

AURORA STATE AIRPORT



PLANNING ADVISORY COMMITTEE (PAC)

MEETING #5 SUMMARY

Date: Tuesday, April 30, 2024

Time: 5:00-7:00 pm

Location: Zoom Webinar

In Attendance

PAC Members Present

Bill Graupp, *Aurora CTE, Inc*
Bruce Bennett, *Positive Aurora Airport Management*
Brian Asher, *City of Aurora*
Councilor Joann Linville, *City of Wilsonville*
Chris Neamztu, *City of Wilsonville*
David Waggoner, *Willamette Aviation*
Jeff Baymor, *Charbonneau Country Club*
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*
Whitney Stewart, *Oregon Office of Emergency Management*
Ted Millar, *AABC/TLM Holdings*
Tony Helbling, *Aurora Airport Improvement Association*
Trent Brownlee, *Atlantic Aviation*
Wayne Richards, *Alternate, Friends of the French Prairie*

PAC Members Absent

Ben Williams, *Friends of French Prairie*
Beth Wytoski, *Regional Solutions*
Austin Barnes, *Marion County Planning Dept.*
Ben Clayton, *Life Flight Network*

PAC Members Absent (Continued)

Bob Buchanan, *Alternate, Columbia Helicopters*
Brandon Reich, *Alternate, Marion County Planning Dept.*
Ken Ivey, *Aurora Butteville Barlow Community Planning Organization*
Cathryn Stephens, *ODAV Board*
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*
Rian Johnson, *Vans Aircraft*
Rob Roedts, *Columbia Helicopters*
Robert Fournier, *Helicopter Transport Service*
Roger Kaye, *1000 Friends of Oregon*

Agency Representatives Present

Kenji Sugahara, *ODAV*
Alex Thomas, *ODAV*
Tony Beach, *ODAV*
Brandon Pike, *ODAV*
Tim House, *FAA*

Staff and Consultants

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

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*

Mark Ottenad

Julie Fitzgerald, Mayor of Wilsonville

George Buley

Brad Schuster

Bruce Bergman

Sarah Lucas

Joseph Schaefer

Kurt Wilson

Kirsten Newbury

James Kirby

Greg Leo

Shannon Colebank

Tim Warren

Glenn Lancaster

Audience / Members of the Public

Aron Faegre, *alternate, AABC/TLM Holdings*

George Van Hoomissen

Josh Goldschmidt

Anonymous Attendee

Audience / Members of the Public (Continued)

Overview

The meeting goals were to review Draft Chapter 4: Draft Chapter Facility Goals and Requirements and ensure that the members had time to talk and ask questions 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, reviewed the agenda and Zoom meeting tips and etiquette. She reminded the members of their roles and responsibilities. The next PAC meeting will be held on June 11, 2024 and will discuss the range of alternatives. There will also be a workshop in July before the decision-making process happens.

Presentation

David Miller, Century West, gave a presentation on the Draft Chapter 4 Facility requirements. He reminded the PAC that there would be opportunities to ask questions throughout the meeting; more technical or detailed questions could be answered in writing after the meeting. He reminded the group that the facility requirements evaluation is not the alternatives evaluation.

Facility requirements are defined in three-step process:

- Defining applicable standards, both current and to make sure future construction meets those standards.
- Evaluating the current or existing facilities conformance to the standards.
- Identifying potential facility improvements.

Facility requirements that are defined through this process are the inputs that are used in the next phase of the master plan to evaluate facility improvement options.

David explained the difference between landside and airside facilities. Over the 20-year planning period, the forecast indicates that there will be a demand for about 72,000 square feet of additional aprons and 19 hangar units based primarily on the needs of transient jet aircraft, turboprops and helicopters. Parking demand for small single engine and multi-engine piston aircraft is expected to decline.

Airside facilities are primarily the runway taxiway system, and things like pavement, lighting and signage. The overall goal with airside facility standards is to provide the safest possible environment for the movement of aircraft.

The Facility Requirements Chapter defines the runway length evaluation that is consistent with the FAA approved forecast. This defines the length that meets the FAA-based criteria for long range planning.

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 public comments at this meeting.

