

Appendix B

PLANNING ADVISORY COMMITTEE - MEETING SUMMARIES

Master Plan Update

Grants Pass Airport

Grants Pass Airport Master Plan & Airport Layout Plan Update

Meeting #1 Summary

January 12, 2009

Grants Pass Airport, FBO Classroom

6:00 – 7:30 p.m.

Attendees:

Josephine County Department of Airports: Alex Grossi, Airport Manager

Public Advisory Committee Members: Trenor Scott, Brett Hopper, Tobin Shackelford, and Jeff Tompkins

Liaison Commissioner: Sandi Cassanelli

Oregon Department of Aviation: Chris Cummings

WHPacific, Inc: Rainse Anderson and Sarah Lucas

General Public: Refer to attached sign-in sheet

Welcome and Introductions Alex Grossi opened the meeting at 6:05 pm by introducing the Advisory Committee members and WHPacific staff.

Purpose of the Master Plan / ALP Update Rainse Anderson, Project Manager, gave an overview of the project's purpose. The intent is to update the 1990 Grants Pass Airport Layout Plan (ALP) Update. This document is over 17 years old and needs to be updated to reflect new facilities, current projections of airport activity, new environmental and other regulatory constraints, and to plan for an appropriate mix of land uses to support projected aviation and non-aviation needs and the long-term financial health of the airport.

The updated Master Plan will help the Josephine County Department of Airports select appropriate patterns of land use on the airfield and adjoining County properties based on updated forecasts of demand for aviation services such as hangars, tie downs, repair, flight instruction, etc. Adjacent development will be considered to ensure growth is compatible with airport operations. Paradise Ranch, and its connection with the Airport, will also be evaluated. Obsolete elements of the existing ALP will be corrected. An updated capital improvement plan will allow the County to make strategic investments in needed airfield projects.

Project Components Sarah Lucas, Project Planner, presented the Master Plan Components,

which are Inventory and Data Collection; Aeronautical Activity Forecast; Facility Requirements; Airport Alternatives; ALP Drawings; and Capital Improvement Plan. The ALP drawings consist of the following: Airport Layout Plan, Airport Airspace Plan, Inner Portion of the Approach Surface Drawing, Terminal Area Drawing, Land Use and Noise Contour Drawing, Runway Departure Surfaces Drawing, and Airport Property Map. Each component represents a chapter in the Master Plan. Advisory Committee members will receive draft chapters 2 weeks in advance of public meetings, in order for them to review and provide input.

The 18-month project schedule is included in the Advisory Committee member's project binder. This schedule allows for review time from the Committee, in addition to the County and Federal Aviation Administration (FAA).

Roles of the Advisory Committee

The Committee will serve as an advisor to the County. The County has final authority over the Master Plan. The Committee is asked to provide input, based on specific knowledge of the members, to help produce a document that incorporates a wide range of interests.

The Committee is asked to bring comments and concerns of the public forward at the meetings for discussions. It is also requested the Committee help in "rumor control" to reduce misconceptions about the Plan's intent.

Comments from the Committee can be discussed during the meeting, or at anytime between meetings by contacting the County or WHPacific.

Inventory

WHPacific conducted a physical inventory of the airport on the day of the meeting. A draft Inventory Chapter will be drafted and provided to the Committee in the next few weeks.

Some of the items gathered are:

- Airport Acreage is approximately 400 acres
- Runway dimensions: 4,001' x 75'
- Full Parallel Taxiway (35' wide)
- Medium Intensity Runway Lighting (MIRL) is installed
- No taxiway edge reflectors
- Limited Airport signage
- GPS Approach
- 12 T-hangars with a total of 85 individual units
- 47 box hangars
- 41 tie downs

-
- 7 businesses located on-site
 - 120 based aircraft

This information, along with other information such as fuel sales and lease information, will be included in the draft Inventory chapter.

