

AURORA STATE AIRPORT



PLANNING ADVISORY COMMITTEE (PAC) WORKING SESSION #3 SUMMARY

Date: Tuesday, July 30, 2024
Time: 5:00-8:00 pm
Location: Zoom Webinar

In Attendance

PAC Members Present

Ben Williams, *Friends of French Prairie*
Bill Graupp, *Aurora CTE, Inc*
Bruce Bennett, *Positive Aurora Airport Management*
Cathryn Stephens, *ODAV Board*
Alvin Klassen, *Marion County*
Councilor Joann Linville, *City of Wilsonville*
David Waggoner, *Willamette Aviation*
Dave Mauk, *Charbonneau Country Club*
Ken Ivey, *Aurora Butteville Barlow Community Planning Organization*
Melissa Ahrens, *alternate, Oregon Dept of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD)*
Naomi Zwerdling, *Oregon Dept of Transportation*
Pam Barlow Lind, *Confederated Tribes of the Siletz Indians*
Patrick Donaldson, *Wilsonville Chamber of Commerce*
Ted Millar, *AABC/TLM Holdings*
Tony Helbling, *Aurora Airport Improvement Association*

PAC Members Absent

Austin Barnes, *Marion County Planning Dept.*
Beth Wytoski, *Regional Solutions*
Ben Clayton, *Life Flight Network*
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 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*
Rian Johnson, *Vans Aircraft*
Rob Roedts, *Columbia Helicopters*
Robert Fournier, *Helicopter Transport Service*
Roger Kaye, *1000 Friends of Oregon*
Trent Brownlee, *Atlantic Aviation*
Wayne Richards, *Alternate, Friends of the French Prairie*
Whitney Stewart, *Oregon Office of Emergency Management*

Agency Representatives Present

Brandon Pike, *ODAV*
Tony Beach, *ODAV*

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*
Ashley Balsom, *JLA Public Involvement*

Audience / Members of the Public

Dave Tibbetts
George Van Hoomissen
George Buley
Greg Leo
Joseph Schaefer
Jennifer Redding
Mayor Julie Fitzgerald, *City of Wilsonville*
Mark Ottenad, *City of Wilsonville/SMART*
Tess Chadil
Tom Herzog
4785t
Aleta Best

Overview

CWE reviewed common questions regarding the FAA approved forecast and answered clarifying questions from the Planning Advisory Committee (PAC). CWE reviewed common questions and key considerations from Draft Chapter 4 Facility Requirements and answered clarifying questions from the PAC. CWE reviewed comment themes from the PAC and public on the Preliminary Alternatives shared in the June PAC meeting and Open House. CWE presented Refined Preliminary Alternatives based on PAC and public feedback. PAC members reviewed, asked questions about, and provided feedback on the refined preliminary 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. Brandy also alerted the PAC that a virtual feedback form will be available for them to provide more lengthy comments about the preliminary alternatives over the next three weeks. She added that ODAV would like to hear from every member to ensure all viewpoints are collected before moving forward to more refined options.

Presentation

David Miller, Century West, presented on the Airport Master Plan to ensure that the entire group was working with the same information and data. The first two topics were repetitive from previous meetings and materials; only the Meeting #6 themes and Refined Preliminary Alternatives section included new information.

Forecasting Methodology

David addressed forecast modeling methodology and selection questions posed by the group. He summarized how the Facility Requirements were evaluated, including the reasoning behind the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) approved forecast model. The FAA approved aviation activity and established C-II design standards for the airport for both current and future design aircraft. This was based on Portland State University (PSU) 2021-2041 Population Forecast; this methodology was approved by FAA in lieu of Air Traffic Control (ATC) data due to the COVID-19 pandemic affecting ATC data collection.

David then opened the floor to clarifying questions from PAC members. **Dave Mauk, Charbonneau Country Club** and **Ted Millar, AABC/TLM Holdings** both asked questions, which are included in the table below (WS.1; WS.2). David then summarized that the ATC data existed for a limited period and a number of events occurred during that period which affected the ability to forecast growth.

There were no more clarifying questions. Brandy closed the floor to questions but noted that there would be a longer opportunity later for comments and discussion.

Facility Requirements Summary

David then reminded the group that during previous meetings the justified runway length from the analysis, which meets FAA requirements, is 5,500 feet. David also summarized the design standards and opened the floor to clarifying questions from PAC members. **Ben Williams, Friends of French Prairie** asked a question which is included in the table below (WS.3)

PAC Meeting #6 Input Themes

The project team received limited input from PAC members following meeting #6, but the themes were on **noise concerns, EFU land impacts, property acquisition needs, increase in traffic/operations, and impacts to existing roads.**

Brandy asked if anyone had additional comments to add; **Patrick Donaldson, Wilsonville Chamber of Commerce** and **Ben Williams, Friends of French Prairie** each raised their hands. Their questions are included in the table below (WS.4-WS.6)

Refined Preliminary Alternatives

David then reviewed the refined preliminary alternatives that included feedback from PAC members and the community via the online survey and in-person event in June. He reiterated the following information that will further shape the refined preliminary alternatives.