Next Steps

Brandy reminded the group that the next virtual PAC meeting will be held June 11, 2024, from 5 pm to 8 pm and will review preliminary alternatives concepts. The Public Open house will be held on June 13th, 2024, location TBD. Please submit comments through May 14. **Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation**, and David thanked everyone for their participation and engagement throughout the master planning process.

PAC Member Questions/Comments and Responses¹

ID	Name	Affiliation	Question/Comment	Response
5.1	Tony Helbling	<i>Aurora Airport Improvement Association</i>	<p>The red line along the taxiway predominantly runs along the face of two airports. One is the midfield air park at A 3 and then from there to the south down to Atlantic. It runs along SECAP in the verbiage of the document you sent out.</p> <p>In the document, you discuss potential reanalysis of access across this area as non-standard.</p>	<p>It would incorporate all of the area affected. We're looking at the side of the runway. One of our evaluation pieces is the actual runway object free area and the taxiway object free area, which are driven off the center lines. Any component of that along the side that is inside one or both of those would be evaluated.</p> <p>The direct access issue is essentially FAA design guidance that discourages the straight shot from the apron or hangar to the runway without some distinct turning</p>

¹ Live responses are included, along with additional information/clarification, as needed.
PAC Meeting #5 Summary – Revised

			Does that refer to the frontage along the taxiway?	mechanisms for the pilot. The guidance is intended to improve a pilot's situational awareness and reduce inadvertent runway incursions.
5.2	Tony Helbling	<i>Aurora Airport Improvement Association</i>	Is this analysis going to consider the easements that are documented in the deeds that were granted in perpetuity to the owners of the properties adjacent to that taxiway?	This step is evaluating existing conditions. We don't yet know what the future condition of the runway-taxiway will be because we haven't gotten to the alternatives. What's there today may or may not be the same going forward. We'll make a note of the comment.
5.3	Councilor Joann Linville	<i>City of Wilsonville</i>	I have a question about the landside facility recommendations, in reference to the additional hangars and square footage. My understanding was in the beginning of the discussion about the master planning process, there were not going to be any recommendations for property that was outside of the ODAV-owned footprint. This seems like a recommendation for beyond the fence owners, and I'm wondering why they are included in the master plan?	<p>We are talking about on-airport landside facilities demand. The demand projections are not a recommendation per se. The numbers are an attempt to approximate facility demands based on the forecast. In Chapter 3, the based aircraft fleet are projecting a decline in single engine piston aircraft.</p> <p>There is a reduction in hangar demand, and the numbers in Table 4-8 of the chapter have a reduction of almost 115,000 square feet of single engine piston hangar space. We also see a reduction in another 28,600 square feet of single engine piston hangar space. Most of these hangars are privately owned and the owners will make business decisions about potential reconfiguration. The master plan does not evaluate future changes in facilities off airport property. These numbers are just an assessment based on the forecast.</p>
5.4	Councilor Joann Linville	<i>City of Wilsonville</i>	With the decline, why isn't this section repurposing the landside property that is owned by ODAV instead of talking about an additional 62,750 square feet of new space? It's confusing to show a decline and then show additional hangar space.	<p>There seems to be limited interest in exploring uses other than landside facilities. Aircraft storage and support are considered the highest and best use. Future development will depend on opportunities within that space. The average size requirements for business aircraft, jets, and turbo props are greater than for single-engine piston airplanes, leading to the need for larger hangar spaces. These approximations are based on FAA-approved forecasts, but actual</p>