Open Discussion

The following comments were made by members of the Advisory Committee:

Tobin Shackelford –

- Paradise Ranch is planning on opening in Summer 2009
- Components of the through the fence arrangement include a 12,000 s.f. heated hangar and terminal building
- Paradise Ranch would like to bring in more business in addition to their clients.
- A runway extension is vital
- The Airport is key to economic growth
- Paradise Ranch plans to employ 5-10 aviation only employees. Total, the Ranch plans on hiring 80 full-time employees and up to 40 part-time employees. These employees will be local.
- Paradise Ranch has done studies of aircraft used by potential clients, which range from Citation I to a Falcon 900.
- The first line of the sewer system (referred to as the “spine”) is planned for installation in the summer of 2009.
- An eastside parallel taxiway would encourage more development on that side of the runway.

Brett Hopper –

- Runway extension of 1,000’ to 2,000’ is needed
- Airport has high approach minima
- UPS mail carrier discontinued service to the airport. It is believed this happened because the airport’s airspace is Class G up to 700’. UPS couldn’t take off in IFR conditions in Class G airspace; Class C is preferred.
- Is it possible to have ADS-B technology at Airport?
- The Airport’s SuperAWOS doesn’t report to the FAA. ATC and flight briefers do not have access to the weather reporting. This has inhibited operations, especially life flight, and the weather station needs to be modified or upgraded.
- Airport security and access is lacking. Codes need to be changed periodically or people should have personal access codes. Video cameras and a webcam would be useful.
- There are talks that Ameriflight would like to do their priority

overnight operations from the Airport in the BE-99.

- The County should have an out of the box, ready leases for cookie-cutter development. The process needs to be streamlined to encourage development.

Jeff Tompkins –

- There is natural gas near the Airport and it should be connected into the Airport.

Alex Grossi –

- The fuel station needs to be relocated, preferably at the Runway 12 end of the airfield.
- A new FBO location with more close-in ramp area is needed. This would be beneficial for charter, life flight, and transient operations. It would also increase security and safety at the Airport.

The following comments were presented by members of the public (*responses in italics*):

- Where does the Airport's financing come from? *The Airport is funded by federal and state grants and user fees. No County general funds have been used to date.*
- Can the project timeline be compressed? *Yes, we will try to compress the schedule; however, things like review allowances cannot be changed.*
- Are projects on hold until the Master Plan is completed? *No. The County is underway with a fencing project at Illinois Valley as an example.*
- Are there any advantages for the Airport to staying small? *Not in the means of economic development.*
- Would a larger airport mean Merlin would be incorporated into Grants Pass? *That would be extremely unlikely. There are issues such as the Urban Growth Boundary that would prohibit that.*
- If the Airport is looking at changing zoning, they need to work with the County. *Yes, that is correct.*
- Asked to Paradise Ranch: Are there any problems with the Airport? Paradise Ranch response: *Yes- runway length, weather reporting. The summer high volume is estimated at 15 operations per day. This would double or triple fuel sales. The Airport's rural feel is attractive to their clients – they prefer the privacy.*

Grants Pass Airport Master Plan & Airport Layout Plan Update

Meeting #2

July 13, 2009

Grants Pass Airport, FBO Classroom

5:30 – 7:00 p.m.

Attendees:

Josephine County Department of Airports: Alex Grossi, Airport Manager

WHPacific, Inc: Rainse Anderson, Sarah Lucas and Sara Funk

Planning Advisory Committee (PAC): Brett Hopper, Tobin Shackelford and Del Renfro,

