

AURORA STATE AIRPORT



PLANNING ADVISORY COMMITTEE (PAC)

MEETING #4 SUMMARY

Date: Tuesday, March 12, 2024

Time: 5:00-7:00 pm

Location: Zoom Webinar

In Attendance

PAC Members Present

Aron Faegre, *alternate, AABC/TLM Holdings*
Ben Williams, *Friends of French Prairie*
Beth Wytoski, *Regional Solutions*
Bruce Bennett, *Aurora Airport Improvement Association*
Councilor Joann Linville, *City of Wilsonville*
David Waggoner, *Willamette Aviation*
Jeff Baymor, *Charbonneau Country Club*
Ken Ivey, *Aurora Butteville Barlow Community Planning Organization*
Matt Crall, *Oregon Dept of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD)*
Matt Lawyer, *alternate, Marion County*
Melissa Ahrens, *alternate, Oregon Dept of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD)*
Naomi Zwerdling, *Oregon Dept of Transportation*
Patrick Donaldson, *Wilsonville Chamber of Commerce*
Sarah Puls, *Alternate, Oregon Office of Emergency Management*
Tony Helbling, *Positive Aurora Airport Management*

PAC Members Absent

Trent Brownlee, *Atlantic Aviation*
Austin Barnes, *Marion County Planning Dept.*
Ben Clayton, *Life Flight Network*
Bill Graupp, *Aurora CTE, Inc*
Bill Martin, *Oregon Office of Emergency Management*

PAC Members Absent Continued

Cathryn Stephens, *ODAV Board*
Bob Buchanan, *Alternate, Columbia Helicopters*
Brandon Reich, *Alternate, Marion County Planning Dept.*
Brian Asher, *City of Aurora*
Cheryl Pouley, *Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde Community of Oregon*
Commissioner Danielle Bethel, *Marion County*
Commissioner Tootie Smith, *Clackamas County*
Greg Hughes, *Alternate, Vans Aircraft*
Matt Williams, *Deer Creek Estates HOA*
Pam Barlow Lind, *Confederated Tribes of the Siletz Indians*
Raul Suarez, *Aurora Air Traffic Control Reservation of Oregon*
Rian Johnson, *Vans Aircraft*
Rob Roedts, *Columbia Helicopters*
Robert Fournier, *Helicopter Transport Service*
Roger Kaye, *1000 Friends of Oregon*
Ted Millar, *AABC/TLM Holdings*
Wayne Richards, *Alternate, Friends of the French Prairie*

Agency Representatives

Kenji Sugahara, *ODAV*
Alex Thomas, *ODAV*
Tony Beach, *ODAV*
Brandon Pike, *ODAV*

Aurora State Airport Master Plan – Planning Advisory Committee (PAC)

Tim House, *FAA*

Chris Neamtzu

Staff and Consultants

George Van Hoomissen

Matt Rogers, *Century West*

Jeff Lewis

David Miller, *Century West*

Jerry Johnson

Mike Dane, *Century West*

Joseph Scheafer

Samantha Peterson, *Century West*

Kip Morris

Mark Steele, *Century West*

Krista Kroiss

James Kirby, *Century West*

Mark Ottenad

Brandy Steffen, *JLA Public Involvement*

Neal White

Jen Winslow, *JLA Public Involvement*

Pam Lind

Audience / Members of the Public

Peter Shikli

Bill Poehler

Rayna Jenks

Bruce Bergman

Shannon Colebank

Brad Schuster

Overview

The meeting goals were to review the project status, Working Paper #1, Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) approved forecast, and ensure that the Committee members had time to talk and learn about the materials.

The presentation, FAQs, meeting recording and other materials are posted on the website (publicproject.net/AuroraAirport).

Welcome and Introductions

Brandy Steffen, JLA Public Involvement, welcomed everyone to the meeting and reviewed the agenda and Zoom meeting tips and etiquette. She reminded Committee Members of their roles and responsibilities. Brandy briefly reviewed the Planning Advisory Committee (PAC) meeting guidelines, who makes decisions within the project, and current project schedule. She thanked the PAC for their time on the project. **Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation (ODAV)**, introduced ODAV staff and **Kenji Sugahara, ODAV**, introduced himself and thanked the group for their participation. **Alex Thomas, ODAV** was introduced as the new Planning and Programs Manager.