- Maintaining current non-standard conditions is not acceptable to FAA
- FAA requires airfield facilities to be consistent with forecast demand and the associated design standards
- The runway may be placed in maintenance-only mode by FAA until progress is made towards meeting design standards
- Failure to make measurable progress may jeopardize future FAA funding

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

- All airside alternatives will include a parallel taxi lane adjacent to the east parallel taxiway to accommodate aircraft movement and access from landside facilities to the taxiway
- A Vehicle Service Road (VSR) will be provided along the frontage of the east landside areas
- East Side Property Acquisition - lands currently in aeronautical use in the vicinity of the Aurora State Airport are identified as reserve for future property acquisition from willing sellers to insure continued long-term aeronautical use
- The South Runway Extension Option was eliminated from further consideration due to its greater need for property acquisition and impact on EFU land when ODAV has sufficient land available on the north end of their property to accommodate the proposed extension.
- The existing ODOT Hubbard Highway right-of-way width (200' +/-) will be maintained for all airside alternatives

Brandy asked if anyone had additional comments to add; **Patrick Donaldson, *Wilsonville Chamber of Commerce*** had comments about EFU lands and concerns about the process of eliminating alternatives. **Ben Williams, *Friends of French Prairie***, also asked a question about EFU lands and acquisition. **Dave Mauk, *Charbonneau Country Club*** asked a question about exploring a hybrid of the refined alternatives as a solution. The questions and answers are included in the table below (WS.7-WS.14).

Brandy reiterated that the project team is currently in the winding-down process and thanked Patrick for bringing up questions about the elimination process. David then presented on each of the Refined Preliminary Alternatives:

Refined Option for Preliminary Alternative 1 (1A) – Impacts to both aeronautical use facilities and non-aeronautical properties

- Extends existing runway 497 feet north (5,500 feet)
- Shifts Hubbard Highway and ODOT right-of way (ROW) approximately 80 feet west to clear ROFA; assumes new highway is centered in ROW and with the same roadway configuration
- Maintains existing ODOT ROW width (200') by acquiring additional ROW on west side of highway

Refined Option for Preliminary Alternative 1 (1B) - Minimizes impacts to aeronautical facilities with greater impacts to non-aeronautical properties

- Extends Runway 497 feet north (5,500 feet)
- Shifts Runway approximately 80 feet west to accommodate parallel taxi lane and vehicle service road on east side
- Maintains existing 200' wide Hubbard Highway right-of way and shifts ROW approximately 175 feet west to clear ROFA
- Reduced impacts to existing east hangars

Refined Option for Preliminary Alternative 2

- Extends Runway 497 feet north (5,500 feet)
- Runway & Parallel Taxiway is shifted 85 feet east to clear Hubbard Highway
- No change to Hubbard Highway required
- No property acquisition required west of Hubbard Highway

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

- Maintains existing ODOT ROW and west airport property boundary
- Reroutes Keil Road to clear ROFA and TOFA

PAC Questions and Comments

Brandy opened the discussion for PAC questions. *Comments and responses are provided in the table below (WS.15-19).*

David reiterated that the purpose of the Master Plan process is to identify projects that are justified and that can ultimately be funded; everything comes back to meeting FAA standards. All options involve significant costs and would be a significant effort. No option would happen overnight but will require ongoing coordination.

FAA funding is not guaranteed, but the vast majority of costs associated with this project would be funded through FAA dollars (airport user trust fund dollars), including highway reconfiguration.

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 (WS.20-WS.22).*

Next Steps

Brandy reminded the group that ODAV and the planning team will continue to take PAC comments and public comments for an additional three weeks, until August 20th. The presentation and recording are both on the website to review.

The next virtual PAC meeting is scheduled for September 17th, 2024. It is a working session where the PAC will continue the conversation and talk through any further refinements based on feedback. The last PAC meeting will be in December.

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
WS.1	Dave Mauk	Charbonneau Country Club	<p>Are there some airports that you know or have looked at that would serve as a model for our general Information purposes that are roughly the same demographic, the same size in a rural, borderline metro area, like ours is? That we can use as a reference point.</p>	<p>I think that's a common method. And when you go back and look at the forecast models in Chapter 3 – the table that summarizes the models, including the recommended model – one of the models that we considered was the Terminal Area Forecast model for Oregon. So basically, airports with air traffic control towers in Oregon.</p> <p>So it's kind of comparable to what you're describing. And that growth rate was similar. All the growth rates in that category were below 1% per year, and there's some differences between them, but negligible in terms of actual growth.</p> <p>So that's one example. But I think the other comparison is when we look at the FAA National Aerospace Forecast, when they have both historical data and their forecast data for general aviation airports with traffic control towers, that captures the same kind of airport that Aurora is: general aviation airports, as opposed to air carrier airports.</p> <p>Airports like that, that have control towers, tend to be, as you pointed out, maybe larger population centers or urban areas.</p>
WS.2	Ted Millar	AABC/TLM Holdings	<p>I just wondered if they'd taken consideration flights that occur when the tower's not open, because I think some of the towers are open longer than Aurora.</p>	<p>We took into consideration the fact that the tower at Aurora is not open 24 hours a day, and in the evaluation of activity, the baseline operations and numbers, we were able to approximate activity after hours.</p> <p>But you're right. The majority of tower air traffic control towers at general</p>

