

AURORA STATE AIRPORT



PLANNING ADVISORY COMMITTEE (PAC)

MEETING #6 SUMMARY

Date: Tuesday, June 11, 2024

Time: 5:00-8:00 pm

Location: Zoom Webinar

In Attendance

PAC Members Present

Beth Wytoski, *Regional Solutions*
Bill Graupp, *Aurora CTE, Inc*
Bruce Bennett, *Positive Aurora Airport Management*
Brian Asher, *City of Aurora*
Councilor Joann Linville, *City of Wilsonville*
David Waggoner, *Willamette Aviation*
Dave Mauk, *Charbonneau Country Club*
Naomi Zwerdling, *Oregon Dept of Transportation*
Pam Barlow Lind, *Confederated Tribes of the Siletz Indians*
Patrick Donaldson, *Wilsonville Chamber of Commerce*
Rian Johnson, *Vans Aircraft*
Ted Millar, *AABC/TLM Holdings*
Tony Helbling, *Aurora Airport Improvement Association*
Trent Brownlee, *Atlantic Aviation*
Wayne Richards, *Alternate, Friends of the French Prairie*
Whitney Stewart, *Oregon Office of Emergency Management*

PAC Members Absent

Austin Barnes, *Marion County Planning Dept.*
Ben Clayton, *Life Flight Network*
Ben Williams, *Friends of French Prairie*
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 Crall, *Oregon Dept of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD)*
Matt Lawyer, *alternate, Marion County*
Matt Williams, *Deer Creek Estates HOA*
Raul Suarez, *Aurora Air Traffic Control*
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

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*

Audience / Members of the Public

Aron Faegre, *alternate, AABC/TLM Holdings*
Chris Neamztu, *City of Wilsonville*
Melissa Ahrens, *alternate, Oregon Dept of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD)*
George Van Hoomissen
George Buley
Tom Herzog
Mayor Julie Fitzgerald, *City of Wilsonville*
Mark Ottenad, *City of Wilsonville*
Dave Tibbetts
Krista Kroiss
Greg Leo
Chad Robertson
Bill Poehler
Kirsten Newbury
Linette Dobbins

Overview

Planning Advisory Committee (PAC) members reviewed and asked questions about the preliminary alternatives. Staff also collected feedback on the alternatives. *The presentation, FAQs, meeting recording and other materials are posted on the website (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, reviewed the agenda and Zoom meeting tips and etiquette. She reminded the members of their roles and responsibilities. The meeting was extended by an hour to ensure time to discuss each airside and landside alternative and answer questions. **Kenji Sugahara and Tony Beach, Oregon Department of Aviation (ODAV)**, thanked everyone for their time and comments. They alerted the PAC that a virtual feedback form is available to provide more lengthy comments about the preliminary alternatives.

Presentation

David Miller, Century West, reviewed the takeaways from the previous PAC meeting. He summarized how the Facility Requirements were evaluated. The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) approved aviation activity and established C-II design standards for the airport for both the current and future design aircraft. The justified runway length from the analysis, meeting FAA requirements, is 5,500 feet. He reminded the PAC that there would be opportunities to ask questions throughout the meeting, but more technical or detailed questions would be answered in writing after the meeting.

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

David reviewed the Preliminary Alternatives, which were developed consistent with FAA standards and the results of the aviation forecasts. As a twenty-year plan, the further out forecasts go the more uncertain they can be. The master plan evaluation process aims to identify improvements that accommodate demand-driven needs while meeting design standards. He clarified that the proposed runway and taxiway improvements are not driven by forecast activity but by the need to meet FAA standards based on current activity. The design standards identified will apply throughout the planning period, and the justified runway length meets FAA criteria currently. The forecast does not result in a change in the category for the design aircraft.

Tim House, Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), explained why B-II Alternatives are not viable and will not be considered. While maintenance and rehabilitation can continue as long as progress towards meeting standards is evident, reconstruction, which includes extensions and new construction, must adhere to the standards. The "no action alternative" allows for a temporary continuation of maintenance, but at some point, further action will be required. It is not a long-term path forward.

PAC Questions and Comments

Brandy opened the discussion for PAC questions. *Comments and responses are provided in the table below.*

Public Comment

Brandy opened the public comment section of the meeting. There were no verbal public comments at this meeting. *Written comments and responses are provided in the table below.*

Next Steps

Brandy reminded the group that there will be an in-person open house held on Thursday, June 13, from 4:00-7:00 p.m. The next virtual PAC meeting will be a virtual working session held on July 30 from 5:00-8:00 p.m., to review the refined alternatives, which incorporate feedback from the PAC and community. Feedback forms will be emailed to PAC members, and public feedback forms will also be available at the public event and online.

Tony and David thanked the PAC and public attendees for their time and input, then ended the meeting.