Presentation

David Miller, Century West, gave a broad overview of airport master planning and the contents of Working Paper #1. He highlighted that FAA has completed their review and has approved the forecasts. He reminded the PAC that an Airport Master Plan (AMP) is an FAA requirement that helps ODAV plan for the future of the Airport, reflects current FAA airport design standards, updates the Airport Layout Plan (ALP), and replaces prior planning. After the AMP is completed there will be additional planning, funding alignments, environmental review, design, and potentially construction for individual master plan projects. David added that the Working

Paper is draft until finalized at the end of the project. Additional information can be added to the chapters as needed. An updated project schedule was shared with the PAC.

Tim House, Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), explained the process used to approve forecasts and why this process took an extended period of time. The FAA approved forecasts will be used in all subsequent analyses.

David reviewed the FAA approved forecast summary, which showed moderately increasing operations over the next 20 years. Based aircraft are projected to decline, which is comparable to other airports of a similar size and aligns with the FAA’s national expectations. He shared characteristics of design aircraft used in the FAA approved forecast.

PAC Questions and Comments

Brandy opened the PAC question and comment agenda item. *Full comments, along with responses are provided in the table below.*

Public Comment

Brandy opened the public comment section of the meeting. Each person had two minutes to speak.

- There were no verbal public comments at this meeting.
- There were several written comments collected during the meeting from the meeting chat (*see table below*).

Next Steps

Brandy reminded the group that the next PAC meeting will be held April 30, 2024, when they will review Chapter 4 which defines the on-airport facility needs. Brandy thanked everyone for attending and closed the meeting.

PAC Member Questions/Comments and Responses¹

ID	Name	Affiliation	Question/Comment	Response
4.1	Councilor Joann Linville	<i>City of Wilsonville</i>	I have some questions related to Chapter 2. The Working Paper reviews other airports in the Willamette Valley area, but it doesn't conduct an alternatives analysis of the capacities of these airports, such as runway lengths and emergency services. Why wasn't the alternatives analysis done? It would be helpful to see	Many questions and answers are listed on the website's FAQ page. This project is an airport master plan specific to the Aurora State Airport property. Alternatives for the Aurora State Airport property will be evaluated in Chapter 5 of the Working Paper. An alternative evaluation for other airports is outside the scope of this project.

¹ Live responses are included from David Miller (CWE), Tim House (FAA), and ODAV staff, along with additional information/clarification, as needed.

			<p>how it relates to Aurora Airport. Has there been seismic impact analysis specific to liquefaction done south of the airport? Why was this not included in this iteration of the working documents?</p>	
4.2	Ben Williams	<i>Friends of French Prairie</i>	<p>David had statements about forecasted growth and models. I would like clarification about the selection process for the forecast models, and how one model was justified vs. the others. What data and criteria were used? Very little appears in draft Chapter 3 specific to the forecast model section.</p>	<p>I would refer to the Working Paper and Tim can weigh in about the recommended models. We worked through a variety of methods with the FAA to find the most reliable option.</p> <p>Response to Friends of French Prairie’s written comments (Referenced below in item 4.13).</p>
4.3	Councilor Joann Linville	<i>City of Wilsonville</i>	<p>What is C-II and D level aircraft? Does this change where we are now in terms of size of aircraft size and weight, and what the runway can handle?</p> <p>Are the D level design aircraft using the airport because they have been given waivers to do so? It seems they are beyond what is approved for this (airport).</p>	<p>The C-II is not a change from the last FAA approved master plan and is the same type of activity. The approach category D reflects a difference in approach speed for different types of jet aircraft. Design aircraft C-II does not preclude use by those approach category D aircraft. It’s a distinction in terms of volume of traffic. The airport runway is designated as C-II because it does not have enough current or forecasted D-II operations.</p> <p>Aircraft weight is a facility requirement evaluated in the next chapter with a recommendation to compare the current pavement strength.</p> <p>The C and D aircraft are referenced in the chapter because they are currently in operation at the Airport, and we expect them to continue. When FAA defines its design standards, C and D aircraft are combined into one group and the same standards are used for both.</p> <p>Looking at the design aircraft operations in the Working Paper, there were 500 operations (take-offs or landings) of the C or D aircraft, with the minimum level being C. There were not 500 operations of C-II aircraft. There were 500 by C and above,</p>

