Aurora State Airport Master Plan

Planning Advisory Committee (PAC) Meeting #5

June 7, 2011
Maplewood Grange Hall, Aurora, OR

MEETING SUMMARY

Attendees

Oregon Department of Aviation (ODA) –Sandra Larsen, John Wilson and Mitch Swecker (also a PAC member)

WHPacific – Rainse Anderson and Sarah Lucas

JLA Public Involvement –Adrienne DeDona and Sylvia Ciborowski

Public Advisory Committee (PAC) – Patti Milne, Bruce Bennett, Jim Bernard, James Meirow, Tony Holt, Steve Hurst, Nick Kaiser, Rick Kosta, Ted Millar, Fred Netter, Dan Riches, Ray Phelps, Craig Wilmes, Randy Carson, Tony Helbling, Roger Kaye and Dave Waggoner. (PAC Member not in attendance: Jim Hansen)

Public Attendees – see attached sign in sheets

Welcome and Introductions

Rainse Anderson kicked off the meeting and thanked everyone for coming. He explained that this was the fifth PAC meeting. The meeting had been moved up to address the preferred alternative and the various add-on scenarios developed in March. Rainse introduced himself, Sarah Lucas from WHPacific and Mark Gardiner from the Oregon Aviation Board. Mark Gardiner introduced himself as the Chair of the Oregon Aviation Board and added that Joe Smith and Jack Loacker from the Oregon Aviation Board were also in attendance. Mark explained that this project has been through quite a process and a lot has gone on. He said that initially a preferred alternative and a couple of scenarios were developed and reviewed by the Aviation Board. The Board is interested in hearing what people think of each of the scenarios. Mark said that one scenario included an 800 foot displaced threshold to the north. He felt that this scenario balanced as many varying factors as possible. He added that many people feel this scenario is a viable alternative for the airport, while still meeting the community needs. However, he said that he is not confident that they will get cooperation from FAA related to this scenario. Because of this, they are still looking at an extension to the south. Mark said that they are still in process of balancing the needs of the airport and needs of the community.

Rainse asked for show of hands from the audience whether or not this was the first meeting they had attended. There were several people who raised their hands; approximately one quarter of the group.

Rainse reviewed the meeting agenda and explained there would be public comment at the end of the meeting. Each person would likely have about 2 minutes to speak. He said the meeting should be wrapped-up and adjourned around 7 p.m.

Presentation: Draft Preferred Alternative

Rainse explained that the master plan is a 20 year guide for airport development in order to obtain funding from the FAA. He said that so far in this process, they have completed Chapters 1 through 5 [Chapter 1: Introduction *(master plan issues and goals and airport role),* Chapter 2: Airport Inventory *(current airport facilities, zoning and aviation activity),* Chapter 3: Aeronautical Activity Forecast *(forecast for 20-year planning period),* Chapter 4: Facilities Requirements *(airport needs to meet future forecasted demand),* and Chapter 5: Airport Alternatives *(how to address the needs identified in Chapter 4)].* They are currently moving towards developing Chapters 6 and 7: the Airport Layout Plan (ALP) and Capital Improvement Plan (CIP). The ALP must be approved by the FAA, to enable funding from the FAA.

Rainse said that this meeting was moved up from the last meeting, which would have covered the Master Plan' final draft, so that the preferred alternative and the various add-on scenarios could be reviewed with the PAC and the public. The last meeting has been eliminated in order to provide for this meeting.

Rainse explained that the draft alternatives were presented to the PAC on March 10th. Following that meeting, public comments were collected until March 24th. A presentation was given to the Oregon Aviation Board on March 31st and again on April 28th. Due to the comments that were received related to the draft alternatives and the need for extended runway, a discussion took place regarding adding a displaced threshold.

Rainse reminded everyone that this meeting was intended as a work session for the PAC and requested that members of the public hold their comments until the public workshop session or during public comment.

Sarah Lucas reviewed the process since the last PAC meeting. She said that they had received 30 comment forms at the last meeting and 60 were sent in following the meeting. Over 100 people took the online survey. The results were fairly split between the no-build and alternative 2. Common themes throughout all of the comments were related to the airport reference code, runway length, runway strength.