PAC Member Questions/Comments and Responses¹

ID	Name	Affiliation	Question/Comment	Response
6.1	Patrick Donaldson	<i>Wilsonville Chamber of Commerce</i>	<p>There are changing dynamics of the types of aircraft all over the country. Will drones be analyzed?</p> <p>Most aviation press has talked about this changing dynamic and how aircraft are moving. Vans, located at the Airport, has a significant role in the international unmanned flight space. There are also developments in Salem related to PGE and rapid charging for unmanned drone taxis. It is suggested that the master plan includes at least a mention of the evolution of aviation and its potential impacts.</p>	<p>The integration of unmanned aerial systems (UAS) with airport airspace will be necessary, but forecasting their activity is challenging due to the lack of established methodology. Previous attempts to project UAS demand have been speculative. Facility needs, such as hangars for UAS storage, similar to conventional aircraft, aircraft parking, and electric aircraft charging facilities will be considered in the master plan landside facility alternatives. UAS operations will be regulated by air traffic control, and operators must comply with regulations. Currently, the master plan cannot precisely project UAS impacts or capacities, and ongoing integration with conventional aircraft will be required.</p>
6.2	Tony Helbling	<i>Aurora Airport Improvement Association</i>	<p>I'm concerned about the runway length of 5,500 feet. Based on the Gulf Stream 450's accelerate-stop distance, it does not account for real-world conditions faced by corporate pilots. While test pilots achieve this distance under optimal conditions, corporate pilots encounter varying factors and surprises, leaving no margin for error. Why was the previously planned 6,000 feet length not addressed in the summary.</p> <p>The Gulf Stream 450, already at the airport, is part of the same design class category as the Challenger 350, used as a representative aircraft in the master plan. The Gulf Stream 450 should</p>	<p>The FAA methodology for runway length evaluations must be followed in the master plan. The future critical aircraft is the Challenger 350, not the Gulf Stream 450. While the FAA runway length analysis includes a margin of safety for balanced field lengths, meeting FAA standards for runway safety areas is crucial. These areas provide an extra margin of safety for aircraft mishaps.</p> <p>The Gulf Stream 450 is included in the same airport reference code as the design aircraft. The FAA methodology accounts for the mix of aircraft in the fleet, including larger aircraft like the Gulf Stream.</p> <p>Tim House, FAA: Even if an aircraft like the Gulf Stream 450 operates at the</p>

¹ Live responses are included, along with additional information/clarification, as needed.
PAC Meeting #6 Summary

			be considered since it requires over 5,500 feet.	airport, it doesn't mean the runway and facilities must be modified to meet the full capacity and safety standards for every specific aircraft. If this were done for every aircraft, runways would need to be excessively long, to accommodate larger planes like the Boeing 777. Design standards and justified lengths need to be followed, as they have in this case.
6.3	Ted Millar	<i>AABC/TLM Holdings</i>	According to new FAA regulations for vertical takeoff aircraft, both electric and internal combustion types, master plans must consider separating these aircraft from regular airplanes due to downwash issues similar to helicopters. It should be separated. Please include this consideration in the master plan.	<p>Similar to how helicopters are handled, there should be a method to separate vertical takeoff aircraft from fixed-wing aircraft..</p> <p>It is challenging to accommodate various facilities within a finite landside area. There is demand for additional hangar space and different types of aircraft parking. Segregating vertical takeoff aircraft from other parked aircraft should be addressed in the planning, even if it means sacrificing space for other facilities like hangars or tie-downs. ODAV will make the final decision on this.</p>
6.4	Bruce Bennett	<i>Positive Aurora Airport Management</i>	The runway length is recommended at 5500 ft. The former Master Plans going back to 1976 show a 6000 preferred runway length? Why has that changed?	<p>Previous plans often included the maximum stage length of aircraft flights and other criteria that could result in a longer runway length that are no longer allowed in the runway calculations in the current FAA standards. The runway length analysis involves choosing the percentage of useful load and fleet based on FAA defined criteria, which can influence the results. We followed the applicable methodology for the airport to identify the runway length that was justified.</p> <p>Tim House, FAA: Many airports depict runways on their ALPs that they may</p>

				<p>never achieve or justify based on actual operations required to meet funding eligibility. The ALP may show longer runways than currently constructed to protect for future possibilities. However, what is justified is based on actual need and is what airports should work to protect through local zoning and regulatory entities. This distinction ensures that runways are not unnecessarily extended beyond what is operationally necessary.</p> <p>Tony Beach: Just a reminder that this is not a master plan update. This is a new master plan based on new data and is an independent analysis of the runway length and all the other facility requirements.</p>
<p>6.5</p>	<p>Councilor Dr. Joann Linville</p>	<p><i>City of Wilsonville</i></p>	<p>(In the chat) Question for Tim regarding the “no action alternative”: In some of the Preliminary Alternatives possible downgrade to B-II is mentioned. If there was a downgrade, how would that impact the identified non-standard deficiencies that have been identified?</p> <p>I’m concerned about the impact of downgrading to a B-II airport on identified deficiencies and non-standard conditions. Was the airport's change from a B level to a C-II level based on an FAA decision, and was it related to waived or unapproved use during the B-II period? Can larger aircraft using the airport lead to an FAA upgrade of the airport's level, regardless of whether those aircraft were approved to use the airport?</p>	<p>David Miller: The transition from a B-II to a C-II airport occurred gradually over the years as traffic levels evolved to include more C-II aircraft. There were no rules preventing C-II aircraft from operating at the airport as long as the runway could accommodate them. The evaluation for the master plan confirms that the airport now has enough C-II operations to meet the criteria for a C-II airport.</p> <p>Tim House, FAA: Aircraft performance varies based on factors like weight and fuel load. This variation is why there are different categories for approach speeds and aircraft size. The G450 aircraft, for example, falls into the C-II category for approach speeds, meaning it can operate at the airport. The decision to classify the airport as C-II is based on the number of C-II operations observed, not a specific FAA or airport decision. Once the number of C-II operations exceeds 500, actions must</p>