¹ Live responses are included, along with additional information/clarification, as needed.
PAC Working Session 3 Summary

				aviation airports do not operate on a 24 hour per day schedule. So there's a combination of working hours and that, of course, includes towers that are staffed by FAA personnel, and there are towers that are staffed by contract operators.
WS.3	Ben Williams	<i>Friends of French Prairie</i>	So specific to the Hubbard highway aspect of the different alternatives, have you been in dialogue with ODOT on realignment of highway 551? And if so, what is ODOT's position on that requirement?	<p>The answer is that ODAV has reached out to ODOT, and they are in consultation. We are waiting to hear more on that, and Tony Beach is on the line here and can also weigh in, but that's where that stands right now.</p> <p>Tony Beach, ODAV: That's right. We've reached out to the Department of Transportation and are just trying to get their input on the feasibility of this alternative, if that one were to be the selected alternative.</p>
WS.4	Patrick Donaldson	<i>Wilsonville Chamber of Commerce</i>	Is there any assessment of the economic impact positively or negatively, about any of these issues?	<p>Not as part of the Master Plan scope of work.</p> <p>If you're talking about assessing the economic impacts in terms of elements like job creation or things of that, that is not part of the scope.</p>
WS.5	Patrick Donaldson	<i>Wilsonville Chamber of Commerce</i>	Has it been brought to your attention about the standing that small business administration has with regards to any and all Federal assessments, airports or other things?	I think that likely falls under NEPA and environmental assessments for projects which include economic and other related issues. So yes.
WS.6	Ben Williams	<i>Friends of French Prairie</i>	So my questions about impacts and concerns. Actually, David, it jumps back to the airside facility requirements, which shows the drain field in the RSA at the south end of the runway protection area. Is there a reason why the Columbia septic field, which is located at the	<p>The reason is that the drain field that's at the south end of the runway is in the existing runway safety area. The drain fields at the north end of the one way are not in the current runway safety area. So that's the reason why the North Greenfields are not called out currently as nonconforming. Or, in other words,</p>

			<p>north end isn't shown? It's right there in the airport at the time.</p>	<p>the runway is not non-conforming in that sense.</p> <p>Now, if you may recall from our preliminary alternatives where we looked at runway extension options north and south; The option of extending the runway to the north would bring one, or possibly both, of those drain fields into the RSA. So they would then be subject to the same requirements and they would need to be relocated if that was the preferred option for extending the runway. But as it stands right now, the drain fields of the North End are not in the RSA area.</p>
<p>WS.7</p>	<p>Patrick Donaldson</p>	<p><i>Wilsonville Chamber of Commerce</i></p>	<p>You gave, in my opinion, short shrift to the discussion about the EFU land at the south entrance. Talk in more detail about how that gets removed off the consideration of that significant impact, as you went into more detail about significant impact upon Hubbard Highway.</p>	<p>Okay, that's a great question. Sure. Yeah, I think with the choice between the north and south options that touched on the EFU land, it is EFU land, but it's also land that would need to be acquired.</p> <p>So, in addition to the EFU land, the South runway extension option would require property acquisition to accommodate the extended runway, the runway safety area, etc. The north extension option does not require property acquisition, and it does not affect the EFU land the way the south extension does. Now, that isn't to say that there would not be some effects to EFU land at the south end. We know that Keil Road is in the current object-free area for the runway, and we anticipate that that will need to be addressed at some point, and that kind of realignment of Keil Road, in whatever form it ultimately takes, would likely involve EFU land.</p>

				<p>But I think that was essentially those themes, the property acquisition, EFU land, and the ability to accommodate the improvements at the north end.</p>
<p>WS.8</p>	<p>Patrick Donaldson</p>	<p><i>Wilsonville Chamber of Commerce</i></p>	<p>So there's nothing legal that prevents any of these things? Because you talked about the East Side acquisition of land, and I realize that they're all different sorts of pieces of land, but it seems like it's not a legal reason to remove them from consideration. It's just that a judgment was made that the lift would be heavier on both the South and West sides because of the things you've just mentioned, whereas on the east side there are less of those encumbrances. Is that a fair summary?</p>	<p>Well, I would say I think the land use guidelines are fairly clear in terms of discouraging impacts on EFU lands. That's a high priority in Oregon land use law. I'll defer to Tony and ODAV, but I think as far as a judgment, I think you're absolutely right. It is an assessment of options.</p> <p>There's nothing barring an airport from going through a land process to convert EFU land to something else. But I think on balance, this is where the north option is more viable.</p>
<p>WS.9</p>	<p>Patrick Donaldson</p>	<p><i>Wilsonville Chamber of Commerce</i></p>	<p>Because this is the first time that I felt that a judgment has been made about the deliberations based upon the things you've just talked about. And I wonder if at the end of this process, in 2025, do we open ourselves up to criticism that a judgment was made to not go further into consideration of those things because of encumbrances?</p> <p>And I'm just wondering, the history has been that a process has been flawed in the past. Do we open ourselves up to, once again, that the process is flawed because of judgments that were made, not based on legal, but just the heavy lift that might be involved.</p> <p>It just seems that that's what the criticism has been in the past, and</p>	<p>Tony Beach: Thank you, David, for your comment. As Brandi had mentioned earlier, the PAC process is giving feedback to ODAV so we can make a decision on the preferred alternative. Back in June, in the last PAC meeting, in an open house meeting, we had shared quite a few preliminary alternatives. They were just preliminary, and with the feedback that we received from the PAC and the public from those processes we did make a decision to remove the south extension as one of the alternatives due to its greater impacts to EFU land and because the property that ODAV currently has can meet the needs for the north extension.</p>