				<p>fulfillment of these projections can be limited by factors such as available land. That doesn't alter the projection.</p> <p>I would suggest looking at the tables that are in the chapter that are broken down by aircraft types, which shows the net positive/negative and how the numbers balance out. How this all materializes will depend on opportunities presented at the Airport.</p>
5.5	Wayne Richards	<i>Friends of French Prairie</i>	<p>Farmers are wondering if you are closing Keil Road. They wonder if they will be out working and have to wait on a taxiway to be cleared to cross the runway by the tower. Are you rezoning 30 acres of exclusive farmland? Can you address this in Chapter 5? It's been this way since the mid-70's with Senate Bill 100.</p>	<p>The facility requirements do not identify future proposed airport changes. Any proposed airport changes will be included in the alternatives analysis.</p>
5.6	Bruce Bennett	<i>Positive Aurora Airport Management</i>	<p>The hangar demand is surprising to me because there's always been a waiting list. The demand is higher than what's available, so it's hard to think about how many hangars are needed when there's a long waiting list.</p> <p>If there were adequate hangers now, then it would make sense to say we need 3 more or 6 more. The ramp demand also seems rather modest.</p> <p>I hate to see unrealistic expectations and then scramble to meet them. The population isn't getting any smaller and when visitors come, they need a place to park on the runway.</p> <p>One question on alpha 3. Would you strictly paint anything on it? I can't imagine moving the taxi away from alpha 3 or the airport runway</p>	<p>The methodology to determine hangar requirements are explained in draft Chapter 4 – Facility Requirements and is based on the FAA approved forecasts.</p>

			to taxi away taxilane. I could see the departure from the taxiway to the ramp moved to the left a little bit. Would that make it no longer a direct access?	
5.7	Bruce Bennett	<i>Positive Aurora Airport Management</i>	The master plan sees the need for additional hangar space. Is that talking about growing the airport boundary for additional hangar space or is that talking about using the existing airport land? Or additional hanger space?	Neither. It's quantifying the demand that comes out of the forecast that was approved by the FAA. ODAV will control what is on their property, and they cannot control what happens on private property adjacent to the airport.
5.8	Jeff Baymor	<i>Charbonneau Country Club</i>	I sent an email from a resident in my community to Mayor Fitzgerald, with concerns about over jets and jet noise. It's clear that jets are going to slowly replace the piston planes and they will be flying over Charbonneau in the early morning hours or the late evening. It is concerning, and how do we address that as a community trying to make certain that we're working in a positive way with the airport, and the people that are dependent upon the Aurora airport for the businesses and their employment? We are considering doing an evaluation of the number of residents who take issue with it. I'm not sure if Wilsonville has done the same.	Thank you for your comment and email. Tony will follow up about this.
5.9	Councilor Joann Linville	<i>City of Wilsonville</i>	Page four of Chapter 4 talks about the FAA advisory circular. A basis for coming up with the formula for the runway length. It talks about in the in that approach and departure reference code area. There are two comments that says the AP, the approach, and the departure above from the circular indicate the following aircraft may land or depart on the runway and	Yes, based on that criteria the distinction between airplane design group (ADG) categories I and II is the wingtip clearance (wingspan). There's no distinction between an approach category C and a D aircraft when it comes to the designer wingspan for either ADG The basic method used here is that these are dimensional standards (lateral setbacks) for runways and parallel taxiways. Discussions of runway length are driven by a different advisory circular.

			<p>taxi on the parallel taxi way without operations restrictions.</p> <p>Those are categories A, B, and then C and D groups I and II. This seems to be adding in D category aircraft. Does that mean that in the airport's current state, these aircraft can land and take off without operational restrictions in the current setting?</p>	<p>The section referred to has no bearing on runway length.</p>
5.10	Councilor Joann Linville	<i>City of Wilsonville</i>	<p>Page three of the section on runway design code discusses approach visibility. It says "component may change with AAC -ADG C-II/ Could you explain what that means?"</p>	<p>There are different layers of design standards that fit together. Some are driven by approach speed, approach category, the design group or wingspan. There are additional standards that are driven by the approach of visibility minimums established on the runway. Currently, there are three instrument approaches at the airport with a visibility minimum of 7/8 of a statute mile. If visibility were to change to one mile, it could impact the clearances required for the runway.</p>
5.11	Councilor Joann Linville	<i>City of Wilsonville</i>	<p>When looking at table 4-4, it shows 75% of the fleet and 100% of the fleet. Does 100% of the fleet actually represent 25% of the total? Does the FAA care about which larger aircraft have been given special waivers to use the airport?</p>	<p>The FAA distinguishes between different types of jets in their advisory circular, with one table representing 75% of the fleet consisting of smaller and medium-sized jets, and another representing the higher-performance aircraft making up the last 25%. Even though some higher-performance aircraft at Aurora don't meet the 500 operations threshold, the FAA guidance suggests using the 100% fleet number if any of these aircraft are present. This is why the 100% fleet number is used instead of the 75%. However, even if the 75% number were used, the runway length would be similar due to a cap on the wet and slippery length adjustment at 5,500 feet.</p> <p>The analysis is based on traffic, using detailed instrument flight plan data called</p>