				<p>be taken to ensure compliance with FAA standards.</p> <p>David Miller: No runway length can accommodate all aircraft under all conditions. While some B-II, C-II, and D-II aircraft might not be able to operate on a 5,500-foot runway on a very hot day with a full load, pilots can adjust by reducing weight or waiting for cooler temperatures. This scenario is common across all airports, including commercial ones. Despite meeting C-II dimensional standards, there will be times when the runway length might not be sufficient under certain conditions, requiring pilots to make adjustments or use a different airport.</p>
6.6	Councilor Dr. Joann Linville	<i>City of Wilsonville</i>	<p>All current alternatives, excluding the downgrading to B-II, suggest extending the runway by 497 feet to the justified length. There might come a point where the airport could no longer expand due to limitations from adjacent land, highways, and land configurations. Will the FAA and ODAV acknowledge that they have reached the maximum expansion capacity and cannot accommodate larger aircraft due to these constraints?</p>	<p>Most airports face natural development constraints. The current master plan forecasts and design standards relate to C-II aircraft with a justified runway length of 5,500 feet. For the purposes of this 20-year master plan, this is considered the outer limit of development for the runway and taxiway system. Future master plans, possibly 10-15 years down the road, will need to reevaluate these constraints and requirements.</p>
6.7	Councilor Dr. Joann Linville	<i>City of Wilsonville</i>	<p>I'm also concerned about the significant costs and feasibility of the proposed alternatives, such as moving Highway 551, relocating the control tower, and reconstructing the runway. Is it realistic to expect the state to move a highway to accommodate the airport? Are</p>	<p>David Miller: There are challenges in meeting FAA standards for airports, and they often involve expensive fixes. This issue is widespread across many airports in the country. The FAA recognizes the high costs and challenges and that the key for ODAV is to identify the most viable option for compliance. Downsizing the airport is not acceptable to the FAA. The</p>

			<p>more limitations in the alternatives being considered?</p>	<p>preliminary alternatives presented are for discussion, and feedback will help refine these concepts, but no easy decisions are expected.</p> <p>Tony Beach, ODAV: That is a good summary and it's important to get feedback from the PAC, who represent all the different organizations and groups at the airport and surrounding communities. The purpose of the meeting and discussions is to consider these preliminary alternatives.</p>
<p>6.8</p>	<p>Bruce Bennett</p>	<p><i>Positive Aurora Airport Management</i></p>	<p>Wouldn't installing an FAA approved geo fabric eliminate the drain field challenge(s)</p>	<p>David Miller: The FAA runway safety area (RSA) standard requires the surface to be graded and compacted to support aircraft or emergency vehicles. If structural components are added to the drain field, it could potentially meet these requirements. The primary goal is to bring the RSA up to standards, including grading and compaction. If viable engineering solutions can achieve this, they would be considered. Otherwise, the drain field may need to be relocated outside the RSA, likely off airport property.</p> <p>Tim House, FAA: There are no FAA standards or specifications for structurally improving the sub-grade in the safety area. The drain field's user would not be eligible for FAA funding for such improvements.</p> <p>James Kirby: The existing drain field at the airport has been a challenge due to poor soil quality, which prevents proper infiltration. The soil conditions make it impossible to bury the drain field or add structural fill over it without compromising its function. The drain field needs to be close to the surface to</p>

				function properly, but its current location doesn't meet grading standards or allow for non-load bearing structures. The most viable solution appears to be reconstructing the drain field in a different location that meets these requirements.
6.9	Rian Johnson	<i>Vans Aircraft</i>	Bruce: yes, consider a GeoCell Ground Grid System	Thank you for your comment.
6.10	Dave Mauk	<i>Charbonneau Country Club</i>	Is there a scenario viable where the runway shifts east with taxiway on west side instead of east side?	The idea of flipping the taxiway to the west side hasn't been considered due to the current layout of adjacent landside facilities. Relocating the taxiway in this manner could lead to a constant stream of traffic crossing an active runway, which goes against good design practice aimed at minimizing such crossings.
6.10	Dave Mauk	<i>Charbonneau Country Club</i>	Following up Councilor Linville's question: B-II enables C-II aircraft to use airfield, so what's would be necessary to those requirements?	The C-II designation is based on the current airport traffic and forecasted airport traffic. Once you are at that level, the FAA standards are defined to accommodate C-II aircraft.
6.11	Wayne Richards	<i>Friends of French Prairie</i>	I was bothered by Alternative 6 and 7 being so small and not being as visible. C-II aircraft are already landing at the airport, so it's essential to analyze which option might cause more potential conflict with existing residential development, noise, and pollution. They may not specifically be FAA compliance issues, but they are significant enough to be considered in the decision-making matrix.	The refinement process will involve creating a matrix to compare the components of each alternative, which will identify their relative strengths, weaknesses, and challenges. The environmental and noise impacts analysis will be part of the master plan, but a detailed evaluation will typically occur during a separate environmental assessment study. We are using this meeting to gather feedback on the alternatives, not choose an option.
6.12	Bruce Bennett	<i>Positive Aurora Airport Management</i>	I think it's important to point out that 100% of any costs will be paid by FAA and or ODAV funds.	Thank you for your comment.