PAC Discussion: Draft preferred Alternative

Tony Holt asked if the slide regarding public comments was presented to the Aviation Board. He said that he was not sure how many of the comments were recorded since he had submitted a petition with 260 signatures that were not included and supported no runway extension. He added that this seems to be cherry picking the comment data. Sarah responded that the comments were not 1 for 1 weighted and there were other communities that submitted petitions. Sarah clarified that this is a summary of the input received from the comment forms.

Tony asked how they came to the conclusion of developing the preferred alternative and the displaced threshold scenarios. Rainse responded that the comment forms are all available online. There were many comments received from airport users that requested a runway extension and that they are trying to balance the input received. Rainse stated that this has been an open process; trying to juggle all of the needs. Mitch explained that ODA values all of the input received and they consider all input equally; they don't put more weight on some input than others. He added that they've met with the FAA numerous times and the FAA believes they have justified constrained operations for a runway extension. Tony reiterated that his issue is with the decision that was made related to the preferred alternative. Rainse explained that based on the input collected, along with the input from the Board, they determined the preferred alternative.

Bruce Bennett said he would like to point out that there were various alternatives considered that made up the outcome of the preferred alternative.

Sarah reviewed the draft alternative that was presented to the Oregon Aviation Board:

- No runway extension
- Increased pavement strength (load capacity), which would match the parallel taxiway's pavement strength. This would allow for heavier aircraft to takeoff and land on the runway.
- To the south shows increased RPZ for a larger safety area with an approach greater than three quarter statute miles. Some impacts to residential and farm properties due to acquisition needed.

Sarah explained that at their last meeting, the Aviation Board requested further public comment on the preferred alternative and add-on scenarios. Since that time, they have received 42 e-mails. Most comments received were in support of the preferred alternative: increased runway length and increased runway strength. A few people made comments in support of or against improved instrument approach capability. A couple of people were against the upgraded airport reference code and the cargo apron. One person made a comment in support of the Rural Fire Protection District Facility. Sarah stated that all of the comments are listed online in Appendix K.

A PAC member commented on the strength and length of the runway. Sarah explained that comment summary is related to the comments received. Another PAC member asked if there was someone on the team that is an expert in statistical analysis. Sarah explained that this isn't a statistically valid survey.

Sarah said that the add-on scenarios were developed based upon the comments received following the last PAC meeting. She reviewed the concept of displaced thresholds, which are a very technical design for runway extensions/declared distances that typically only pilots understand. Sarah read the definition of displaced thresholds: *The purpose of declared distances in airport design is to provide an equivalent Runway Safety Area (RSA), Object Free Area (ROFA), or Runway Protection Zone (RPZ) in accordance with the design standards at existing constrained airports where it is otherwise impracticable to meet standards by other means. Declared distances are also employed when there are obstructions in the runway approaches and/or departure surface that are beyond the ability of the airport owner to remove.* Sarah said that what that means is that there are four proposed declared distances:

Add-on Scenario 1: Sarah explained that in this scenario, the threshold stays the same, but pavement would be extended 200 ft to the north and 600 ft to the south for a total of 800 feet.

	Runway 35	Runway 17
Takeoff Run Available (TORA)	5,604'	5,204'
Takeoff Distance Available (TODA)	5,604'	5,204'
Accelerate-Stop Distance Available (ASDA)	5,804'	5,804'
Landing Distance Available (LDA)	5,004'	5,004'

There was a question from a PAC member regarding relocating fuel tanks: If ODA can afford to move the fuel tank, why can't we ask property owners to move their facilities to provide for a runway extension? Mitch explained that funding hasn't been identified. Sarah explained that fuel tanks will be moved when they reach their life expectancy.

Add-on Scenario 2: Sarah explained that the distances will remain the same in this scenario, but with no additional added pavement to the north. Traffic departing to the south would have additional runway, but traffic departing to the north would not. Departing to the south is against the calm wind recommendations.

