sugahara that this record will be preserved in its entirety and recorded verbatim.</p> <p>The reason I ask is that Mr. Helbling and I went to a Board of Aviation meeting and testified, and our testimony got lost. That is completely unacceptable in a public process.</p> <p>I want to hear from Kenji and Tony that this record will be maintained in full and verbatim.</p> <p>And you can understand my concern, given that our testimony has previously disappeared.</p>	<p><b>Tony Beach, ODAV:</b> I want to be very clear for the record that we did issue a response to the testimony received in our December board meeting.</p> <p>There was a brief technical issue where a few seconds of audio were cut out, but the overwhelming majority, about 13 to 14 minutes of testimony, was captured.</p> <p>When Mr. Helbling and Ms. Johnson informed us about the audio lapse, we were happy to include their written comments to address that.</p>

## Additional Emailed Comments

ID	Date	Name	Question/Comment	Response
9.62	2/10/25	<b>Chris Neamtzu, AICP</b> <i>Community Development Director</i> City of Wilsonville	<p>I am writing to let you know that I have a personal issue that has arisen that is in conflict with the PAC meeting tomorrow evening.</p> <p>As a result, I am unable to attend. If you would please be so kind as to ensure that Councilor Shevlin receives the zoom access link as the alternate, I would appreciate it.</p> <p>Councilor Shevlin can be reached at <a href="mailto:Shevlin@wilsonvilleoregon.gov">Shevlin@wilsonvilleoregon.gov</a>.</p>	<p><b>2/10/25, Brandy Steffen:</b> Thanks for the heads up Chris! Please let Councilor Shevlin know to check their junk folder for the invite from Zoom.</p>
9.63	2/17/25	<b>Bruce Bergman</b> <i>Wylee Hangars Condominium Association</i>	<p>During the last Master Plan meeting, I picked up off the layout plans that a portion of our property is slated for State acquisition. I asked a question during the meeting on why and how it affected our drain field. The quick response was for Taxiway Safety Area, but the drain field question was not answered. So, please explain the reason this property needs to be acquired and the ramifications for our vital drain field.</p> <p>Assuming this is not reversible, when will we receive details on boundaries, value, timing, etc.</p>	<p>The proposed property acquisition depicted adjacent to the Wylee Hangar area is intended to bring all property within the ROFA into the airport property boundary. A small portion of the existing drain field encroaches upon the taxiway safety area (TSA). Drain fields are not allowed within a TSA as they cannot support the weight of an aircraft or emergency equipment. Any area of drain field within the TSA will need to be removed. Further evaluation of the drain field is needed to determine how much drain field infrastructure – if any – encroaches on the TSA.</p> <p>Details regarding boundaries, value, timing and so forth will be discussed outside of the planning process and through implementation of the project.</p>
9.64	2/19/25	<b>Chris Gage</b>	<p>I attended the Feb 11, 2025 meeting. I have to say I was embarrassed for the ODAV team that could not answer simple questions that were asked over and over. The ODAV representatives on the call were defensive and lacked information that was being asked. It is apparent that this being attempted to be pushed through. I am strongly opposed to this "preferred alternate plan" The cost is extremely outrageous, taking EFU land and converting it "airport reserve" is against current county law. The impacts this will have to the congestion of</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments.</p>

			Wilsonville and Boone Bridge will be detrimental to the current congested issue. Be prepared to add many dollars to the budget for litigation expense from many parties.	
--	--	--	--	--