			<p>this could open us up to that in the future.</p>	
WS.10	Patrick Donaldson	<i>Wilsonville Chamber of Commerce</i>	<p>Have we also added additional alternatives as a result of the June meeting and the public open house?</p>	<p>If you recall when we had our meetings in June, we had two preliminary alternative concepts relative to the runway, and then there were sub-alternatives. One that was called Alternative #1 involved shifting of Hubbard Highway to clear the object free area for the runway.</p> <p>Second option was to go in the opposite direction and shift the runway east to clear the object free area, and then we had north and south options for both of those. So those are what we call the airside alternatives.</p> <p>As I mentioned, we've discarded the south extension options from each of these. So we are now looking at refining the north extension on all of the options. We're looking at the highway shift option and the refined runway shift option.</p> <p>So they're the same concepts, But they have added significantly more detail. And that's a product of the input we've received from the PAC, but also the ongoing and the FAA. So they're not new alternatives as much as they are refined.</p>
WS.11	Patrick Donaldson	<i>Wilsonville Chamber of Commerce</i>	<p>So I want to make sure I understand this. So you brought forward alternatives, we discussed those in June. There was some reaction to that, both at that meeting as well as in the comments submitted, and then there was the open house, and there were more comments made.</p> <p>And as a result of that, there was modification or elimination of those alternatives (the south runway and</p>	<p>Sure. Yeah, I think that's fair question. I think, as Brandy mentioned earlier, the PAC input is the goal of this process. And the public process is to provide input to ODAV to make decisions, and ultimately their decision will be which of these scenarios is the one they think is the best option for the airport. That'll be their basis for making a decision, and I think that the refinement process is common to master planning. We begin with very general concepts, and the goal</p>

			<p>the Hubbard Highway), and then there was modification. So my question is.</p> <p>Some of the criticism I heard was that options were limited; both pro and con about that. And then we had the open house, and the public comments.</p> <p>And so now, what you're saying is that we don't have new alternatives, we have revised alternatives with the alternatives that were originally proposed in June, and then the south runway extension has been eliminated because of a judgment about the EFU and all of those things you've already mentioned. I just want to make sure I understand the process of June till now.</p>	<p>is to add detail and really drill down into the important, most important elements, and we start with a large number of options and they narrow it down to the most viable options.</p> <p>So that's common in master planning. And I think it's transparent in the fact that we present information, the PAC and the public provide input, we come back and discuss that, and we say, okay, we heard that. And we've also had other input from folks like the FAA, and that's led to a refined concept. So that is where we are, and all of the incremental steps along the way will be documented in Chapter 5 that will be produced that begins at the preliminary stage.</p> <p>And we'll include all of the options that were presented, including those that were discarded. And that would include, if you recall from the last meeting, there was the input provided by the FAA to eliminate the so-called B-2 options. Those were eliminated from consideration, but they are still going to appear in the chapter. So everything is documented, and that will be the case until we end up at a point where ODAV can make a decision.</p> <p>So you're right. I think it's a judgment situation where the sponsor, the owner of the airport, has to weigh all of the factors involved to make decisions. So you're exactly right, that is the process.</p>
<p>WS.12</p>	<p>Patrick Donaldson</p>	<p><i>Wilsonville Chamber of Commerce</i></p>	<p>And it's continued to evolve if I understand this, so that all of these options might continue to evolve and be enhanced or minimized.</p>	<p>Yes, often in any airport master plan, we present a slate of alternatives, and sometimes it works out that one is the clear winner, and sometimes people like parts of one and parts of another. There</p>

				are elements that can be combined, sort of a hybrid approach. The goal is to work through all of that and get to a point where we've got to refined alternatives.
WS.13	Ben Williams	<i>Friends of French Prairie</i>	<p>A comment and a question; the comment is to Patrick's concern about the removal of EFU land and the south extensions. As an echo of the past, I would remind, everybody, and particularly those that weren't around for the 2011 Master Plan process, that the preferred alternative presented in 2011 was no build, and it was specific to the complexities of EFU land acquisition and expansion onto EFU land at the south. That's a fact, 13 years ago.</p> <p>The question is about the property acquisitions. I'm jumping back to east side – you were just talking about west side – the east side property acquisitions, is that east side of the existing airport fence boundary, or does it include outside the existing airport boundary, outside the fence? And is this all west of Airport Road, or does it contemplate property on the east side of Airport Road?</p>	<p>Thank you for that, Ben, I think we'll get into more detail on this as we look at these figures on the alternatives. But I think the concept of showing future property acquisition is to essentially recognize all land that is privately owned that's currently an aeronautical use, as a potential opportunity to acquire, to become part of the airport, if you will.</p> <p>One, it's a goal that we would help ensure that those lands continue in aeronautical use. This is private land and can be bought and sold, so it can be converted into lots of things.</p> <p>So that's one. And two is that it opens the opportunity for – if property does become available and ODA is interested in acquiring it – the ability to use FAA funding is provided all the way out to Airport Road. Outside is basically from the fence over and incorporates anything that is in that in that realm. So it's a lot of area.</p> <p>But again, Tony can speak to the broader policy implications there. But it's a protective device, really, for the airport and the ability to guarantee long term aeronautical use for those areas.</p>
WS.14	Dave Mauk	<i>Charbonneau Country Club</i>	<p>I have 2 questions, and maybe a comment at the end of that kind of based on the answers. One is, I know that, David, you even mentioned it in your comments about a hybrid. And I know this was</p>	<p>Thank you Dave. I wasn't referring specifically to the runway extension as the hybrid example. I just was more referring to the fact that there can be pieces of different options that sometimes work together, and I think the north and south split was noted, but</p>