6.13	Councilor Dr. Joann Linville	<i>City of Wilsonville</i>	Costs are still paid by taxpayers. Has a runway extension of 248.5 feet both north and south been considered?	Splitting the extension between the two ends of the runway has been considered, but was not carried forward into these preliminary alternatives.
6.14	Bruce Bennett	<i>Positive Aurora Airport Management</i>	Yes, but I believe it is important to point out ONLY aviation taxes, no income or property taxes. Both ends should be considered. Thank you.	Tim House, FAA: FAA AIP funding is from taxes collected on aviation fuel sales, aviation parts, etc. not the General Fund, or other taxes. I am not exactly certain where ODAV funding comes from other than fees they charge the users.
6.15	Patrick Donaldson	<i>Wilsonville Chamber of Commerce</i>	<p>When I received the preliminary alternatives, I was pleased, but would like larger pictures. If I'm understanding correctly, the Aurora State Airport is classified as a C-II airport by the FAA. The alternatives were developed with the goal of either maintaining C-II status or returning to a B status. However, a decision was made that reverting to a B-II alternative was not justified by current and forecasted usage. The current C-II status was deemed justified based on FAA determinations of current and forecasted usage, not by any other entity.</p> <p>When was the forecast approved?</p>	<p>Yes, that is correct. Thank you. The airport's designation of C-II doesn't necessarily prevent occasional use by aircraft that exceed that designation. For example, a D-II aircraft could still land at a C-II airport. Changing the designation on paper wouldn't necessarily discourage such aircraft from landing. This inconsistency between designation and actual activity is a broader issue seen at many airports around the country.</p> <p>Tim House, FAA: The airport cannot fit into a B-II standard mold and the do-nothing alternative or reverting to a B-II status is not feasible. It would be going lower than doing nothing. The airport is clearly categorized as a C-II based on existing operations and forecasts. The goal of the master plan is to look 20 years ahead and make incremental steps towards meeting FAA standards, which is why the B-II option is not acceptable for moving forward for consideration in the master plan.</p> <p>The forecast was approved on January 23, 2024.</p>
6.16	Patrick Donaldson	<i>Wilsonville Chamber of Commerce</i>	It is important to understand the factual basis behind the current discussions about the airport's development. The process follows FAA guidelines and projections based on actual usage. There is a need for realistic expectations, and	Thank you for your comment.

			the process is not like designing a town center, as it is governed by national and federal laws and regulations.	
6.17	Dave Mauk	<i>Charbonneau Country Club</i>	So, the B-II alternative doesn't really exist (?)	FAA has determined that B-II alternatives are not viable. They will not be considered further.
6.18	Whitney Stewart	<i>Oregon Department of Emergency Management</i>	Good evening. During any of the master planning work for these airport upgrade suggestions, has emergency preparedness and response capabilities factored in? I am thinking specifically along the lines of runway hardening/seismic upgrading and storage capabilities for local resources such as material handling equipment and backup communications equipment? However, this may be outside the scope of this particular project.	Resiliency is an important factor in airport planning, especially regarding pavement and drainage work. While specific set-asides for equipment storage in emergencies haven't been identified, experience shows that in emergency scenarios, agencies like the National Guard will close the airport and use existing facilities as needed for response efforts. Emergency planning focuses on utilizing available resources rather than pre-designated storage areas.
6.19	Councilor Dr. Joann Linville	<i>City of Wilsonville</i>	What is the timeline for homing in on the preferred alternative? The methodology used by the FAA in determining the C-II classification for the airport did not use control tower data and used population studies when the airport doesn't have passenger service. I would like to know more about the methodology used.	The PAC will weigh in on the refined alternatives at the July 30 meeting. There will be a period for review and input, with the expectation of reaching a decision on the preferred alternative in the latter part of the summer, including a full plan on implementation. The project is expected to conclude by May of the following year. The evaluation of actual operations numbers was challenging due to limited data duration and the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on flight training activity, which led to an unsustainable growth rate in local operations.
6.20	David Waggoner	<i>Willamette Aviation</i>	The Aurora Airport currently has two Emergency Operations Centers located on the field. One is the Civil Air Patrol. The other is the Oregon Disaster Airlift Response Team. Both organizations are designed to support the State and local	Thank you for your comment.

			populations by responding to emergencies and natural disasters.	
6.21	Ted Millar	<i>AABC/TLM Holdings</i>	I'm concerned about the lack of itinerant parking for airplanes in the new master plan. When the airport was first given to the state of Oregon, there was a requirement to buy additional land for this purpose. Right now, it is being built out with hangars and all parking is left on private property. I'm also concerned about the removal of fire suppression tanks in the area and am wondering if these factors have been considered in the plan.	There are limited transient parking areas in the proposed concepts, which are mainly on ODA property. Smaller aircraft tie-downs are depicted in the south existing tie-down apron, along with some larger aircraft parking spaces. The itinerant parking, especially considering the potential location of a new FBO in the area, is a valid concern and something for ODAV to consider. The fire suppression tanks and potential relocation will need to be considered.
6.22	Tony Helbling	<i>Aurora Airport Improvement Association</i>	What about the easements in place for access for the through-the-fence owners to the taxiway in Figure 12? There are no restrictions for aircraft movement across that area.	Proposed improvements to meet FAA standards that impact existing easements will be coordinated between ODAV and the property owner.
6.23	Bruce Bennett	<i>Positive Aurora Airport Management</i>	There is property near Mid-field near Alpha 3 that ODAV could acquire. There is an issue with the diagram regarding direct access at midfield. The ramp and taxiway do not align as shown in the diagram, with the actual access being between two hangers, indicated by double yellow lines. The area might need to be repainted for clarity.	We are not at a point to make a decision on property acquisition at the moment. Any property acquisition would be a result of the master planning process and based on input from the PAC. Thank you for your comment.
6.24	Whitney Stewart	<i>Oregon Department of Emergency Management</i>	David Waggoner- thank you for that information and that is great to have two great resources staged/poised to operate from the airport in times of need.	Thank you for your comment.