				TFMSC data. This data covers the last decade and is not specifically broken down by the relatively few waivers offered by ODAV. It's up to the airport to determine if these aircraft can be safely accommodated on a case-by-case basis for heavy aircraft requests.
5.12	Tony Helbling	<i>Aurora Airport Improvement Association</i>	Aircraft 150 might be able to leave the ground at 2600 feet, but at the point of rotation where a pilot needs to make a decision and get on the brakes. Would he be able to stop in the 2600 feet that puts him at 52? A larger aircraft can take off in 3000 feet but needs 3200 to stop. There are also differing insurance requirements. Does the Aircraft 150 analysis takes these regulations and requirements into account?	The Aircraft 150 analysis considers regulations outlined in Airport Advisory Circular 150/5325-4B, which specifically addresses runway length operations for aircraft over 12,500 pounds up to 60,000 pounds. These regulations are tailored to turbine aircraft, including jets, which are often operated under Part 135. The analysis includes factors such as accelerate-stop and accelerate-go calculations, ensuring safety in various scenarios like engine failure during takeoff.
5.13	Bruce Bennett	<i>Positive Aurora Airport Management</i>	Which is the regulation for carrying passengers for hire that firefighters or ambulance flights or businesses use? The FAA has a lot of different arms and for an operator, they require both the balanced field and a 40% margin for error. If you calculate the runway length, then you stop with 6 inches to spare or a little bit on the other side. That wouldn't be safer because the FAA requires an additional 40% minimum legal runway length. I want to make sure that's factored in because there are a lot of people operating under 135 charter.	Commercial aerial firefighters and air ambulance operators are typically certified under FAR Part 135 (for hire). Privately owned corporate aircraft are commonly operated under FAR Part 91. See previous comment response on the criteria used in runway length planning required by FAA in master planning. Any runway length adjustments required for FAR 135 operators are made by individual aircraft operators based on conditions at the time. This may result in constrained operation conditions that may limit operating weights and payload that can be accommodated.
5.14	Councilor Joann Linville	<i>City of Wilsonville</i>	On page nine, it notes that the city of Wilsonville and other jurisdictions will need to update their comprehensive plans to	This section is intended to summarize Oregon land use regulations that apply to

			<p>remain compliant with state land use laws. The city recently updated its comprehensive plan to address airport issues, and ODAV was notified of those proceedings.</p> <p>What exactly is involved in the city's future comprehensive plan update? What will be required?</p>	<p>local governments. ORS 836.610 Local government land use plans and regulations to accommodate airport zones and uses.</p>
5.15	Councilor Joann Linville	<i>City of Wilsonville</i>	<p>I want to mention the noise concerns Jeff brought up, and the mention of noise evaluations in the master plan. When will these evaluations happen? A goal in the master plan is to coordinate with users to improve the voluntary fly-friendly program. This isn't something that should be discussed privately. This should be coordinated with the FAA Seattle Airport District, the ADO, local land use jurisdictions, airports, and neighbors. How will the analysis be conducted, who will do it, where the information will be available, and which jurisdictions will be involved in addressing the results?</p>	<p>The fly-friendly program involves coordinating with pilots, users, and neighbors to minimize noise over sensitive areas and there has been outreach with the goal of minimizing noise and low flying aircraft over sensitive areas. Tony Beach can have further discussion with Charbonneau and Wilsonville, and there will be upcoming noise contour discussions in the master planning process. The noise analysis for the master plan will use current runway data and traffic forecasts as a baseline, with future analyses based on the chosen runway option.</p>

Attendee Questions/Comments and Responses²

ID	Name	Question/Comment	Response
5.16	Anonymous Attendee	<p>This public process is a farce. Members of the public should be able to attend a public body meeting without registration in advance or at the time of the meeting. This ODAV process is about control and manipulation of the public process.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment.</p>

