

Appendix B

PLANNING ADVISORY COMMITTEE - MEETING SUMMARIES

Airport Layout Plan Update

Illinois Valley Airport

Illinois Valley Airport - Airport Layout Plan Update

Meeting #1 Summary

January 13, 2009

Illinois Valley Airport, Restaurant Building

6:00 – 7:30 p.m.

Attendees:

Josephine County Department of Airports: Alex Grossi, Airport Manager

Public Advisory Committee: Bill Gettle, Ed Russell, Tony Paulson, Keith Hill, and Don Moore

Liaison Commissioner: Sandi Cassanelli

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 ALP Update Rainse Anderson, Project Manager, gave an overview of the project's purpose. The intent is to update the 2001 Illinois Valley Airport Layout Plan (ALP) and Narrative Report. This document is over 7 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.

This project will provide the airport with revised ALP drawings and a Capital Improvement Program (CIP) that will provide the airport with a method and proposed schedule for correcting identified airport design deficiencies. It is the intent of this study to update existing drawings and provide a review of existing and long-range needs of the airport. Specific items that will be addressed within the narrative report include a review of the historic buildings on the Airport and how they may affect future development, along with a detailed discussion of the appropriate Airport Reference Code (ARC). The ARC dictates the Federal Aviation Administration's (FAA's) design and safety standards for the Airport.

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 CIP. The ALP drawings consist of the following: Airport Layout Plan, Airport Airspace Plan, Inner Portion of the Approach Surface Drawing, Land Use and Noise Contour 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:

- Runway 18/36 – 4,807' x 75'
- No parallel taxiway
- No instrument approach
- 9 box hangars
- 2 T-hangar, for a total of 12 individual units
- 12 based aircraft
- SuperAWOS weather reporting
- Nearby obstructions (trees)

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

Open Discussion

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

Bill Gettle –

- Current ALP has many mistakes. Please e-mail the old ALP to committee members for them to mark-up and comment on.

Ed Russell –

- Development of the westside and industrial park are priority. Electricity is still needed at industrial park. The Airport and the industrial park need to be connected.
- The eastside lacks space for any development
- The historical buildings and recreation opportunities (both on and off airport) are assets.
- We need to ask ourselves what is “useful” to the community.
- The Airport serves as an alternate for many people in the event of coastal or valley fog, but there isn’t any fuel available.
- Are the forecasts prepared in real-time? *Yes, they are.*
- Does the National Plan of Integrated Airport Systems (NPIAS) have something to do with the Airport Reference Code (ARC)?
No.

Don Moore –

- The facility is underused
- More hangar space is needed
- The USFS bunker is obsolete (County has requested that the bunker and the property be relinquished to them).

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

- Does the FAA permit modifications to standards? *Yes, in some instances, like if they change their design standards. This is not the same; however, if the airport moves from one ARC designation to another. In the case of changing designations the FAA asks you to do what you can about meeting the standards.*
- The trees are beneficial to the airport for activities like camping.
- The Plan should consider that the Airport is unique and has national significance. First, it is the only smoke jumper base in its original condition. Second, the mantle rock creates an alluvial fan that makes the soil artificially arid and creates a unique environment. Third, it is the only place of its kind in the US with three wilderness areas, and three wild and scenic

rivers within 10 miles.

- This Airport is an attractive destination for many pilots due to its beauty and recreational potential. People don't move here for jobs, so the focus shouldn't be economic development.
- Fuel is needed at the Airport
- Is there a direction the consultants have been asked to head towards in the Plan? *No, the Plan will be guided from input.*
- The B-II classification changed the airspace from Class G to Class E.
- Can the Airport keep young people in the area? *Yes, it is a welcoming and friendly place for training. If services are provided, that would create jobs. The Airport could also increase job opportunities in tourism, but the industrial potential is questionable. This is a great place to raise families. (Response from public members)*
- 300 people have soloed here in the last 17 years with no fatalities. The light sport realm is very attractive to people in the lower economic brackets.
- Is it the County's intent on doing something pre-meditated or will input be heard? *The ALP is the County's roadmap. The Commissioners want the Airport to be economically viable. Input will be heard; however, extreme options on either side will not be entertained. FAA design standards must be considered and development will be demand driven.*
- Cheryl Johnson offered her facilitating expertise to help create a Mission and Vision statement for the Airport.
- Has WHPacific done work at the Airport previously? *Yes, WHPacific has worked at the Airport twice as the State's engineer for the Pavement Maintenance Program.*
- Will the inventory chapter include the environment (botanical wayside, rare plants, etc.)? *The Airport could be an asset to the botanical attraction. Yes, the inventory chapter does include a review of the natural and built environments.*
- Louise Gettle talked about how her family's aircraft maintenance business brings people in from Nevada, California, and other regional airports but everyone stops in California or elsewhere to buy fuel. Bringing fuel to the airport is essential.
- The nature of the airport is very important. We need expert advice from people who are thinking for us. Plans for the smoke jumper base have been put on hold because vehicle parking has been taken away.
- A suggestion was made to turn the runway into the parallel