Welcome and Introductions	Alex Grossi opened the meeting at 5:35 pm by introducing the Advisory Committee members and WHPacific staff.
Project Update	Rainse Anderson reported the project team has prepared and submitted draft Chapters 1, 2 and 3 to the County, Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) and PAC Members. The FAA has approved Chapter 2, <i>Aeronautical Activity Forecast</i> .
Inventory	Sarah Lucas presented a brief review of Chapter 1, <i>Inventory</i> .
Aeronautical Activity Forecasts	<p>Sara Funk and Sarah Lucas presented Chapter 2, <i>Aeronautical Activity Forecast</i>. The purpose of the forecast is to determine the types and levels of aviation activity expected at the Airport during a 20-year planning period. The method used to prepare the forecast is to utilize national and regional aviation trends and forecasts; review regional socioeconomic trends and forecasts; and examine various FAA-approved forecasting models.</p> <p>The Preferred Based Aircraft Forecast was chosen by selecting the mode of six different forecasting models. An average annual growth rate (AAGR) of 1.10% was selected for based aircraft at the Grants Pass Airport.</p> <p>The Preferred Aircraft Operations Forecast is based on 250 operations per based aircraft (FAA guidance for rural GA airports). Using this guidance, operations are expected to grow at 1.09% AAGR over the planning period.</p> <p>Chapter 2 also presents the Critical Aircraft, which is used for planning purposes, as the most demanding aircraft performing at least 500 annual</p>

itinerant operations at the Airport. The Airport's Critical Aircraft was identified as the Beech King Air 200, which represents an airport reference code of B-II.

Members of the PAC noted the forecast is difficult, given the current economic conditions. It was reemphasized; however, that fuel sales are increasing at the airport.

**Facility
Requirements**

The project team discussed Chapter 3, *Facility Requirements*. The intent of this chapter is to identify the adequacy of existing facilities and outline what new facilities may be needed to meet the projected demand. By utilizing planning criteria defined by FAA and the Oregon Department of Aviation (ODA), the requirements are developed. Industry guidance was also presented for the PAC and County to understand the facilities and services desirable for corporate aviation and air taxis. However, it was noted the FAA cannot use industry criteria or economic development criteria to substantiate funding.

Facility needs identified in the chapter are:

- precision instrument approach
- taxiway lighting
- terminal building
- cargo apron
- 24-hour fixed base operator (FBO) service
- nonstandard object free area
- grade of one taxilane
- full-parallel taxiway east of runway
- upgrade SuperAWOS to transmit data to FAA
- nine additional T-hangars by 2029
- ten additional conventional hangars by 2029
- 39 additional aircraft tiedowns
- fueling system access and possible relocation
- improved pedestrian gates
- zoning recommended to be changed to "Airport"

The existing runway length is adequate for the Airport's critical aircraft, using FAA and ODA criteria. However, using industry standards for small business jet aircraft it was noted the runway length is deficient.

The PAC members had an opportunity to give input on their perceived needs

at the Airport. They were: weather reporting (FBO cannot transmit due to liability concerns, data is erroneous sometimes, ceiling height data is needed, and air ambulances cannot shoot approaches), reconnecting the pilot controlled lighting system, medium intensity runway lighting (MIRL) system and instrument approach to Runway 30, and taxiway at Rogue Aero needs to be wider.

Airport Alternatives Discussion

PAC members gave input on items the alternatives should include. These items are:

- The FBO should be centrally located, with easy road access.
- Consider remodeling existing FBO facility.
- Consolidate FBO functions that are now spread around the airport.
- Some FBO functions can be separate.
- There are limitations to development due to utilities.
- The fuel station needs to be relocated, with more capacity. The jet fuel tank is underground and will need remediation within 20 years.
- Water needs to be provided to the Airport.
- The Airport is within an enterprise zone and that may help with funding projects, like utilities.
- Visual glideslope indicators would be beneficial at the Airport.
- National Guard fencing to secure the airfield will be done by the end of August.
- Increase pavement strength for air attack (firefighting) operations.

Runway Overlay Update

Rainse Anderson and Alex Grossi gave an update on the runway overlay project. The scope and fees should be approved within 2 weeks of the meeting date.

The project includes rehabilitation of Runway 12/30, new MIRL system, and new electrical equipment building. The existing pavement strength is 19,000 lbs single wheel gear (SWG) and approximately 40,000 lbs dual wheel gear (DWG).