	Runway 35	Runway 17
Takeoff Run Available (TORA)	5,004'	5,804'
Takeoff Distance Available (TODA)	5,004'	5,804'
Accelerate-Stop Distance Available (ASDA)	5,804'	5,804'
Landing Distance Available (LDA)	5,004'	5,004'

Rainse explained that the scenarios were reviewed by the FAA and they were not thrilled with the idea of displaced threshold, and said that there is justification for a runway extension. ODA requested an official position from the FAA which was received today. Copies were provided to the PAC members. Rainse summarized the letter from the FAA. The FAA feels that displaced thresholds would only be used in a limited capacity and anything additional is a runway extension. To take the Runway Protection Zones (RPZ), object free areas and move them out impacts operators, particularly Columbia Helicopters on the north. The same thing would occur on the south side which would cross Keil Road. The benefit of the displaced threshold goes away with the FAA's position. The FAA indicated they will not participate in funding partial or limited use of a runway extension.

A PAC member asked about the closure of Keil Road which is an important farming access road. He asked if the FAA plans to pay for relocation. Rainse replied that often times these types of road relocations are paid for by the FAA.

Add on Scenario *3*: Sarah explained that this scenario includes a 1,000 ft extension to the south and takes pavement out to the current airport property RPZ another 1,000 ft. This option would require closure of Keil Road. Scenario 3 shows the declared distance of 6,004 ft.

	Runway 35	Runway 17
Takeoff Run Available (TORA)	6,004'	6,004'
Takeoff Distance Available (TODA)	6,004'	6,004'
Accelerate-Stop Distance Available (ASDA)	6,004'	6,004'
Landing Distance Available (LDA)	6,004'	6,004'

Rainse asked if there were further questions from the PAC.

Tony Holt stated that this was a planning process, not a funding process and his understanding was that the FAA does not have to approve the master plan. Rainse explained that they have to sign the ALP, but not the master plan. The State has to approve and update the capital improvement plan each year. Tony asked if we have to conform to the FAA through this process. Rainse replied there is a lot of demand driven items in this process such as hangars, tie-downs, etc. That is why the user survey was completed at the outset of this process in order to justify the process. The State doesn't have money in the foreseeable future for this project. Mitch explained that this is a long-range plan based upon the needs of the aviation community. The FAA will not fund improvements without approval of the ALP. Tony said that part of his problem is how to get to the ultimate decision considering the feedback received. Mitch responded that the FAA thinks the extension is justified based up on the constrained operations.

Jim Bernard, Clackamas County Commissioner, said he understands that many PAC members feel that the needs analysis was cooked. He also supports economic development and job growth. There will be impacts on Clackamas County that they don't know how to pay for. Will an extension increase the use at the airport? An analysis of the impact on public facilities needs to take place. Was there any analysis of closing Keil Road? Will Mulino be the next rural airport that needs to be expanded? There needs to be an analysis of farm land and farming practices. Has ODA analyzed the impact of the Salem Airport extension? Will ODA commit now to do the analysis later? Mitch responded that we have talked about a lot of these issues all along and a study would have to be done on the runway extension. It would not be fair for ODA to do all the traffic analysis study. Jim Bernard added that the Mayor of Canby has also said they do not have the money to accommodate the impacts of expansion. I-5 will be impacted. Communities to the north will be impacted. He added that he would greatly appreciate the analysis of these impacts. Mitch said ODA would consider cost sharing when the time comes and added that it is not reasonable for the airport to bear the cost when airport traffic is only a small percentage of the total traffic. Rainse said that prior to any runway extension there would have to be an environmental process that would have to take place, which would analyze traffic, endangered species, social impacts, etc. before construction was approved by the FAA.

Fred Netter commented that when this first came out the first concern was safety. Now looking at an extension, he's not sure if the safety impacts have been addressed. Rainse explained that on the last scenario there were three locations identified for the control tower. Fred said that the Fire District has talked about the Fire District facility, but he doesn't see a location for where that would be designated when funding is identified. He asked if a location will be guaranteed. Mitch said that they would like to have that space designated for a fire facility.

A PAC member commented that we were informed that a tower would be added to improve safety. He doesn't understand how lengthening the runway would improve safety whether there is a tower or not because there would be larger planes with more fuel. Rainse said the two aren't necessarily connected. Planes can come in and land, but are constrained when taking off. The additional runway will allow for better take off.