Attendee Questions/Comments and Responses²

ID	Name	Question/Comment	Response
6.25	Anonymous Attendee	How many years has that 'developable land' been available, and why was it not developed long ago? How does this relate to the massive off-airport acreage developed beyond ODAV's control?	According to a review of historic aerial photography (Source: Google Earth), that piece of ODAV property has been undeveloped since at least 1994. Development on the airport is market driven and is primarily accomplished through private development on leased land. Up until this time, a developer with interest in leasing property in that area had not been identified. Currently, there are ongoing negotiations regarding the lease of that property for aeronautical development.
6.26	Anonymous Attendee	Regarding G-IV and Tony's comment... Is it true that 5,500 ft is half the length and width of the runway at PDX?	PDX has three runways that are all 150 feet wide. According to FAA Airport Master Records and Reports, Runway 3/21 is 6,000 feet long, Runway 10L/28R is 9,825 feet long, and Runway 10R/28L is 11,000 feet long.
6.27	Anonymous Attendee	Does a septic drainfield in the RSA conform with FAA standards, for safety in handling overruns?	The drain field located in the south end of the RSA does not meet load bearing requirements for the RSA and will require mitigation to meet compliance with standards. Additionally, there are posts and plastic pipes that penetrate ROFA standards and would require mitigation.
6.28	Anonymous Attendee	What design standards would make the RPZ legal by FAA standards? I.e., what aircraft group and visibility minimum standard works today?	FAA design standards, including RPZs, are simply standards meant to accommodate safe operation by aircraft that regularly use a facility. They are neither legal, nor illegal. With that being said, RPZs are meant to address land use off the ends of runways. Examples of incompatible land uses within an RPZ include places where people reside and gather (homes, parks, schools, churches, etc), and critical infrastructure (public roads, utilities). The current RPZs contain roads, residential homes,

² Live responses are included, along with additional information/clarification, as needed.
PAC Meeting #6 Summary

			<p>and neighboring helicopter support facilities.</p> <p>Mitigation of incompatible land uses in RPZs may involve relocation or removal of the land use (i.e. reroute roads) or altering approach procedure visibility minimums to reduce the RPZ dimensions. In this case, raising approach procedure visibility minimums to not lower than 1-mile would reduce the width of the RPZ, which would mitigate many of the residential areas and road conflicts. See the Preliminary Alternatives Summary on the project website for more information.</p>
6.29	Anonymous Attendee	Correction, previous question is about the ROFA (hard to see on this tiny graphic).	The drain field does not meet RSA load bearing requirements. However, there are posts and plastic pipes that do penetrate ROFA standards and would require mitigation.
6.30	Anonymous Attendee	If you shift the runway to the east, what are the rough cost, and is the actual intent to rebuild it for heavier weight bearing capacity?	The goal of these preliminary alternative concepts is to answer the big questions that will allow us to move forward with more detailed refined alternative concepts. Order-of-magnitude cost estimates and final configurations will be developed as we continue through the development alternative process. Any reconstruction of the runway will be designed to support the critical aircraft, as identified in the master plan.
6.31	Anonymous Attendee	Relocate the tower which was just built a few years ago... how does this reflect on how well this airport is being managed by ODAV? I.e., is it reasonable for a citizen to conclude with this proposal, all past airport master plans have just been an expensive exercise failing to help ODAV manage this airport?	<p>Alternatives that propose shifting the runway east to deconflict Hubbard Highway and the ROFA will necessitate the relocation of the Air Traffic Control Tower (ATCT).</p> <p>When the existing ATCT was constructed, it was designed and built to current FAA standards.</p>
6.32	Anonymous Attendee	Miller is saying FAA shot down a downgrade to B-II. Please include ALL notes and correspondence into the public record of who advocated for what, and the what and why of the need to 'reject' this otherwise good idea.	FAA reviewed the preliminary alternatives and provided an email from Tim House (FAA) dated Friday June 7, 2024 stating that the B-II concepts are not viable and requesting that they be removed from the presentation is included in the Preliminary Alternative

			Summary available on the Meetings tab of the project website.
6.33	Chad Robertson	Is there a preferred alternative that has been shown that the panel is leaning towards? What is the most likely outcome?	A preferred alternative has not been identified at this point in the process. Refined alternatives will be presented at future meetings as the Planning Team works toward a preferred alternative, based on input from the PAC, public, and FAA.
6.34	Chris Neamtzu, <i>City of Wilsonville</i> <i>Alternate</i>	Will there be other alternatives generated for the PAC's consideration at the July meeting, or will a decision be made on the four remaining viable alternatives?	The presented concepts are open to refinement based on the input received. We are open to ideas. Often, feedback leads to creating hybrid solutions combining elements from different alternatives. This process is part of a 20-year plan, and any improvements like runway extensions would be implemented gradually through various projects. While the planning analysis is essential to qualify for funding, the airport owner is not obligated to extend the runway. The team welcomes suggestions for alternatives and will refine the options based on feedback. In the July meeting, we will present more detailed, refined alternatives for further input, focusing on viable options based on current forecasts and facility requirements, excluding non-viable B2 options.
6.35	Anonymous Attendee	If an aircraft exceeds the weight capacity of the runway or taxiway, does the pilot have an obligation to get pre-approval from the airport authority, ODAV in this case? What has been the ODAV position on use by G-IV's and other larger bizjets?	ODAV requires an overweight waiver for aircraft that exceed the runway's weight-bearing capacity. Each request for a waiver is reviewed and approved at the discretion of ODAV. There are aircraft that meet the current critical design category that do exceed weight bearing capacity.
6.36	Anonymous Attendee	Tim House says, once the count exceeds 500.. so, does that mean an aircraft owner can base a large D-III aircraft and do lots of very short hops to PDX (using KUAO as a garage for activities centered at PDX) and thus 'build up' a D-III count to force ODAV to	Critical aircraft and Regular Use are defined in AC 150/5000-17, Section 1.2: 1.2 What is the Definition of Critical Aircraft and Regular Use?