² Live responses are included, along with additional information/clarification, as needed.
PAC Meeting #5 Summary – Revised

5.17	George Buley	Does ODAV own the land to accommodate the anticipated 72.3K SF?	ODAV has about 30 acres of land within the airport, and the ability to accommodate demand depends on available land and future opportunities.
5.18	George Buley	Is Keil road located in the Runway Object Free Area? If yes, will there be proposed mitigation?	A portion of Keil Road is within the runway object-free area, and mitigation for its non-standard conditions will be part of the alternative's evaluation. The evaluation will focus on addressing non-standard conditions for the existing runway without considering changes to the runway itself. There are unique challenges due to non-standard conditions on both sides of the runway, which will be addressed with various scenarios in the next meeting.
5.19	George Buley	Does ODAV own any other drain fields in the RSA other than the ones identified on the Runway Non-Standard Drawing?	ODAV does not own any drain fields at UAO, the drain field identified in the Runway Non-Standard Drawing is the only one in the RSA.

Additional Emailed Comments

ID	Name	Affiliation	Question/Comment	Response
5.20	Bruce Bennett	<i>Positive Aurora Airport Management</i>	Thank you for the professional planning job! Please include an internal circulation road and consider ODAV purchasing approximately one acre of ramp space NE of taxiway A3 to allow a huge relief in taxiway congestion as well as significant improvement in ramp to taxiway flow. Also please consider the FAA requirement to land in 60% of the available runway and to always have a "balanced field".	Thank you for the comment.
5.21	Jeff Baymor	Charbonneau Country Club	The video is excellent and I have two others to review. I would like to provide the text of a Charbonneau resident who appears to be negatively impacted by fly-overs. I have removed their name as I have not requested nor	Thank you for the comment.

			<p>have I received approval to share such:</p> <p>Good morning Mayor Fitzgerald,</p> <p>We met at the city's recent presentation in Charbonneau. I shared my daily round with the flight noise from Aurora airport. You asked that I send a note of follow up; I apologize for the delay.</p> <p>This morning a 2:00 am fly over woke me. Another took place at 2:23 and another at 5:37. Just another day in the neighborhood. Yesterday my husband heard a plane around 3:00 and small planes were a constant the entire day.</p> <p>Either Saturday or Sunday when home, I wrote down flights noted. They were: 2 in the 3:00 am hour, 9:17, 9:32, 2:48, 3:54, 5:21, and 6:38. I was not home all day. I have noted planes at every wee hour.</p> <p>This has been going on for years now and has drastically altered quality of life. Last year I did not sit out on my patio or deck one single time as the noise is nerve wracking and depressing.</p> <p>I am worried about quality of life, noise pollution, disregard for the supposed "Good Neighbor policy" we are told pilots are to be guided by, and frankly home values over time.</p> <p>Thank you for all your work with this issue and many others. Please can't quality of life be weighed in this very long debate</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>over the region’s supposed benefit from the airport’s increased traffic?</p> <p>Thank you.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>-----</p> <p>I would like to share this information with the PAC Meeting participants.</p>	
5.22	Bruce Bennett	<i>Aurora Airport Improvement Association</i>	<p>I believe an internal circulation road created on private airport property connected to State airport property should be made a priority at KUAO for operational and safety purposes. Also, that ODAV should expeditiously pursue purchasing the ramp property NE of taxiway A3 and connecting to the midfield State ramp for immediate and significant improvements in operational flow and airport safety.</p>	<p>Response was delayed; added on 06/28/24.</p> <p>Thank you for the comment.</p>
5.23	Tony Helbling	<i>Positive Aurora Airport Management</i>	<p>We feel the 5500’ number is predicated on a “uncontaminated runway” = dry runway, and pilots perform with exact precision. It rains A LOT here in Oregon... most of the year. Add in human factors and that 5500’ number is a very tight limitation. Thinking 6000’ (as has historically been called out in past master plans over the past 45+ years), gives a better margin for safety.</p> <p>We agree the FAA may recognize the design class/category is based on specific example models of aircraft. We want it noted that most of those aircraft are aging aircraft (15 to 20 years old) and will age more before this runway is extended (5 years? So 20- to 25-year-old airframes). Most newer aircraft in the design class are up against that 5500’ number and we predict future (quieter) aircraft could exceed it.</p>	<p>Response was delayed; added on 06/28/24.</p> <p>Thank you for the comment.</p>