			<p>submitted to you in the comments, because I did it myself in my comments, and I know others did. And that is extending on both the north and south end, as opposed to just looking at one end or the other. That's one question.</p> <p>And the second is, are we only down now to one alternative, and that's the north extension?</p> <p>So, is a hybrid considered with a north and south going both ways. I know it wasn't originally, and it looks to me like an oversight. I don't know why it isn't now, and certainly in the comments that you got at the open house as well as from some PAC members. And then what are we down to alternative wise?</p>	<p>in evaluation it didn't appear to provide significant benefits to justify creating another runway site alternative for consideration. So that's the short answer for that.</p> <p>As far as down to alternatives, I would say we're still facing two choices for this airfield. In terms of air side alternatives, in order to meet the C-II standards, one is to affect a shift of the Hubbard Highway west, two is to shift the runway east. So those are the two.</p> <p>We know as we've looked at this sort of east and west conundrum, there are no easy or inexpensive options out there. There just aren't, and the north and south was a complication in that, if you will. But it isn't the biggest challenge in terms of the feasibility. The challenges of implementing either of the realignment lateral realignment issues. So what we're going to go through tonight is we're going to come back in and bore down into more detail on those 2 main choices, east or west. And there are clear impacts on both sides, and that's the challenge that ODAV faces in terms of trying to chart a course that is most effective for the airport.</p>
<p>WS.15</p>	<p>Patrick Donaldson</p>	<p><i>Wilsonville Chamber of Commerce</i></p>	<p>So I've already previously mentioned about the economic displacement temporarily or permanent.</p> <p>So, with the original alternatives we were delivered in June; we had reaction, we had a public gathering. Feedback was obtained, and based upon that some of the alternatives were eliminated, some were modified.</p> <p>With these new modifications and alternatives, I just have to raise the issue once again, both the temporary and permanent displacement that might take place with these options, and, as</p>	<p>Okay. Thank you.</p> <p>One thing I would add, a detail on once the preferred alternative is defined, as part of the process there will be cost estimates prepared for each of the elements. So there'd be a cost associated with each of these, whether realigning the highway or reconstructing a runway or purchasing existing hangar square footage.</p> <p>So there will be a cost using consistent methodology to define that.</p> <p>The secondary economic impact of displacement would be something that would not typically be part of the Airport</p>

			<p>opposed to anecdotally coming to a judgment, I think it's important to measure those displacements as a factor in determining viability of the alternatives, and those are fairly simple calculations to be obtained.</p>	<p>Master Plan process, but something I'm sure they'll consider. And the reality is that I mentioned earlier, there are no options that are easy or cheap. And I think the economic displacement of private residences and businesses on the highway will also have a significant cost and a measurable impact on the communities. So I think ODAV is weighing all of those factors while still recognizing that maintaining the status quo is not an option.</p>
<p>WS.16</p>	<p>Dave Mauk</p>	<p><i>Charbonneau Country Club</i></p>	<p>If you're getting that kind of funding, clearly ODAV is your client, I'm wondering what the public benefit is here. We're now talking about using ODOT funds. That's taxpayer money. You're talking about acquiring land that's outside the purview of ODAV, I mean, obviously, you have to go through a whole lot more hoops. It's sounding like a square peg in a round hole. You can move down to Salem, you can move to McMinnville. You're not going to spend \$15 million of your money, not going to spend maybe \$15 million of taxpayer money. I think we're looking at the wrong kind of airport here, I really, really do. And what assurance do any neighbors have that – here you're going to be acquiring 143/47 acres there, or 43 acres here – that it stops? Why would we believe that that? All this for 500 feet of runway? 50 to 100 million bucks for 500 feet of runway in a rural area. It boggles my mind that you think that this is reasonable. To be really blunt about it. I didn't expect to say this tonight, but I'll tell you, you start</p>	<p>I would point out, I think to Dave's point, Master Planning does deal with a lot of concepts and conceptual assumptions. As I mentioned at the beginning, there was a question about coordination with ODOT. So, to be clear, anything involving the highway would require coordination with ODOT. So you're absolutely right, making a decision to shift to a highway, a right-of-way, is not in ODAV's purview. It would be coordination and agreement with ODOT. So that ongoing agency coordination will also be reflected when we go back together in September. And I don't have anything to say on that, as far as which direction that's going, at this point it's early days in that conversation. But I would also point out, there are a lot of moving parts of this story, without a doubt, and every one of them has a million complications. What we're trying to do here is to do an Airport Master Plan that meets FAA standards. The FAA has been very clear that the requirements are there today and they're there for a reason. We're not passing judgment on it, we're just simply presenting technical information that says, "to meet the design standards that have been identified for this airport, these are options that would be viable,</p>