It was added that engine failure could occur at any time and additional runway allows more space and prevents emergency landing in fields or residential areas. Also, increased airport use takes cars off the road. The Keil Road closure could be relocated to Ehlen road.

Tony Holt stated that the issue of safety is obscured because there will be larger aircraft coming in. Larger aircraft will have the same safety problem as smaller airplanes. The logic is not there.

It was commented that the infrastructure doesn't meet the current demand of the airport. The PAC member added that he's not against growth, but he's concerned about how growth will be handled and how it affects the City of Aurora.

Another PAC member said this doesn't necessarily mean larger aircraft will come to Aurora unless it allows for it based upon the strength of runway.

A PAC member stated we are strengthening runway, so we would be allowing for larger planes. Rainse replied that if you look at the airport's current use, there are currently 60,000 pound aircraft. This change would be preserving the life of the pavement by strengthening it.

Bruce Bennett stated that most people wouldn't notice difference between 45,000 and 60,000 pound aircraft. The 60,000 pound aircraft are just larger business aircraft which tend to be quieter. These larger planes will allow for more jobs which will bring in revenue.

Public Workshop

Rainse reviewed the format for the public workshop and explained there would be 25 minutes for the public and the PAC to interact with staff to ask questions and review information about the preferred alternative.

After the 25 minute public workshop, Rainse reconvened the PAC session. Rainse explained that the PAC would now have the opportunity to discuss the preferred alternative and add-on scenarios and give input on the direction for the preferred alternative.

PAC Discussion

Mark Gardiner responded to some of the questions raised by the PAC earlier in the meeting. He said that related to the analysis of public facilities, traffic counts were done and airport traffic is a minor impact currently and is not a factor in any meaningful percentage between Canby and I-5. He added that at the last Aviation Board meeting, a person from Canby and a major employer in the area testified in favor of airport improvements. Airport users will not be forced to move anywhere, but may choose to move to Mulino due to the tower. Mark explained that intersections will be addressed through a planning process the airport will go through as part of the land use planning requirements. There has been consideration for prime farm land in the area and they have tried hard to limit any impacts to farmland. They are working hard to extend to the north vs. the south for that reason and will look at how to mitigate that. None of the recommendations will adversely impact farming. Keil Road is a minor facility and is not currently a source of traffic problems. The Salem Airport is outside of the Aurora airport market area, this would be the same thing as saying people would go to Portland although there are no hangars in Portland. Mark added that they will absolutely analyze the impacts, as required by the State's planning laws.

Steve Hurst, Wilsonville City Council, explained that during the breakout period he placed a copy of a letter on everyone's chair which states Wilsonville City Council's list of preferences related to the Master Plan:

- Improve management of aircraft approaching the airport that would result in the enhanced safety and reduced noise on Wilsonville.
- Eliminate the need to expand to the north.
- Preserve farmland
- Support concurrency by recognizing surface transportation improvements
- Recognize importance of preserving existing use of Keil Road for farm use

Patty Milne, Marion County Commissioner, stated that safety is most important to her. Farm and Agriculture in Marion County is extremely important to her and the Marion County Commissioners. Over the years, Marion County has made many specific statements about preserving farmland. Economic Development is extremely important to Marion County and the surrounding communities and they want to protect that. Everyone is well aware of the positive impact the businesses at the airport have on the City of Wilsonville, Clackamas County, and Marion County. Roads and transportation will need to be a joint effort with Clackamas County. When a master plan is determined, that will be the time to look at the conditions of the surrounding roads and identify the responsible parties. At that time, we will know how to identify the most important projects and prioritize them on the Marion County capital improvement plan and working with Wilsonville and Clackamas County. We will also look to federal and state government to help fund those projects.

Nick Kaiser said that since this project came out originally with preferred alternative, he has felt that it was a compromise and thought that it was a valid approach. He doesn't support a runway extension. He said they have the ability to deal with some of the safety issues without extending the runway and preserving the viability of the airport. Nick added that he had some other issues that he will address at a later time.