Currently, construction is planned for summer of 2010.

Next Meeting Date and Time

The next meeting will be to discuss the airport alternatives. The meeting will be held in September. Notice will be sent once the date, time and location is set.

Public Comment

The following comments were made by public attendees:

- Tearing out three rows of T-hangars for an FBO is not necessary. Doing so would put a limit on the life of a hangar. Suggests remodeling hangars and finding a location for the FBO elsewhere.
- It was also asked who was funding the FBO. *The FBO would be funded privately, although they may receive grants by state or federal agencies. Southern Oregon Regional Economic Development, Inc (SOREDI) is currently working with the FBO by doing a feasibility study to determine funding options.*
- The Airport is not served by a fire department. The Airport does not have a contract for fire protection and instead will pay for services as needed. Several people were concerned by this. They asked if the County has anyone doing inspections or airport-related training with the fire protection providers. There was a lengthy discussion on this topic and it was suggested this is a County-wide issue and should be taken to the County Commission.
- A tenant reminded attendees the Airport takes no County general funds.
- Should the National Guard be moved to the Illinois Valley Airport? *Alex Grossi said that had not been discussed.*
- Paradise Ranch shouldn't drive development in the forecasts. *The consultant team said information from Paradise Ranch was used only anecdotally in the forecasts and did not affect the outcome.*
- Is having representatives from the FBO and Paradise Ranch on the PAC a conflict of interest? *No, the PAC embodies a good cross-section of airport stakeholders, which is what the FAA recommends for a master plan advisory committee.*
- Is it possible for a noise curfew to be implemented at the Airport. *No, this would be in violation of federal law.*

The meeting adjourned at 8:00 pm.

Grants Pass Airport Master Plan & Airport Layout Plan Update

Meeting #3

January 26, 2010

Merlin Community Center

100 Acorn Street, Merlin

5:45 – 7:15 p.m.

Attendees:

Josephine County Department of Airports: Alex Grossi, Airport Manager

WHPacific, Inc: Rainse Anderson and Sarah Lucas

Planning Advisory Committee: Trenor Scott, Brett Hopper, Tobin Shackelford and Jeff Thompkins

Public Attendees: 29 members of the public signed in (see attached sheet)

Welcome and Introductions	Alex Grossi opened the meeting at 5:45 pm by introducing the Planning Advisory Committee (PAC) members and WHPacific staff.
Project Update	<p>Rainse Anderson reported the project team has prepared and submitted draft Chapter 4, <i>Airport Development Alternatives</i>, to the County, Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) and PAC Members.</p> <p>The intent of this meeting is to select a preferred alternative that will ultimately become the basis of the Airport Layout Plan (ALP). The preferred alternative can be a hybrid of the alternatives presented.</p>
Draft Chapter 4 – Airport Development Alternatives	<p>Rainse and Sarah Lucas presented the following: Chapter 4 presents several development alternatives that focus on meeting the Airport’s facility needs for the long-term future (2029 and beyond). The Airport’s needs are based on the recommendations presented in Chapter 3, <i>Facility Requirements</i>. The alternatives consider the ultimate potential of the airport property.</p> <p>A summary of the Chapter 3 facility requirements was presented to the PAC:</p> <p><i>Airfield:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Increase Runway Protection Zone (RPZ), as appropriate, for future instrument approach• Upgrade to precision instrument approach• Install approach lighting system, as appropriate• Upgrade runway markings for instrument approach• Clear Object Free Area (OFA)

-
- Extend runway
 - Construct full-length eastern parallel taxiway
 - Level taxilanes south of Hangar Row "A", when appropriate
 - Upgrade Medium Intensity Runway Lighting (MIRL) to a can / conduit system
 - Install taxiway and taxilane edge lights
 - Upgrade SuperAWOS (Automated Weather Observation System) to transmit data to FAA

Landside:

- Construct nine T-hangars and ten conventional hangars
- Expand tiedown apron
- Install cargo apron
- Reserve land for locating a Fixed-Base Operator (FBO) facility
- Install punch type combination locks on pedestrian gates
- Relieve congestion around the self-service fueling station

Three alternatives, in addition to the no build alternative, were presented (and are attached for reference). A brief overview of the alternatives follows:

No Build Alternative:

- Maintenance of existing facilities
- No expansion of airfield or landside facilities
 - OFA would remain non-standard
 - FBO would remain in inadequate facilities
 - Congestion around the self-service fueling station would persist
 - There would still be a financial impact to the County for maintenance

Alternative 1:

Airfield Components

- Runway and parallel taxiway extension of 1,200 to the NW
- Instrument approach to Runway 12, with minimums not lower than ¾ mile (would require property acquisition or avigation easement)
- Full-parallel taxiway on the east side
- Installation of approach lighting system and taxiway/taxilane edge lights
- Helicopter operations area

Landside Components

- Expand FBO in current location, removal of T-hangars required
- Fuel station moved to the north
- Reserve areas for corporate, T-hangar and conventional hangars, aviation-related business and aviation compatible commercial development

-
- Road relocation near the aviation-related business reserve
 - Relocation of beacon and SuperAWOS

Alternative 2:

Airfield Components

- Runway and parallel taxiway extension of 2,000 to the NW
- Instrument approach to Runway 12 and 30, with minimums not lower than 1 mile
- Full-parallel taxiway on the east side
- Installation of taxiway/taxilane edge lights
- Helicopter operations area

Landside Components

- FBO relocation to the north of current location
- Fuel station would remain in its current location
- Extension of aircraft parking apron
- Reserve areas for corporate, T-hangar and conventional hangars, aviation-related business and aviation compatible commercial development
- Road relocation near the aviation-related business reserve

Alternative 3:

Airfield Components

- Runway and parallel taxiway extension of 2,000 to the NW
- Instrument approach to Runway 12, with minimums not lower than ¾ mile (would require property acquisition or avigation easement)
- Full-parallel taxiway on the east side
- Installation of approach lighting system and taxiway/taxilane edge lights
- Helicopter operations area

Landside Components

- FBO relocation to the north of current location
- Fuel station relocated near FBO facility
- Extension of aircraft parking apron
- Reserve areas for corporate, T-hangar and conventional hangars, aviation-related business and aviation compatible commercial development
- Road relocation near the aviation-related business reserve and new main airport access road
- New access road on the east side to access corporate development reserve area
- Relocation of Super AWOS
- Potential land purchase near aviation-related business reserve

Financial Impact of Alternatives

Detailed cost estimates were not prepared. Order of magnitude capital costs used to analyze impact.

- Alternative 3 would have highest capital cost
 - Longer runway extension and more expensive instrument approach improvements
- Alternative 2 would have second highest capital cost
 - Less expensive instrument approach improvements
- Alternative 1 would have the third highest capital cost
 - Shorter runway and parallel taxiway extension
- No-Build Alternative would have the least capital cost
 - Maintain only existing pavements and facilities

Environmental Screening

A high-level environmental screening of each alternative was prepared, based on the 21 impact categories presented in FAA Order 1050.1E and guidance from the Council on Environmental Quality, per the National Environmental Policy Act.

The review found that both Alternatives 2 and 3 would have the same environmental impact, with Alternative 1 having a slightly less impact mostly due to the shorter runway extension. The no build alternative would have the least environmental impact, as it only maintains existing facilities.

Airport Alternatives Discussion (PAC comments)

Questions from PAC members are presented, with responses in *italics*.

Explain restrictions of an aviation easement.

An aviation easement restricts the height and nature of buildings constructed within an outlined area. Height restrictions are based on runway elevation; therefore, lower lying areas have reduced restrictions.

What is aviation compatible commercial?

Aviation compatible commercial can be any business ranging from car rental, hotels and restaurants. The development does not have to be aviation-related (like an avionics shop); rather it must not conflict with airport operations (such as a factory that produces smoke or steam).