		<p>going after taxpayer money, it's a whole other ball game.</p> <p>And we haven't even started. I don't understand why you have to go this route. Talk to your friends at the FAA. I'm sure there are lots of exceptions. Why does every airport have to meet the exact same [standards and] fit every need? You know, one shoe does not fit all, and this is something that needs to be looked at.</p> <p>This is an individual situation. This is an individual airport. You've got busy roads, you have a state highway literally adjacent to it. You have an enormously busy intersection also adjacent to it, and you have a freeway that goes from Mexico to Canada. And you're really close to that.</p> <p>And you've got 26,000 people who live two miles away, two and a half miles away, in direct route to this airport. There's a lot of obstacles that I think somehow missed the ODAV purview here. I really believe that.</p> <p>It's great that you've got all these alternatives. To move a highway, to move 551? Wow. You guys have a lot of power. But if you start using our money, we have some power too. I just need to say this. I'm a little surprised at how cavalier this seems to be at this stage, and how, right away, all the other options are off the table, and it's expand property, expand runways, expand the highways.</p> <p>I vented. I apologize for that, and I'm not picking on you, David, but you happen to be the guy that's so calmly presenting all this. And it just isn't sitting well with me, and I know</p>	<p>that could be considered.” So I just want to make that clear, we’re just trying to identify possibilities while acknowledging there are no easy options here.</p>
--	--	--	--

			<p>the people I represent won't be happy about hearing any of this, and that's all I have to say. Thank you for listening.</p>	
WS.17	Ben Williams	<i>Friends of French Prairie</i>	<p>So David, I think you just summed up the dynamic in master planning processes and many other processes. There's usually no simple solution. The process isn't simple, the iterative process can be painful, and you've got multiple variables to consider, etc, etc. That's all true.</p> <p>All of that said, while I, as a representative of farmers and local farmland, am happy to hear that expanding to the south onto farmland is off the table, I've still got to ask the same question I asked in an email a week ago to Tony Beach, which derived from a statement in your own master plan, page nine of [draft?], chapter five, on the Landside Alternatives and Introduction:</p> <p>Aurora State Airport is located on a constrained site. That was one of the opposition themes in 2011. At what point is common sense going to prevail here and say, we're trying to shoehorn something that's not just a square peg in a round hole, it's like an oversized peg in a round hole. And I'm not looking for an answer, David, you don't have to respond to that question. It was hypothetical. Thank you, though.</p>	Thank you for your comment.
WS.18	Councilor Joann Linville	<i>City of Wilsonville</i>	<p>Thank you, David, for that presentation. I have to say that I appreciate David [Mauk]'s comments. I'm not going to reiterate them, except to second them. Obviously, his group that he represents is a small section of Wilsonville, but those are our citizens, and those comments and</p>	Thank you for your comment.

			<p>those concerns are echoed across our entire community.</p> <p>And I think that was very evident at the open house. We had people show up, and I think unfortunately, because we ran out of paper copies of the comment forms, a number of those people got away without being able to memorialize their comments, which was very unfortunate, given that this is a very expensive FAA planning process for our consultants. And with all due respect, I am astonished that there would not be enough copies and that I would have to go and ask those people that were monitoring the event to take the tablets over to the table where the comment box was. That is very, very unfortunate. I think this was intended as an opportunity for our citizens to have input, and I just want to go on the record to say that it was not a satisfactory public input project. Very poorly run, very, very poorly done, when people cannot have the input that they had hoped to have.</p> <p>So the data that you're going to gather, and the results of that, I think, are not satisfactory. I don't know what conclusions we could draw from them, because people were not able to [submit] in the consistent format of even having the flip chart available, where people put dots on. You're mixing apples and oranges. You know, we expect some really good, hard data, and that certainly was confounded by any means.</p> <p>I'm also disappointed that, a second time now, we're at a significant meeting and a planning session. And not only [do we not] have the total list of alternatives</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

that we were given in the beginning, we now have even a truncated group now, down to two. I recognize that the PAC does not have control of power in this process but I'm very disappointed that we would not get advanced notification that there would be a change in the alternatives that would be offered. Neither time was that given, and I've had numerous conversations with Tim about when the FAA knew that they were going to only approve an increase to a C-I or C-II level for the airport. And he indicated to me that it was that Friday prior to our last PAC meeting, when that information was forwarded to the consultants, and I would have expected that, since that was significant information, that the PAC would have been notified in advance.

But here we are again in a situation where we're now down to two alternatives, which again precludes much of an opportunity to... it's like I used to do with my daughters. And I'd say, here are two dresses. You can pick this one or this one, and I'd already made the choices on which were the satisfactory options. That's where we are.