				<p>and 500 by ADG II and above. A C-I aircraft counts toward the C category. Hypothetically, a B-III would count toward the ADG II category. The D aircraft get counted into the C-II classification. There is no waiver granted for a D, but a D-II, which is just faster than a B or C aircraft, can operate at the airport when the conditions are right. Pavement condition strength is another factor. We're seeing a lot of newer jets in the B-II range that are becoming popular because of their efficient design and ability to approach at a slower speed.</p> <p>Not all approach category D aircraft are larger. There are several D-II's that are just faster. Newer designs have been able to bring those approach speeds down quite a bit. ODAV manages waivers for heavier aircraft.</p>
4.4	Bruce Bennett	<i>Aurora Airport Improvement Association</i>	<p>I'm surprised at the planned decrease in volume at Aurora Airport. Could that cause future challenges as the population around the airport is exploding? Use of the airport has been increasing since 1943. Assuming that it will slow down could set us up for issues.</p>	<p>Our forecast model for the operations was based on forecast population growth in both Clackamas and Marion County at about a 1% increase. One may wonder how take-offs and landings can increase, but based aircraft decrease. Air traffic is generated by locally based aircraft and transient aircraft based at other airports. Business aircraft activity is often related to transient aircraft based at other airports. We are seeing some decline in the locally based conventional piston engine aircraft fleet. Forecasts are just guides. If we use this as such and the fleet doesn't decline, it doesn't alter planning for the Airport.</p>
4.5	Jeff Baymor	<i>Charbonneau Country Club</i>	<p>Is the decline due to fewer people learning to fly?</p> <p>I have other questions and concerns regarding anti-terrorism measures, but that is probably a later discussion.</p>	<p>The FAA uses the National Aerospace Forecast, which is fleet-wide and updated annually. It breaks out all types of aircraft and analyzes trends within each set of aircraft in the fleet. We followed a similar method in our based aircraft modeling, which followed trends of each aircraft. One reason for the decline is fleet attrition of legacy (piston) aircraft, and the current manufacturing generating fewer new aircraft. Another reason is the aging pilot community. Efforts have been underway</p>

				<p>to try to encourage younger people to learn to fly, but many pilots are either flying less or not at all.</p> <p>Bruce Bennett, Aurora Airport Improvement Association (in the chat): I think Jeff had a great question (about fewer people learning to fly) and as David covered this is not a local change but a global change. The piston fleet is getting smaller and jets are a much bigger percentage of the fleet due to speed and safety.</p>
4.6	Aron Faegre	<i>AABC/TLM Holdings</i>	<p>The FAA never likes to look too far ahead in terms of changes of the fleet and I wonder if electric aircraft are beginning to arrive and get almost certified. Can the master plan include that in the discussion of the fleet?</p>	<p>Yes, but I think it's in an early development stage. It will probably take time for it to be reflected in the FAA long-term aerospace forecast. We're seeing the electrification of conventional aircraft and growth in unmanned aerial systems. We are seeing an anticipation of the need to accommodate these facilities and aircraft at airports, especially electric vehicle charging stations. They also need to consider getting the power systems into the airports. Not every airport has enough infrastructure in place. We will touch on it in later chapters. We still anticipate these aircraft being accommodated by hangars and aprons.</p>
4.7	Kenji Sugahara	<i>ODAV</i>	<p>I spoke with FAA Administrator Whitaker and he mentioned that fixed wing electric aircraft would come before the EVs mentioned before and Councilor Linville seemed excited by that as well. There are a lot of new forms of aviation coming that will change the dynamics, so I was wondering whether that conversation is happening at airports.</p>	<p>We're seeing a lot of exciting changes, including changing to unleaded fuel for piston aircraft.</p>
4.8	Councilor Joann Linville	<i>City of Wilsonville</i>	<p>When do you anticipate the next draft chapter will be available and will we get notice of that?</p>	<p>Yes, we will email it to you two weeks prior to the next meeting and we are hoping to provide a short video from David that will explain key takeaways.</p>
4.9	Bruce Bennett	<i>Aurora Airport Improvement Association</i>	<p>For the landslide review, an internal vehicle access road should keep all deliveries and</p>	<p>Surface transportation routes specific to the Aurora State Airport property will be</p>