		upgrade and extend into and over neighbors? Is this crazy or what?	1.2.1 The critical aircraft is the most demanding aircraft type, or grouping of aircraft with similar characteristics, that make regular use of the airport. Regular use is 500 annual operations, including both itinerant and local operations but excluding touch-and-go operations. An operation is either a takeoff or landing.
6.37	Anonymous Attendee	Why does this feel like airport neighbors are 'David' and FAA-ODAV are 'Goliath', and slingshots are nowhere to be found?	ODAV is undergoing a public process to gather input from all stakeholders of the Airport. Input from all stakeholders has been and will continue to be considered as we move through this master plan.
6.38	Anonymous Attendee	Bringing the drainfield to standards... how can compaction be used, when it conflicts with drainfield functionality?	Drain fields, by their characteristics necessary to function in the soils present on the airport, cannot meet RSA standards. Any additional compaction reduces absorption and limits the amount of oxygen to keep aerobic drain field bacteria alive. Existing drain field materials and structures are not designed for aircraft weight.
6.39	Anonymous Attendee	If the runway was SHORTENED (or never improperly extended) would that possibly resolve the drainfield conflict? Can we consider runway shortening as an engineered solution to this problem?	Based on the critical aircraft and associated runway standards, a runway shortening is not a viable alternative. Drain fields within the RSA will require other forms of mitigation.
6.40	Chad Robertson	Has there been any more conversation with extending Aurora's sewage line and eliminating the drainage fields all together?	Future plans for City of Aurora's sanitary sewer network are the responsibility of the City and are outside the scope of this project.
6.41	George Buley	Is there a detailed analysis showing step by step how the runway length was determined using the forecast design aircraft? Providing this data may answer how FAA's design standards consider other criteria other than operating requirements.	Yes. The runway length analysis is discussed in detail in Chapter 4 – Facility Goals and Requirements.
6.42	Anonymous Attendee	What design standards would make the RPZ legal by FAA standards? I.e., what aircraft group and visibility minimum standard works today?	FAA design standards, including RPZs, are simply standards meant to accommodate safe operation by aircraft that regularly use a facility. They are neither legal, nor illegal. With that being said, RPZs are meant to address land

			<p>use off the ends of runways. Examples of incompatible land uses within an RPZ include places where people reside and gather (homes, parks, schools, churches, etc.), and critical infrastructure (public roads, utilities). The current RPZs contain roads, residential homes, and neighboring helicopter support facilities. Mitigation of incompatible land uses in RPZs may involve relocation or removal of the land use (i.e. reroute roads) or altering approach procedure visibility minimums to reduce the RPZ dimensions. In this case, raising approach procedure visibility minimums to not lower than 1-mile would reduce the width of the RPZ, which would mitigate many of the residential areas and road conflicts. See the Preliminary Alternatives Summary on the project website for more information.</p>
<p>6.43</p>	<p>Wayne Richards (response)</p>	<p>The cart before the horse? So if C 2s are allowed now as a pilot choice why spend all the money to try to make Aurora a bigger airport. They're fine just as they are without extension. Do not eliminate Alt 7?</p>	<p>Aurora State Airport is currently a C-II airport. The alternatives presented are concepts intended to meet C-II standards, including proposed property acquisition required. The proposed runway extension is justified to support the safe operation of aircraft already using the Airport. FAA has indicated that B-II concepts, including (former) Alternative 7 are not viable and will not be considered further.</p>
<p>6.44</p>	<p>Chris Neamtzu, City of Wilsonville Alternate</p>	<p>Is cost a consideration for ODAV in considering the most viable alternative? If it is, then cost estimates for each alternative would appear to be warranted</p>	<p>While both scenarios presented would be costly, a direct cost comparison between them has not yet been conducted. Developing preliminary high-level costs for each option would be useful in the refinement process to help understand the order of magnitude of the expenses involved. While cost is a significant factor, the implementation challenges for each scenario could be equally complex. FAA funding would likely cover a large portion, if not the</p>

			majority, of the costs, with the remaining balance being the local share. The federal share typically ranges from 90% to 95% depending on the authorization bills from Congress at the time of the project.
6.45	George Buley	I asked this question at the last meeting. Does ODAV own drainfields in the RSA?	ODAV does not own any drain fields on the Airport. Please see our response to your question in the PAC Meeting #5 Summary (Question 5.19) available on the project website.
6.46	George Buley	Per Airport Master Plan AC, runway length does include aircraft operating characteristics. My mistake. Excerpt:) Length – The length of a runway is a function of many factors, the most notable of which are the selection of an appropriate design aircraft and the longest nonstop distance to be flown by the design aircraft from the airport. Aircraft-specific runway length requirements are a function of aircraft physical characteristics at time of flight, weather conditions, and runway conditions. See FAA AC 150/5325-4, Runway Length Requirements for Airport Design, for guidance on this analysis. Other common resources for runway length assessments are the aircraft characteristics information published by aircraft manufacturers, consultation with aircraft operators at the airport, and the FAA document, Best Practices: Planning Airports for Business Jets. Aircraft manufacturers may be able to provide airport-specific runway length requirements for their aircraft, especially at airports with severe conditions...	Thank you for your comment.