So you just need to understand that there is frustration. And I understand [after] my conversations with Tim, why we are at 5500 feet for the runway. But my concern is also the concern that Ben just raised, and that is, at what point does a constrained airport, so constrained that it cannot go any larger? So we are now going to a C-I/C-II. At what point do we go to a D level? And simply because we allow pilots the opportunity to land, and they get to decide, and that is

			<p>what happens with the airport. And I think you would agree that it does force the airport to be out of FAA compliance, and that that is a significant driver of what is happening with these changes.</p> <p>So I appreciate that we are not going south with the roadway extension. I think north is the only way to go.</p> <p>I think if you if you saw the traffic that goes on that highway, on that Hubbard Highway, especially at rush hour time, a diversion of that highway to make it bow out and come back in again is not a simple thing. It's not a simple fix. And it will impact what happens to the backup in traffic on I5 that goes south from two o'clock in the afternoon until well after six-thirty or seven o'clock at night. So it may sound like it's a simple thing for the for the airport, and it's a fix, but it has other implications, and our city is already in trouble, as is the city of Sherwood, with the Tualatin-Sherwood Highway, as is Tualatin, with the people trying to get on I5 and get home in the evening.</p> <p>So those are my comments. I don't expect you to respond so I'll just leave it at that. Thank you.</p>	
<p>WS.19</p>	<p>Ted Millar</p>	<p><i>AABC/TLM Holdings</i></p>	<p>There were so many changes that we didn't anticipate. I probably don't have a comments to make at this time, just that we need to absorb some of the thought process that has been given to us all tonight, and trying to figure out a way to give you the right kind of input on our concern. Especially from the airport user standpoint; so far, all we've heard from are primarily opposition. As you know, it's very complicated airport with a lot of</p>	<p>Great. Thank you, Ted. And we'll make sure that you all have this information and then we'll touch base. I'll reach out to all of you just to make sure we collect that input and get it recorded.</p>

			major businesses, and the economic impacts to some of these things that you're talking about are huge. So we've got to do some analysis to see how's the correct way to respond.	
--	--	--	--	--

Attendee Questions/Comments and Responses²

ID	Name	Question/Comment	Response
WS. 20	George Van Hoomissen	This sounds like the only comments were from PAC members expressing concerns about Airport impact on non-airport aspects of the community. My concerns are about the airport itself — for example, mainly runway length. Didn't you get any comments from airport users — in particular about the need for a longer runway?!	Yes, we received comments from the public and the PAC on runway length from the beginning of the project. We're getting into the specifics on the justified runway length. Back in chapter four, Facility Requirements, there was a lot of discussion about the methodology that the FAA requires us to use for master plans versus lengths that might be required for individual operators. So yeah, there was quite a lot of discussion on that, but the justified length based on the FAA methodology was defined and that's been applied consistently.
WS. 21	George Van Hoomissen	Do you now consider the possibility of a runway extension to 6000' being essentially off the table?	For the purposes of this Master Plan, the length that we documented in the facility requirements, the 5,500 foot length, is what meets the FAA criteria as outlined in the applicable advisory circulars. So that is the length that we, again, consistency between forecast, facility requirements and alternatives, we carry that length forward. So 5,500 is considered viable or at least justified based on the information. So that's where we stand.
WS. 22	George Van Hoomissen	In Option 1A, why do [you] assume that the ODOT ROW must remain at 200' and why do you assume that the highway must be centered in the ROW?	That's great question. I think one is, we don't have specific guidance from ODOT at this stage. As we mentioned earlier, there's some ongoing coordination that will be rolling out over the next several weeks. We'll hopefully

² Live responses are included, along with additional information/clarification, as needed.
PAC Working Session 3 Summary

		<p>get some very specific feedback on topics like that. The reason that we maintain the right of way was sort of touched on in some of the comments made earlier by some of the folks about traffic.</p> <p>Since we don't have information from ODOT on our future roadway design, I think it's reasonable to assume that Hubbard Highway will require some very specific upgrades in the next 20 years, whether it's additional lanes or signalization or whatever that is. Bottom line is, we don't know, and we don't want to presume or tell ODOT that they can get by with less right-of-way. If they can, they might communicate that to ODAV. For our purposes though, we wanted to be consistent, so that's why we maintain that.</p> <p>And again, this is a conceptual planning exercise. Centering the future road footprint within the right of way just seems to be reasonable. The ultimate design, you know, at the point if that was pursued, the final alignment would be determined in the design as well. We just are trying to be as consistent as we can.</p>
--	--	---

Additional Emailed Comments

ID	Name	Affiliation	Question/Comment	Response
WS. 23	George Van Hoomissen	VH4 Aviation, LLC	[Included in screenshot below]	Thank you for your comments. FAA has stated that the runway and runway object free area (ROFA) and runway safety area (RSA) must meet standards before any future improvements – including a runway extension – will be considered. Furthermore, by not addressing the non-standard ROFA and

				RSA, ODAV risks violating grant assurances, jeopardizing future funding eligibility.
--	--	--	--	--

George Van Hoomissen
VH4 Aviation, LLC
22320 Yellow Gate Ln NE, Unit N73
Aurora, OR 97002

August 1, 2024

Oregon Department of Aviation

Kenji Sugahara, Director; Tony Beach, State Airports Manager;
Alex Thomas, Planning & Project Manager; Brandon Pike, Aviation Planner

Gentlemen:

I am writing to provide comments regarding your most recent presentation to the Planning Advisory Committee for the Aurora State Airport Master Plan, which was presented to the PAC during the online meeting on July 30, 2024.