			vehicles away from the taxiway and ramp areas but have a way for them to get from hangar to hangar without going onto Airport Road Northeast.	evaluated as part of the Landside Development Alternatives Analysis.
4.10	Jeff Baymor	<i>Charbonneau Country Club</i>	This has been excellent, thank you so much!	Thank you for the comment.
4.11	Jeff Baymor	<i>Charbonneau Country Club</i>	What, if any, anti-terrorism measures have been taken at Aurora Airport? The airport is located less than 25 miles from Portland Downtown Towers and Salem.	Thank you for the question, please reach out to ODAV to discuss their airport security planning.
4.12	Melissa Ahrens	<i>Department of Land Conservation and Development</i>	Hi everyone, I will be attending these meetings as a backup for Matt Crall, Planning Services Division Manager at DLCD, I wanted to make sure everyone had my contact information in case anything comes up during these meetings that I can assist with as Mid-Willamette Valley Regional Representative with DLCD. Thanks!	Thank you for your participation. Your comment and contact information have been added to the record.
4.13	Ben Williams	<i>Friends of French Prairie</i>	03/12/24 letter from Ben Williams	Responses added to the beginning of the letter.

Attendee Questions/Comments and Responses²

ID	Name	Affiliation	Question/Comment	Response
4.14	Jeff Lewis	<i>Attendee</i>	All data is available through 2023. The 2022 and 2023 data is valuable, not just because the KUAO tower has a short history of accurate counts, but also to help us see past data alterations in 2020. Please add the data through 2023 to the Draft. If you will not, will Mr. House please explain why FAA will not press for this superior data product?	Thank you for your comment. FAA has approved the forecast as presented in Working Paper #1. 2021 was approved by FAA as the base year in the airport master plan's 20-year activity forecasts.

² Live responses are included, along with additional information/clarification, as needed.
PAC Meeting #4 Summary

4.15	Jeff Lewis	Attendee	<p>FAA likes to impress us all with their 'NAS' concept, the National Airspace System. Clearly, KUAO is one of a set of airports for what we can view as the north Willamette Valley subsystem of the NAS. Dr. Linville raised a very good point: why is the current Draft so deficient in defining the other key players in this region, especially KPDX, KHIO, KMMV, KTTD, and KSLE? Many of those have huge runways and even 24/7 on-airport CFR to immediately handle crashes and fires. So, for safety, clearly larger fuel-laden jets should be using these other airports. Can we be sure to include a detailed analysis of precisely what is offered at these other airports, so the public can evaluate the wisdom imprudence of a KUAO runway lengthening? If this will not be included in this spendy Master Plan Update, why not??</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. Nearby airports were discussed in Chapter 2 of Working Paper #1. This project is an airport master plan specific to the Aurora State Airport property. A detailed evaluation of the regional airport system is outside the scope of this project.</p>
4.16	Jeff Lewis	Attendee	<p>At 1738, Mr Miller discussed forecast and ops details. Why is there so little discussion about a simple reality: this airport, with a massive quantity of through-the-fence users, is effectively unmanaged, rendering all data about based aircraft utterly meaningless. What assurances does the general public have that ODAV can actually establish with accuracy, how many and what callsign aircraft are based off of Yellow Gate Rd accessed hangars, or on Millar's land holdings, etc.?</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Based aircraft counts are updated and validated by FAA routinely through the National Based Aircraft Inventory Program. The validated based aircraft fleet at Aurora State Airport is discussed in Chapters 2 and 3 of Working Paper #1.</p>
4.17	Jeff Lewis	Attendee	<p>In his presentation, Mr. Miller seems to be suggesting that a 0.9% growth rate equates to a C-II critical aircraft selection. Would someone please provide the FAA Order confirming this decision, and</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. The Aircraft Approach Category (AAC) and Airplane Design Group (ADG) of the Design Aircraft (AAC C/ADG II) were determined based on TFMSC data. Please refer to Working Paper #1.</p>