taxiway and construct the runway west of that.

- Why did the 2001 plan include an eastside taxiway and the 1992 plan didn't? *Those plans were prepared by different consultants and the decision making process is unknown.*
- What is the difference between a B-I and B-II airport? *The Plan will include a discussion on this, but the setbacks are mainly determined by the type of approach planned at an airport.*
- We've just been talking for years; it is time to do something.
- Is the industrial park going to be part of the Plan? *Yes, it is a component.*
- Other than fuel, it would seem that car rental is necessary. Especially if we market the tourism side of the Airport.
- There are many intangible values to the Airport, such as firefighting.
- Will the County make hangar leasing easier? *Yes, the process is more streamlined than before and review time has been reduced.*
- Leases, like for the Lions Club and the Loft, make the County money. The Loft alone is \$3,000 per year.

Illinois Valley Airport - Airport Layout Plan Update Meeting #1

January 13, 2009

Illinois Valley Airport, Restaurant Building

Meeting: 6:00 - 7:30 p.m.

SIGN IN SHEET

NAME	REPRESENTING	MAILING ADDRESS	PHONE#	E-MAIL
Louise Gattie	The Hyung Machine	30504 D Redwood Hwy Cave Junction 97523		
HERB JENSEN	SELF (possible firefighter)	POB173 O'Brien	596-2104	herberj@frontiernet.net
Carol Lynn	SELF	P.O. Box 118 O'Brien	596-2017	
Jim & Kathy Lombardo		PO Box 441 O'Brien	576-2137	lombardn@caavenet.com
Don Strong		30904 Redwood Hwy Cave Junction	592-3730	
Jack McLoonach		PO Box 622 CJ OR	592-3375	
Sandi Rosemwell		PO Box 52, Madras OR 97532	955-7001	S.Rosemwell@co.jorep.org
ALAN JENSEN		6265 WESTSITE RD, AVE JONET	592-6000	
GARY BRICK		712 AIRPORT RD CJ	592-2055	
SHARON WESTCOTT	SELF	S.S.M.P. P.O. Box 473, SEMA, OR. 97538	541-660-7965	sharon@flywildain.com
CAMERON CAR	SELF	PO Box 247 SEMA 97538	597-2974	
PAUL KUELER	SELF	419 DICK GEORGE RD CJ	592-3673	
TONY PAULSON		PO. Box 1855 CJ 97523	287-0429	cel@toyrescue.net
Keith Hill		P.O. Box 3924 Kevs 97571	944-3491	
ROGER BRANDT		PO BOX 2350 KS 97523	592-4316	
Dale Matthews		924 E SUIPINE ST. COP 97526-2742	477-8885	matth@cpnors.com
ALEX GROSSI	TO COPIA	14418 Breakside 97526	955-4535	
KIWISS ANDERSON	WhPacific	9755 SW Business Rd, Suite 300, Portland 97225	503-372-3521	randerson@whpacific.com
SWADY LUCAS	WhPacific	" "	503-372-3533	slucas@whpacific.com

Illinois Valley Airport – Airport Layout Plan Update

Meeting #2

July 14, 2009

Illinois Valley Airport, Restaurant Building

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): Bill Gettle, Ed Russell, Tony Paulson, Keith Hill, Don Moore and Bob Schumacher

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 average of six different forecasting models. An average annual growth rate (AAGR) of 1.27% was selected for based aircraft at the Illinois Valley 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 1.37% AAGR over the planning period.</p> <p>Chapter 2 also presents the Critical Aircraft, which is used for planning</p>

purposes, as the most demanding aircraft performing at least 500 annual itinerant operations at the Airport. The Airport's Critical Aircraft was identified as the Beech Baron 58P, which represents an airport reference code of B-I (small).