Can we (the PAC) suggest that hangar replacements be built before the three T-hangars (Rows A, B, C) are removed?

Yes, the County can choose to replace the T-hangars prior to removal. The replacement can be accomplished by the County or by a developer through land leases.

What does it mean when the report says the FAA cannot pay for items pertaining to economic development?

The FAA can only pay for necessary safety, capacity or maintenance items. For

instance, a runway extension may prove to be an economic generator; however, FAA must be able to justify the extension on a safety or capacity basis.

What was the process of developing the alternatives?

The consultant developed the alternatives based on recommendations from Chapter 3, Facility Requirements, along with guidance from the County.

Why is there no alternative showing the FBO on the east side?

Considering set backs from the runway system and the County road, there is limited area for the development of an FBO on the east side.

Could the fuel island be located on the existing tie down apron?

Yes, it could. However, other locations were shown that would locate the fuel closer to the ultimate FBO facility.

If the FBO were located farther to the north, there would be potential residential impacts. Was this considered?

Yes, residential impacts were considered in the analysis.

If the County were to extend the sewer system to the Airport and the surrounding area, there would be a push for higher density development than what currently surrounds the Airport. How do the plans address this issue?

It is recommended that high-density development not be allowed near the Airport. This is an issue the County must consider when discussing the implications of extending the sewer line.

What would the fencing plans for each alternative be?

Details of a fencing plan would be developed during actual project design.

The ground profile slopes down, the farther north you are on the Airport. How would development be allowed in these areas to maintain appropriate taxiway grades?

Any development would require fill material to raise the ground profile.

Would you have to bury the power lines to develop the triangle area?

No. Discussions with the power company indicate taxilanes are permitted. Hangar development would need an 18-foot setback, while any fueling would require a 100-foot setback.

What is the current runway strength?

The current runway is rated at 19,000 lbs single-wheel gear. However, testing shows the actual rating is much lower. The proposed maintenance overlay will bring the runway up to 12,500 lbs single-wheel gear for a 20-year pavement life.

Is it possible to extend the runway by going south, rather than north?

No. The RPZ would extend over public roadways, which is discouraged by the FAA.

What happens if the Master Plan is prepared and there is public outcry? Do you go back and make changes?

No. The PAC meetings are open to the public, so they are provided an opportunity to give input throughout the entire planning process.

What is the Master Plan approval process?

The Airport Advisory Board would approve the document, prior to sending it to the Board of County Commissioners.

General Comments from PAC Regarding a Preferred Alternative

- The instrument approach with minimums not lower than ¾ mile is preferred. Provide land use protections for this approach at the current and planned runway length.
- A precision instrument approach is a high priority.
- For operations purposes, the FBO and fuel station should be located near one another.
- It was asked if the tie down apron ever fills up and another PAC member indicated it does – especially in the summer months.
- The triangle area is a high development priority.
- The corporate development reserve shown on Alternative 3 is only developable on the south half. The ground profile on the north half of the reserve drops off too significantly for any development.
- There needs to be an area set aside for larger, heavy-lift helicopters to operate. The forest service area on the east would provide a suitable location, with good access (ground and air) and separation.

**Airport
Alternatives
Discussion
(public comments)**

Questions from members of the public are presented, with responses in *italics*.

How much grant money would the County get for these projects?

For all Airport Improvement Program (AIP)-eligible projects, the current funding level is 95% FAA and 5% County. The Oregon Department of Aviation also has a grant program that could provide for part of the County's match. Currently, the County receives \$150,000 of entitlements annually from the FAA. Cost estimates for the preferred alternative are forthcoming.

How did removing hangar rows A, B and C get considered in the alternatives?

With assistance from the County, all alternatives were developed to look at expansion capabilities. One consideration was how to expand the FBO in its current location.

The plans show major development on the east, so why was an FBO not shown there?