As a part of the July 30th presentation, ODAV's consultant Century West Engineering (CWE) explained that, after extensive analysis and consultation with ODAV and the FAA, CWE has determined that the Aurora State Airport currently does not meet applicable FAA design guidelines for a variety of reasons, including unacceptable items in the Runway Object Free Area (Hubbard Highway, Keil Road, ASOS equipment, wind cone), unacceptable items in the Runway Safety Area (south-end drain field, open drainage ditches), unacceptable direct runway access from aprons/hangars, and a runway length that is approximately 500' too short to meet the RDC C-II requirements.

Next, CWE explained that they had developed three "Refined Preliminary Alternatives" (identified as Alternatives 1A, 1B, and 2), each of which presents a potential way that ODAV could conceivably bring the airport into compliance with FAA requirements. Notably, all three of those Refined Preliminary Alternatives include lengthening the runway by 497' to the north (bringing the runway length to 5500'), which apparently could be accomplished on existing ODAV property, with no taking of any private property required at all. I want to point out that, even though this one airport improvement (i.e., a 500' runway extension) would not on its own resolve all of the airport's current deficiencies, nevertheless it would unquestionably make the airport significantly safer for all airport users, and I believe it would be a giant step toward meeting the FAA requirements applicable to this type of airport. Other minor changes to the airport could be made that would address many of the other deficiencies (e.g., moving the windsock and ASOS equipment, replacing open drainage ditches with covered drainpipes, etc.), without requiring significant land acquisitions or negative impacts on properties adjacent to the airport which are now privately owned.

However, as CWE explained during the July 30th presentation, in order to meet all of the FAA's guidelines, either the Hubbard Highway would need to be moved to the west, requiring acquisition and clearing of 39 to 43 acres of private commercial and residential property that is west of the current Hubbard Highway (as detailed in Refined Alternatives 1A and 1B), or the runway would need to be moved to the east, requiring acquisition and clearing of 37 acres of private property that is east of ODAV's current property line and is now in active aeronautical use (as detailed in Refined Alternative 2).

This work by CWE has produced some useful information, and it has been a necessary and helpful part of the Master Plan process – identifying the airport's current deficiencies and exploring the potential implications of various possible ways that the deficiencies, theoretically, could be fixed. Unfortunately, but most importantly, what I believe this work has revealed is that none of the Refined Preliminary Alternatives is even remotely realistic. In fact, I highly doubt that there is anybody at ODAV or CWE who believes that

Comments to Oregon Department of Aviation
August 1, 2024
Page Two.

any of the recently-presented Refined Alternatives will actually be implemented at any time during the Master Plan planning period. All of the presented alternatives are, in my opinion, obvious non-starters, as each of them would require a massive expenditures of public funds, at a level that is extraordinarily unlikely ever to be made available; and regardless which of the alternatives were to be pursued it would be nearly impossible to adequately justify the impacts on adjacent property owners.

While I would very much like to see the Aurora State Airport improved so that it would meet all FAA design guidelines, it is my opinion that this goal realistically cannot (and therefore will not) be achieved within the coming decades. Therefore, it would be very useful for ODAV to direct its consultants to begin exploring ideas for airport improvements that realistically could be accomplished within the Master Plan planning period.

To that end, what I would like to see is CWE developing and presenting to the public some alternatives for projects that would lead to substantial measurable progress in eliminating current non-standard conditions at the airport and that would move the airport meaningfully towards meeting RDC C-II requirements, while also acknowledging that, as a practical matter, it is extremely unlikely that the airport will ever be able to achieve 100% full compliance with FAA design guidelines.

I suggest that ODAV consider what I will call Realistic Alternative No. 3: Leave the runway right where it is now, but extend it 500' to the north. This could be done with or without various other minor changes on the airfield (such as moving the windsock and ASOS equipment and covering drainage ditches) and leaving the Hubbard Highway unchanged (noting that this would still leave the Hubbard Highway within the ROFA, which is undesirable, but perhaps cannot be helped within the foreseeable future). While not perfect, this alternative would make the airport much better for airport users, while minimizing impacts to off-airport lands. Btw, a vehicle service road could be added as well, but that road certainly does not need to be placed right along the taxiway.

I suggest you also consider Realistic Alternative No. 4, which would be the same as No. 3, except that it would also move the Hubbard Highway to the west as far as possible while still keeping it within the existing ODOT right-of-way. Of course, this variation would require cooperation/consent from ODOT, but it would avoid the need for acquisition of a large number of private properties. While this approach may not fully resolve the issue of vehicles traversing through the ROFA, it may enable cost-effective mitigation of that problem. To my knowledge, there is no law of nature, or anything in the Oregon Revised Statutes, or any FAA or ODAV rule, that requires that a highway be centered within a public right-of-way.

Of course there are many other possible variations on this theme. My main point is that the time has come for ODAV to turn its attention to thinking about and exploring feasible alternatives that actually could be accomplished at the Aurora State Airport. If ODAV and CWE are unwilling to explore such alternatives (i.e., projects that would be less-than-perfect but feasible within the near term), then please explain to the PAC why that is.

Thank you for considering this input.

Sincerely,



George Van Hoomissen