Randy Carson, Mayor of Canby, stated that he wears two hats. He works for Columbia Helicopters as well. He has watched the traffic increase over the years. He believes we need more transportation dollars on this side of the county. We should work to improve infrastructure to tie into I-5 and the airport. He believes there needs to be some build-out within the airport. Randy added that the big need is infrastructure and how we can work together to make that happen.

Roger Kaye said Keil Road is an important farm road and cannot be looked at primarily based on traffic counts. It's an important connector road as well. He previously wrote a letter to Mitch and ODA. He opposes lengthening the runway and disagrees that there is no noise difference between 45,000 and 60,000 pound planes.

Fred Netter of the Aurora Fire Protection District said he is happy to say that they have sited a facility at the truck stop which will improve response times to the airport. Keil Road is important for emergency access; without access though a gate or otherwise, emergency vehicles will have to go all the way around the airport. A gate could serve their purpose, but wouldn't help farmers. He wondered if Keil Road could be put below where there wouldn't be issues, or relocated further towards Ehlen Road. Fred said that he is adamantly opposed to any alternative that would remove access to Keil Road. If more traffic was added to Boones Ferry Road it would make it even more unsafe. There are currently numerous traffic incidents on Keil Road at Highway 551 which would be moved to Boones Ferry. He would like to make sure that the fire station has a dedicated spot on the airport property that cannot be taken away.

Tony Holt, representative of Charbonneau Country Club and residents, stated that he somewhat reluctantly supported the first preferred alternative because he felt it was a fair compromise and because that was put forward as a preferred alternative, he did not write numerous letters following the meeting. Tony stated that the summary of the comment forms does not stand up. He would like to know how ODA arrived at the decision for the preferred alternative.

Ted Millar, representative of airport users, said that they have held many public meetings for airport users at which they have come to understand the needs of the airport and the safety issues. A lot of pilots live in Charbonneau also. He believes there are two issues: safety first and jobs second. It has been well documented that there is a need for a runway extension. There have been noise studies that have been completed that prove that 60,000 pound airplanes are much quieter than the planes that currently land at Aurora Airport. Also with the longer runway, they are allowed to use noise abatement procedures. He has worked with the surrounding communities to establish instrument departures. On economic development, the job growth won't be at the airport. Big job growth will be within the surrounding communities that use aircraft at Aurora. He prefers scenario #2 because it fits within the needs of the surrounding community and it meets the needs of the airport users; a longer runway.

Bruce Bennett said he would like to point out that the Aurora airport has been there for 70 years. He has been involved with his family business that has been there over 40 years. He's also been involved in airport departure facilities that will abate noise and improve safety. The only way to do quieter takeoff is with more runway length. He believes we have worked hard to compromise with neighbors and

farmers and for that reason, he prefers scenario 2. Bruce added that additional runway is needed to takeoff safely for commercial aircraft. If FAA won't support scenario 2, then he would support scenario 3.

David Waggoner, business operator at the airport and resident of Clackamas County, said he appreciates the amount of revenue that Clackamas County generates for the airport, but he is frustrated that Clackamas County doesn't appreciate the amount of money that is generated at Aurora and gets funneled to Clackamas County. This is hugely beneficial to Clackamas County. He added that if managed correctly, there won't be an impact on Clackamas County. He supports scenario 2, but if the FAA doesn't, he would go back and support build alternative 1.

Tony Helbling, Wilson Construction, said he operates three fixed wing airplanes at Aurora. His company has various business locations in the United States and being able to get in and out of Aurora airport is critical to their business. When locating there, they looked at what is the best place, safest for employees, and allows growth that provides jobs for the people that live in the community. He added that money that comes in from out of state is brought to this community. He supports scenario #2 or a runway extension. He said that someone asked him if there are standard procedures for approach and he replied that pilots follow a highway in the sky. There are procedures that pilots are required to follow by the FAA. Not everyone follows these procedures, but this is comparable to automobile drivers who do not obey the speed limit. Most follow the regulations, but a few don't.

Jim Bernard said that Clackamas County does not oppose economic development or jobs. He just wants to be sure that the issue of traffic impacts is addressed. He said people can't deny that passenger planes and job growth won't increase cars on the road and he wants that addressed. Clackamas County does support economic development and growth. He feels their concerns were simply not addressed. They are concerned about the traffic impacts should the airport someday expand and want to see a study completed.