			also provide the definitive data (TFMISC?) that helps us see actual C-II and other usages by year?	
4.18	Jeff Lewis	Attendee	At 1749, responding to Dr. Linville’s question, Mr. Miller noted that there are not enough D-II aircraft ops at KUAO to justify a higher critical aircraft. Would someone please dive into the deeper details of FAA’s design standards, and confirm that arbitrary activity levels can be played by aviation individuals to ‘build’ a need for runway expansion? Would ODAV please confirm if excess weight aircraft have been using the KUAO runway and taxiway, and are they getting waivers, needing to get individual event pre-approvals, etc.?	Thank you for your comments. The 500 annual operations threshold for regular use is discussed in FAA Advisory Circular 150/5000-17. Please reference the Design Aircraft section in Working Paper #1 for more information regarding the selection of the design aircraft for Aurora State Airport. ODAV does receive occasional overweight operations requests. This is based on runway pavement strength and is reviewed by ODAV and their pavement engineer to determine if a waiver is warranted.
4.19	Jeff Lewis	Attendee	At ~1752, FAA’s Tim House was very clear about the arbitrary 500 ops threshold for runway upgrades. He was also quite clear, at KUAO, there were 500 ‘C’ ops but NOT 500 ‘C-II’ ops. This sounds very sketchy; precisely what FAA design guideline (please cite Order and paragraph number) allows for conflating ‘C’ operations with ‘II’ operations to hit the 500 arbitrary threshold? At 1758 Mr. Miller again inflated local population growth estimates, i.e., he said growth projections are around 1%, but can he confirm that? Can he look at the Marion and Clackamas projections by PSU’s population studies, where it looks like he will come closer to ~0.6% annual growth rate? If he cannot or will not confirm this, why not?	Thank you for your comment. Please see FAA Advisory Circular 150/5000-17, Paragraph 1.2.1, and Paragraph 3.1.1.
4.20	Rayna Jenks	Attendee	Greetings, I wonder if the PAC members who have not done so already could briefly introduce	Thank you for your comment. Please refer to the PAC Meeting #4 presentation and Chapter 1 of Working Paper #1 for a

			themselves and their role in the PAC.	summary of the PAC members and who they represent. The PAC member list is also maintained on the project website.
4.21	Jeff Lewis	Attendee	At 1804, Faegre inquired about if Miller can address future electric aircraft within the master plan. Can we also address in depth, the need to provide nonleaded fuel at KUAO? And, the needs to resolve through-the-fence issues? Electric aircraft are still far into the future and discussing them serves primarily to fool the public into thinking we have imminent technological solutions to impacts by aviation. This seems disinformational.	Thank you for your comment. It has been noted and added to the record.
4.22	Jeff Lewis	Attendee	At 6:18, Mr Miller discussed Chapter 4 process and goals. Please clarify, is it critical we get Chapters 1 thru 3 correct as they establish parameters for selecting Chapter 4 designs to comply with FAA standards? Please also clarify, if the groundwork (ch 1 thru 3) is erroneous or slipshod, it truly can enable errors in designing for assumed requirements... right?	Thank you for your comment. Working Paper #1 has been extensively reviewed and the forecasts have been approved by FAA. Your comments are noted and have been added to the record.
4.23	Jeff Lewis	Attendee	Mr Miller briefly explained the airside versus landside facilities... can he or someone please quantify what percentage of what airport services are on-airport (by whom, at what locations), and what are off airport (through the fence), by whom and at what locations? Doesn't the public deserve to know these details, to understand their airport?	Thank you for your comments. This project is an airport master plan specific to the Aurora State Airport property. An evaluation of private properties is outside the scope of this project.
4.24	Jeff Lewis	Attendee	At 6:26, Mr. Bennett advocated for roads in the plan for delivery vehicles. Isn't it true, the vast majority of hangars are OFF airport, thus not dependent on any delivery routes across a small patch of ODAV land?	Surface transportation routes specific to the Aurora State Airport property will be evaluated as part of the Development Alternatives Analysis.