			<p>As we look to the future of the airport, it only makes sense to plan the investment wisely to include a margin of safety. In the grand scheme of things, the return on investment will be human lives.</p>	
<p>5.24</p>	<p>Chris Neamtzu and Mark Ottenad</p>	<p><i>City of Wilsonville</i></p>	<p>May 14, 2024 email</p> <p>Questions 1-40 pertain to Working Paper No. 1</p> <p>ODAV PAC Meeting #5; April 30, 2024 - Questions on DRAFT Master Plan Chapter 4:</p> <p>41. The existing Runway Design Code (RDC) defines the standards used for runway construction. Page 4-3 notes that “the approach visibility component may change within AAC/ADG C-II”. Can you please explain exactly what that comment means?</p> <p>42. Page 4-9 notes that comments regarding environmental concerns raised by PAC members will be included in Appendix 9 in the master plan, for future consideration by FAA during the completion of any environmental assessment required by NEPA. When will that documentation will be available on the project web site?</p> <p>43. Page 4-9 notes that the City of Wilsonville and other jurisdictions will need to update their comprehensive plans to “remain compliant with state land use laws”. City recently updated the Comprehensive Plan to address airport issues. ODAV was notified of these proceedings. What is exactly involved in the city’s future Comprehensive Plan update? What exactly will be required of the City?</p>	<p>Response was delayed; added on 06/28/24.</p> <p>Thank you for your comments. We’ve reviewed these with the technical team. Questions 1-40 relate to Working Paper No. 1. We will post a complete set of responses to the project website as soon as possible.</p> <p>41. As noted in the chapter, approach visibility minimums are determined independently from the RDC, based on visual or instrument approach capabilities. Changes to the current approach visibility minimums (defined by FAA instrument approaches or through a separate FAA-issued “Notice to Air Missions” (NOTAM)), could be accomplished for a variety of reasons. This section notes that RPZ dimensions are determined by the approach visibility minimums for each runway end, therefore a change in minimums could change RPZ dimensions for AAC/ADG C-II.</p> <p>42. A summary of comments and responses, including for environmental concerns, will be posted on the project website to document review of each draft work chapter or full working paper. Comments and responses provided during the review of Working Paper 1, are currently provided on the project website. Comments provided after individual comment periods conclude are reviewed with responses posted on the project website when available. During the ongoing development of master plan chapters, responding to current chapter review is the highest priority and responses to previous chapters will be documented in preparation of the draft master plan document. At draft final all meeting summaries, PAC and public comments,</p>

			<p>44. Page 4-9 notes that the city should “develop overlay zone ordinance for airspace protection”. What exactly does that mean for existing land uses? How does this overlay zone work? What is being effected? Please provide specific information regarding this comment.</p> <p>45. Page 4-10 notes that noise evaluations will be conducted in the Airport MP. When will those be created? Which Chapter addresses noise impacts?</p> <p>46. Page 4-16 notes a runway length of 5,500 lineal feet. Which direction, N or S will the additional runway be extended, if approved?</p>	<p>and responses will be summarized in Appendix 9.</p> <p>43. This section is intended to summarize Oregon land use regulations that apply to local governments. ORS 836.610 Local government land use plans and regulations to accommodate airport zones and uses.</p> <p>44. This section is intended to summarize Oregon land use regulations that apply to local governments. ORS 836.610 Local government land use plans and regulations to accommodate airport zones and uses. Additional technical information may be found in the Oregon Department of Aviation Airport Land Use Compatibility Handbook.</p> <p>45. Noise contours will be developed for the 65 DNL noise contour identified for the current conditions as well as the twenty-year contour. Noise contour modeling will use the forecasts and fleet mix identified in the forecast chapter for each run to analyze impacts of airport modifications as it relates to noise. Noise contours will be prepared following the selection of a preferred alternative.</p> <p>46. Future decisions about runway configuration will be made by ODAV at the conclusion of the airside alternatives evaluation.</p>
--	--	--	---	---