Mitch Swecker thanked everyone for providing their input from various viewpoints and said they are really trying to accommodate everyone and their feedback.

Rick Kosta, representative of Deer Creek Estates, said they are the closest community to the airport. If the runway is expanded to the south, they will be within 500 feet of the airport. The noise is currently an extreme factor. He does not support a runway extension, but does support runway strengthening. At previous meetings he has commented on the noise issues and has been told Deer Creek would be beyond the noise boundary. Rainse added that would be part of the social impacts study necessary for construction.

Craig Wilmes, area business representative, said he supports scenario #2 for increased safety and opportunities for business expansion.

Dan Riches, Columbia Helicopters, said he agrees with Craig. He explained that Columbia is a global company. They located at Aurora to be able to respond to their business needs. Columbia has spent a large amount of time ensuring they are a good neighbor. He believes the economic impacts on both

sides of the County line are significant. He supports expansion of the runway for safety reasons and prefers scenario #1. He added that he tempers his input with continuing to defend the use of their property.

Jim Meirow, City of Aurora, said he struggles with how we got from original alternative to where we are today, but has said in the past the City would support an extension within the airport property. Therefore, he supports scenario #2. He added that some adjustments could be made so that everybody can work with it.

Ray Phelps, Wilsonville Chamber, asked if there would be a later opportunity to comment. He explained the Chamber is not as nimble as this process is requiring. Their Board hasn't had a chance to take an official position and they want to do it correctly. He added that most people who work at the airport live in Clackamas County. Those are important people to us (600 of the 900 people). Rainse said that would be going to the Aviation board on the 23rd of June and requested that have comments in by then. Tom also said that many of the large businesses use the airport for airport traffic (Costco, State Farm, etc.).

Mitch Swecker again thanked everyone for input and said they had a tough act to complete.

Public Comments

Members of the public were each given two minutes to provide oral testimony regarding the draft alternatives.

Keith Amundson (Retired urban planner with state federal and local experience and a Charbonneau resident): The data and analysis only supports the no build alternative. Reluctantly, I would go along with idea of the preferred alternative, and reiterate the comments made by Tony Holt and the Clackamas County Commissioner.

Jeff Purr (Charbonneau resident): Against expansion of the runway. I have not heard a survey of residents of the area. There are 50,000 residents. How many of those people actually use the airport? Why are we expanding an airport for a small number of people? I hear jets in the middle of the night. There are other airport options, such as Hillsboro, Portland, and Salem. People can drive to those airports. There is no need to have residents hearing jets so close by. The airport is functioning as is, and there is no need to expand it. If companies want to grow, they can use other airports. I would rather use funds to build a second bridge across the Willamette than to use funds for this airport expansion.

Mike Iverson (French Prairie Board of Directors): French Prairie is opposed to expansion of airport, the closing of Keil Road and taking away farmland. The FAA and the Board seem to go against their statements in the preferred alternative, including stating that any expansion would not prove feasible. What has suddenly made expansion feasible? We should not use tax payer dollars to benefit a small number of people. I also farm land south of the runway and have holdings on the east and west side of the airport. I have 30 employees working for me and we cross Keil Road many times daily, so you can't say that it is not used. We have lots of farm equipment we need to move, and using Arndt Road would

be a disaster. Ehlen Rd would also be impossible. I am also an ex pilot. Surface transportation interruptions caused by the 1,000 ft expansion would be inconceivable to be compatible with farming.

Rob Callan (Charboneau resident): We are not using the best method of getting public comment. You need to talk to the people. There are a lot of pilots that don't follow the rules. 5:30 this Sunday morning there was a jet over Charbonneau—and that is the norm, not the exception. Whatever you do is going to increase the traffic at this airport. We don't understand why we need expansion when 25 miles down the road we have a very long runway. Aurora airport is a convenience to big companies. To have that convenience be to the detriment of homeowners and farms is unconscionable. Salem airport is a fine alternative. Tax payer money will be spent on Aurora, which functions now. Would like to count on Marion and Clackamas County to implement noise abatement ordinances if the expansion goes through.