The development is shown as mostly corporate aviation, with the majority of the general aviation development remaining on the west. There are limitations for development on the east and it would be difficult to locate fuel near the FBO. Additionally, most users of self-service would still be located on the west, which would create unnecessary runway crossings.

We are confused on the process. If the Airport Advisory Board is supposed to endorse the final plan, why aren't they involved now? Can we merge the Board

with the PAC?

Much discussion then followed regarding this issue. The meeting adjourned, so the Airport Advisory Board could discuss their concerns. During their meeting they decided the PAC is doing a good job representing the Airport and the Board would support their decisions.

What kind of timeline are we looking at for making a decision on the preferred alternative?

After tonight's meeting, the consultant will work with the County to help them make the decision on the preferred alternative recommendation from the PAC.

After the Airport Advisory Board meeting ended, the PAC members reconvened and gave their recommendation for the preferred alternative that reflected their discussion presented above. Main components of the recommended preferred alternative were:

- 2,000-foot runway extension to the north
- Precision instrument approach with minimums not lower than $\frac{3}{4}$ mile
- Relocate the FBO and fuel farm to the north (near the current end of Runway 12), with the appropriate surface access modifications
- Internal access roads for the corporate development reserve (east side of airport) and for the T-hangar development in the triangle area (west side of airport)
- Full parallel taxiway on the east side
- Locate future helicopter operations on the east of the airport, by the US Forest Service lease area
- Update weather reporting to be compatible with FAA system

Next Meeting Date and Time The next PAC meeting will present the ALP and Capital Improvement Plan (CIP). It is tentatively scheduled for the third week in April.

Grants Pass Airport Master Plan & Airport Layout Plan Update Meeting #3

January 26, 2010
Merlin Community Center
100 Acorn Street, Merlin
5:45 - 7:15 p.m.

SIGN IN SHEET

NAME	REPRESENTING	MAILING ADDRESS	PHONE#	E-MAIL	
David Carpenter	Bee				
Bob Marshall	Fish				
Bob Breakers		1304 NW Bellevue PL G.D.	954-5877	astivalb@sigmail.com	
Devon's Crumford		300 Glenview Dr	williamcrumford@gmail.com		
ERST BARRUS		490 W. PICKETT CREEK RD, GP 97527		brentbarrus@earthlink.net	
BOB CARAVAS		3874 OAKMOUNT DR	517-97526	BOB CARAVAS@CARAVAS.VERMONT	
Martha Marks		1030 Rainbow Dr	97526		
BERT DOSAIRE		5986 TEROME PRAIRIE RD - GP 97537		bertdosaire@msn.com	
David Toeser		2274 Canyon Way	GP 97526		
Austin Johnson		SAME			
James W. Auer		P.O. Box 1698	Roseburg, OR 9757		
Tyler Shackelford		221 N. Central Ave	Merlin, OR 97501	tylshackelford@gmail.com	
Key Lindsay					
Don Dougherty		200 Spring Dale Way	Merlin 97532		
JAN LINSTAD					
BONNIE COOK					
SALVADOR CORONADO		1906 MCCARTER LN	GP 97527	salvadorcoronadoc@comcast.net	
Rebecca Hummer (Tenant)		2004 NW Birch St. G.A.	97526	541-846-6680	
Bryan Doffinger		PO 408	Merlin 97532		
Michael Smith		50 REED	673 MARKET ST, MERLIN, OR 97504	541-826-2570/michael@saedi.com	
Jim Swasee		POB 674	Merlin 97532	541-440-2864 jim2m@merlinchamber.org	
Michael Bird		2575 Harbeck	GRANTS PASS, OR 97527	441-1258 - mjbrock@olcathink.com	
Beth Hopper		501 Rosestar Bldg	PO Box 1379	97532	479-5216
Bob Traylor		2244 Canton Way	GP 97526	541-441-1841 bethhopper@msn.com	
		PO Box 1114		541-741-5373	