Additional Emailed Comments

ID	Name	Affiliation	Question/Comment	Response
6.47	Councilor Dr. Joanne Linville	<i>City of Wilsonville</i>	Brandy - the supplied "Preliminary Alternatives" document is really insufficient to adequately prepare for the upcoming PAC meeting. There does not appear to be adequate and comprehensive analyses of each	Thanks so much for reaching out. Yes, you're correct that tomorrow night's PAC meeting will be focused on reviewing each of the preliminary alternatives. We've extended the meeting by an hour (5:00-8:00 pm) to give plenty of time for

			<p>alternative including assessments of benefits and constraints of each of the alternatives based on FAA regulations, ODT constraints, land use regulations, ROFA, RSA, RPZ requirements, environmental and community impacts. Will that be provided to the PAC and the general public? Providing a matrix for each alternative including strengths and constraints would be very helpful.</p>	<p>committee members to ask questions and get clarity on the details before providing feedback to ODAV. I'll pass along your idea for a matrix to show the differences between the alternatives.</p> <p>Regarding the public information, we will have the public open house on Thursday of this week where we'll be able to walk people through those details and answer their questions. We'll also post the materials on the website, along with a comment form, for anyone that can't attend on Thursday.</p> <p>I hope that helps answer your questions, but please let me know if you have any other questions or concerns.</p>
<p>6.48</p>	<p>Harmon and Janette Laurin</p>	<p><i>City of Wilsonville</i></p>	<p>We are writing to express our strong objection to lengthening runways and increasing size of aircraft at Aurora Airport. Planes from this airport already take off and land over densely populated areas and this proposal will seriously adversely affect communities in and near the flight path both in terms of noise and quality of life, and also in terms of safety. In addition, the Boone Bridge section of I-5 is already a traffic nightmare and adding traffic to and from the airport is not tenable. We have a more than adequate airport in Portland and the studies do not support the need for this expansion any time in the near future</p> <p>Please take citizens and neighbors' concerns into consideration and stop any expansion of Aurora Airport.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. We will make sure that your comments (along with those from residents, government partners, and businesses) are included in the information that the Oregon Department of Aviation (ODAV) considers in the Aurora Airport Master Plan.</p>

<p>6.49</p>	<p>Bruce Bennett</p>	<p><i>Aurora Aircraft, LLC</i></p>	<p>Attached is an outline of the property parcel that I showed to Tony & Kenji and that is available to ODAV.</p> <p>As we discussed, this Aurora ramp space would facilitate a huge improvement in Aircraft and vehicle movement at UAO.</p> <p>This property transfer would go along with ODAV’s 1995 plans to own & control ramp space as well as the FAA’s 1985 directive for ODAV to increase their UAO ownership percentage</p> <p>Please add this to the master plan record and contact me with any questions.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Potential property acquisitions are being evaluated through the development alternatives process.</p>
<p>6.50</p>	<p>Chelsea Ausland</p>	<p><i>Metro West Realty</i></p>	<p>I am opposed to the expansion of the Aurora Airport. As a resident in Wilsonville, OR, I already see far too many large and small planes above my house. The noise is awful and scares the wildlife. The small is also terrible and has notably affected our health.</p>	<p>Thank you for sending us your thoughts about the runway length and aircraft size at the Aurora State Airport. We will make sure that your comments (along with those from local residents, government partners, and businesses) are included in the information that the Oregon Department of Aviation (ODAV) considers in the Aurora Airport Master Plan. You can find more information at the project website and also submit other questions or concerns you might have: https://publicproject.net/AuroraAirport#</p> <p>Thank you again for taking time to send us your comments.</p>
<p>6.51</p>	<p>Kristin Roche</p>	<p><i>Website Comment</i></p>	<p>For too long Charlotte Lehan, Tim Knapp, Greg Leo and the current Wilsonville City Council have stood in the way of much needed progress of bringing the airport up to date. In fact, I would argue the City makes a big show of fighting the airport expansion to secure NIMBY (not-in-</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment.</p>

			<p>my-backyard) votes to distract from the major issues it is dealing with. These include major traffic, congestion and parking issues that have been eroding public support for current council urban renewal projects like gutting Town Center with thousands of people. It is long passed time that the airport be upgraded and expanded.</p>	
6.52	Trevor Conroy	<i>Website Comment</i>	<p>We are local residents in Butteville and we totally support the planned growth of the Aurora State airport, adding 500ft to one end of the runway to increase safety margins for larger aircraft and develop the land mid-field with hangars. UAO is a fantastic airport that has so many businesses, employing many locals.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment, ODAV appreciates the support of the community and airport users.</p>
6.53	Leann Bennett	<i>Metro-West Realty</i>	<p>Good Day!</p> <p>I am writing of support for the Aurora airport runway extension.</p> <p>This airport is so critically important to our area, providing over 1200 jobs, providing fire fighting equipment and expertise (Columbia Helicopter/HTC) and life saving services (Lifeflight/ organ transport services).</p> <p>Adding 500' to the runway will make the airport safer as any pilot can attest. Having lost a best friend in an airplane accident at Coos Bay/South Bend off the end of the runway, I know this is a life or death solution.</p> <p>Please support this extension which has been part of the master plan since the 70's for safety reasons.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment ODAV appreciates the support of the community and airport users..</p>

			<p>This is also ground zero for subduction earthquake disaster relief. ODART is doing a simulation soon in support of this.</p> <p>Look at the big picture. Airplanes fly over every corner of the United States- (except military restricted zones).</p> <p>They use navigational way points to travel. People near those way points are just as equally affected by airplanes as those near an airport and do they send you their complaints?</p> <p>I recently sold a \$2,000,000 home across the street from the Newberg VOR on Chehalem Mountain. They were not concerned in the least about aircraft traffic.</p> <p>Thank you for your time and consideration,</p> <p>Leann Bennett, Principal Broker</p>	
<p>6.54</p>	<p>Mike Walsh</p>	<p><i>Charbonneau Resident</i></p>	<p>I won't be able to attend the North Marion High meeting tonight to discuss the Airport Master Plan. I would like to itemize the problems or issues with the plan from my perspective as a home owner.</p> <p>-I live in Charbonneau and have for the last 15 years. Over the last 4-5 years the number of aircrafts and the overflight noise has increased greatly which makes it very difficult to hear when sitting on my porch when the planes fly so close over Charbonneau. It sometimes feels like the plane is going to crash. The noise level is much more obvious at Charbonneau than downtown</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. ODAV is aware of the noise concerns held by members of the Charbonneau community. Noise impacts are being considered through the development alternatives process and a noise study will be completed for the preferred alternative.</p>