Janet Olmstead (Wilsonville resident): My biggest concern is the traffic—the road traffic will be impacted terribly if we expand the airport. This whole thing seems to be a plan to enrich a few people and leave the rest of us in noise and traffic.

Glen Liffick: This seems to be airport creep. I have been involved with the evolution of a couple of local airports to regional airports. There is usually an incremental increase in runway length/strength justified by safety, which results in more traffic. Then there are increased taxiways and finally a crosswind of perpendicular runway to handle bigger airplanes. I believe this is the first step in evolution to Aurora regional airport. I encourage citizens to stay involved in this process if they are concerned. Citizens must continue to speak up.

Phil Swain (Chief pilot of Aurora Aviation): I also do safety management consulting in aviation. It is not true to say longer runways don't promote safety. Safety plans need to look at the capacity of the airport. Aurora is extremely limited with the approaches we have. That in and of itself means you can't get into Aurora. Also, we have a lot of mixed traffic—jet aircraft, reciprocating aircraft. Trying to forestall a tower and runway lengthening demonstrates a lack of foresight into what the future will bring in terms of economic growth, whether we like it or not. We need to look at this from a safety and usability perspective. This is not just about a few big businesses coming in. This is an area that needs the economic growth. We need to look down the road for future and economic viability.

Brian Oliver (Employee at Aurora Aviation and resident of Multnomah County): I am an employee that commutes to Aurora. I stop in the stores in Wilsonville and eat in restaurants. I shuttle visitors to the area. The economic growth is there. I have learned that growth is inevitable. We will all experience it. The airport will continue to grow. I am a student pilot. I have been fascinated to hear the armchair aviation that occurs in these kinds of public forums. A lengthened runway will increase safety. We need to listen to the experts and those who understand aviation. We can't look at an airplane on a ramp and make a judgment on it just because we are impacted by something tangential to the safety issue.

Ken Ivey (Chair of an unincorporated communities planning organization in Clackamas County): The noise plans are not being respected very much. In Charbonneau, I had a leer jet over my house, and that is common. People aren't following the noise abatement routes. If you want to justify expansion, you need to control your pilots and get noise abatement in place.

Annie Kirk (Aurora citizen and Marion County resident): I appreciate the comments made about mitigating noise. I would ask that when Charbonneau residents make noise comments, you would include the City of Aurora. I am against lengthening of the runway and agree with the Charbonneau representative that strengthening is okay. If any other alternatives come to pass, those on mailing list should understand they have an opportunity to comment. When the add-ons were made, I was unaware so did not comment.

Next steps

Rainse explained that the comment form would be online for the next two weeks. The next item of business will be a presentation to the Oregon Aviation Board looking for direction from them as to how to move forward with the ALP and the CIP on the 23rd of June. A PAC workshop will follow regarding the ALP and the CIP.

Joe Smith, Oregon Aviation Board said that he came to the meeting to listen and he listened very carefully. He has taken the time to read every comment on the website, and by June 23rd, will read everything on the website and that comes his way. He said there are a couple of things that people should be aware of: First, he is totally in favor of there being a tower for safety and for the best way to see that pilots are obeying flight patterns and noise abatement procedures. Second, he said he has to confess that he's very underwhelmed by the road/traffic arguments. The idea that there is going to be a significant increase in traffic is hard to believe. Before any extension happens, a number of studies would have to take place, and people would have to be compensated for their property. The thing to remember is that what goes into the ALP is not necessarily going to happen, but what doesn't won't happen. He said he really appreciates people attending, staying late and providing feedback.

Tony Holt asked what preferred alternative will be presented to the Aviation Board. Joe responded that he doesn't know where the idea of a preferred alternative came from. He said it's not the business of the consultant. It is the business of the consultant to look at all the possible options. He believes the word preferred has to go away. Rainse responded that they have to get to an ALP and to do so, they will get together with staff from ODA and Mark Gardiner from the Aviation Board to determine how they will present the material to the Aviation Board. Mitch added that it is a Board decision and they will make the call. They have postponed that decision twice. Mitch said that all feasible alternatives will be presented to the Board for consideration and decision.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 7:45 p.m.