		<p>Wilsonville because the flight plans go straight over Charbonneau.</p> <p>-to extend the airport runway will allow larger aircrafts to use it and increase even more the noise level. The infra structure to support increase usage is not mentioned in any of the master plans I have read. Why is that? Traffic on I-5 is already horrendous and the rural roads around the airport cannot handle more cars/trucks.</p> <p>-if only the flight plans to depart and arrive would be vectored away from Charbonneau. I can see the aircraft markings from my porch so they are sometimes not very high in the sky..... For example why can't the planes fly over I-5 or over the many acres of forest and farm land to access the runway. Take the planes away from the populated areas of Wilsonville. Think of options which will accomplish what both the locals and the airport want...a compromise so one side isn't the loser.</p> <p>-I fear the interests of our neighborhoods have taken a back seat for financial gain of the airport businesses and the ODA. The methods that the ODA has taken to push this master plan in the past is evidence of my concern.</p> <p>-Bigger doesn't mean better nor changing what has worked for this small airport. Put the interest of local residents as the reason to NOT implement the master plan. Consider the future of the</p>	
--	--	--	--

			communities who have to live around the airport	
6.55	Mark Johnson	<i>City of Wilsonville</i>	<p>Aurora Airport Expansion</p> <p>Noise Mitigation</p> <p>Request that if the airport is allowed to lengthen the runway for larger aircraft, that those flights be limited to the I-5 freeway corridor. That steeper take-off angles be mandated. And that Wilsonville OR be designated a Noise Abatement Zone. Today, Helicopter Transport fly directly over our home in Wilsonville. Sometimes at low altitude but always in the late and early morning hours. Our windows shake and dogs bark in the neighborhood.</p> <p>To be fair, you have already addressed this issue by requiring pilots of business jets to gain altitude quickly but still present noise pollution upon take-off and landing over town.. along with helicopter "red-eye" service.</p> <p>The I-5 corridor won't eliminate noise but will help.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>ODAV does not have any airspace authority or regulate how pilots operate their aircraft. Those are the responsibility of the FAA. However, our published noise abatement procedures do encourage traffic to turn over I-5 and avoid flying over neighboring communities such as Wilsonville. Helicopter Transport Services is not part of the Aurora State Airport, but we will pass on your message to them as well.</p> <p>I appreciate you sending these comments and we will continue to work with our operators to fly neighborly and avoid noise sensitive areas in our community.</p>
6.56	Janet Moss and Family	<i>City of Wilsonville</i>	<p>Please record that we strongly oppose this expansion. There are multiple alternative airports in the greater Portland/Salem area to use for larger, heavier aircraft.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment.</p>
6.57	John Andrews and Jean Gaumer	<i>Charbonneau Residents</i>	<p>My wife and I are residents of Charbonneau (Wilsonville). We wish to register our strong opposition to any proposed airport expansion. Expansion of the airport, especially the lengthening of the runway, will encourage increased air</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. ODAV is aware of the noise concerns held by members of the Charbonneau community. Noise impacts are being considered through the development alternatives process and a noise study will be completed for the preferred</p>

			<p>traffic and enable and encourage larger jets that will further increase overflight noise. The increased air traffic will also lead to increased local road traffic in the vicinity of the airport and on I-5.</p> <p>The city of Wilsonville has registered opposition to the airport expansion and listed many reasons that the expansion is ill advised and unnecessary. We join with the City in opposition to airport expansion.</p> <p>Another factor in our opposition to airport expansion is that other property owners in the vicinity of the airport will seek exceptions to the land use restrictions outside the urban development zone. Langdon Farms has already sought an exception to the land use regulations to build a truck depot. If the airport were to be expanded, that would provide more justification for Langdon Farms and other property owners to convert from recreational use and farmland to industrial uses in support of the expanded airport.</p> <p>We have lived in Charbonneau for twelve years and have enjoyed the relative quiet of the area and lived with the current level of noise from jet overflights. Increase in the level of aircraft noise and road traffic through expansion of the airport would degrade the area irreparably. Please do not expand the airport and especially do not lengthen the runway to enable larger jets to land and take off from the Aurora State Airport.</p>	<p>alternative and included in the Airport Master Plan</p>
--	--	--	--	--

			I was disappointed that I was unable to speak to a senior member of the Oregon Department of Aviation at the June 13 meeting.	
6.58	Bruce Bennett	<i>Blue Sky Aurora LLC</i>	I request that the one-acre ramp parcel that I own abutting the SW corner of ODAV's landside parcel be considered as potential additional ODAV ramp for short term Aircraft parking and as a taxi lane to allow aircraft and vehicle access to the ODAV parcel from taxiway A. This small parcel could open up access for the tower, Pacific Coast Avionics, the CAA, and the entire ODAV ramp.	Thank you for your comment.
6.59	Bruce Bennett	<i>Blue Sky Aurora LLC</i>	As a PAC member, I strongly discourage any plan to move the runway due to the existing ramp constraints with a "one sided" (due to hwy 551) Airport and due to the giant cost, complexity, destruction of existing businesses, and unknowable time schedule. Thank you.	Thank you for your comment.