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.

Facility needs identified in the chapter are:

- Parallel taxiway
- 100LL fuel sales
- Runway protection zone control
- Visual glide slope indicators
- Upgrade runway lighting to medium intensity runway lighting (MIRL)
- Install taxiway and taxilane edge reflectors
- GPS approach (straight-in or circling)
- Upgrade SuperAWOS to transmit data to FAA
- Three additional T-hangars by 2029
- Two additional conventional hangars by 2029
- Grass overflow tiedown area
- Fixed base operator (FBO) reserve
- Rezone airport property to "Airport"

The PAC members had an opportunity to give input on their perceived needs at the Airport. They were: 220-V power was promised as part of industrial park but never installed, T hangars need more electricity, and parallel taxiway should be on the west of the runway.

Airport Alternatives Discussion

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

- Fuel location available mid-field on east side for short-term, but should be on west side in the long-term.
- Need to have a helicopter fueling area.
- Explosives bunker will be turned back to County.
- BLM land purchases not possible (as previous ALP considered).
- A runup on a west side taxiway would bother the Wayside.

-
- Must blend general aviation and historic properties coherently.
 - A helicopter staging area, with the necessary setbacks, should be identified.

Perimeter Fence Project Update

Alex Grossi gave an update on the perimeter fence project. The design for the project was just completed by KPFF Engineers.

The project includes complete installation of a perimeter fence with access gates. Please see the accompanying presentation for project details.

Some tenants were concerned about the proposed project and how it will impact their access. The County will work with them to remediate these concerns.

A lengthy discussion regarding fencing and airport access followed. It was agreed safety and security of the airport is essential, but that a plan must allow for use by the airport and historical area.

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:

- The forecast reports 85 operations of air taxi in 2014. This is not valid.
- Forecast growth seems inconsistent with 26% unemployment in the County.
- A lot of what was presented makes sense, but an east side parallel taxiway does not. An east side taxiway would crowd fire operations. The west side is preferred.
- It was asked of the County how long it will be until the AWOS data is transmitted to the FAA.
- Why is it important for the County to rezone? *Rezoning is recommended to ensure only compatible land uses are allowed at the Airport. Some rural industrial uses may not be compatible with airport operations. The state also recommends this through the Airport Planning Rule (OAR 660-013).*
- Where did the number for ultralights come from? The number of ultralight and light sport aircraft should be separated.
- The plan should acknowledge the attraction of the smokejumper base museum and plan development to preserve the historic nature of the airport.

-
- Fuel sales should be on the same side of the parallel taxiway. Growth will be on the west side.
 - Museum should have access from the highway and airport.
 - A pedestrian gate to the adjacent botanical wayside should be incorporated into the fencing plan.

The meeting adjourned at 8:00 pm.

Illinois Valley Airport - Airport Layout Plan Update

Meeting #3

January 25, 2010

Illinois Valley City Hall

5:30 – 7:00 p.m.

Attendees:

Josephine County Department of Airports: Alex Grossi, Airport Manager

WHPacific, Inc: Rainse Anderson and Sarah Lucas

Planning Advisory Committee: Bill Gettle, Ed Russell, Tony Paulson, Keith Hill and Don Moore

Public Attendees: 25 members of the public signed in (see attached sheet)

Welcome and Introductions	Alex Grossi opened the meeting at 5:30 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> <p>Prior to continuing with the meeting, Ed Russell, PAC member, read a statement regarding his concerns about the Airport. For details of that statement, please contact Mr. Russell.</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>. 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: based on B-I (small) design standards</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Ensure land use control of the Runway Protection Zones (RPZs) through acquisition or avigation easement• Construct full-length parallel taxiway• Upgrade runway markings for instrument approach• Relocate visual approach slope indicators (VASIs)

-
- Upgrade runway lighting system to medium intensity runway lighting (MIRL)
 - Install runway end identifier lights (REILs)
 - Install approach lighting system, as appropriate
 - Upgrade SuperAWOS (Automated Weather Observation System) to transmit data to FAA

Landside:

- Construct five T-hangars and two conventional hangars
- Relocate tiedown apron, identify locations for paved and grass parking
- Reserve land for locating a Fixed-Base Operator (FBO) facility
- Install a self-service fueling station

Two 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
 - Airport would not be able to support forecasted aeronautical uses and demands
 - No full-length parallel taxiway, safety concerns
 - Uncontrolled RPZs
 - No self-service fuel
 - There would still be a financial impact to the County for maintenance

Alternative 1:

Airfield Components

- Full-length parallel taxiway east of the runway
- Control and protection of the RPZs
- Designated helicopter operations area
- New access from Highway 199

Landside Components

- Increased vehicle parking for airport users and tourists
- Grass tiedown area and pedestrian paths
- Reserve areas for FBO, T-hangar and conventional hangars, aviation-related business and aviation compatible industrial or commercial development
- Self-service card-lock fueling system

Alternative 2

Airfield Components

- Full-length parallel taxiway west of the runway
- Control and protection of the RPZs

-
- Designated helicopter operations area

Landside Components

- Increased vehicle parking for airport users and tourists
- Grass tiedown area and pedestrian paths
- Reserve areas for FBO, T-hangar and conventional hangars, aviation-related business and aviation compatible industrial or commercial development
- Self-service card-lock fueling system, with temporary location

Financial Impact of Alternatives

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

- Alternative 2 would likely have highest capital cost
 - Depicts the most areas for potential development
- Alternative 1 would have second highest capital cost
 - Less area shown for potential development than Alternative 2
- 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 Alternative 2 would have the greatest environmental impact due to increase development reserve areas, with Alternative 1 having a slightly less impact. 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*.

Can automobiles park in front of the restaurant in Alternative 1?

Parking would be restricted to the new parking lot for airport visitors.

Does the location of the building restriction line (BRL) affect the smokejumper base?

No.

General Comments from PAC Regarding a Preferred Alternative

- Relocated of the access road in Alternative 1 would likely involve tree removal and they are concerned about that.
- A taxiway on the east side is a good idea, since that's where development will most likely begin.
- An S-curve access road from the proposed parking lot, keeping south of the

ditch, and meeting back up with the existing access road is a consideration.

- Would like to see the alternatives combined, with a partial parallel taxiway on the east and an ultimate full parallel taxiway on the west.
- The airport will be able to provide for jobs and the economy on the west side and tourism on the east side.
- An eastern taxiway could help the County avoid potential lawsuit with private hangar owners.

As a result from the PAC discussion and hearing comments from the public, the PAC agreed on a preferred alternative that includes:

- West parallel taxiway (full length)
- East partial parallel taxiway (south end)
- S-curve road, as stated above
- Two fuel locations (interim and ultimate)
- Location of the grass tie down closer to the restaurant building

**Airport
Alternatives
Discussion
(public comments)**

Questions and comments from members of the public are presented, with responses in *italics* (where appropriate).

We haven't heard anything about left turning preferences for vision considerations in locating a taxiway. The dominant flow of traffic is landing Runway 36. This would be a good argument for a western parallel taxiway.

Prefer Alternative 2, since it allows the smokejumper base to remain with large set backs. The southeast end of the Airport is good for community involvement, such as model airplane flying or an observatory with walking trails.

The consultant reminded the audience that, as an airport, it would be unwise to introduce public recreation spaces that could become potential liabilities to the County.

Alternative 2 presents greater concerns environmentally, due to the potential of more development.

What is the agenda for the Airport's use?

The County's primary goal is to provide a safe Airport that provides economic opportunities for the community.

The environmental comparison table to difficult to understand.

The road behind the smokejumper base (Alternative 1) is a problem aesthetically and safety-wise (fire truck access, etc).

The vehicle parking area should be designed to promote traffic flow.

If the County is concerned about revenue generation, they should focus on bringing the smokejumpers back.

The federal government makes all decisions regarding the smokejumpers; the County has no say.

Did the environmental screening consider the noxious weed alyssum?

Yes, further recommendations of best management practices will be included within the report.

Ultimate vision of the Airport should include a taxiway on the west side.

Fuel should be located mid-field.

What are the funding sources for the proposed projects?

For all Airport Improvement Plan (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 from the FAA. Cost estimates for the preferred alternative are forthcoming.

The Airport can be an economic engine.

As a community, we must ask what is right and not compromise. As such, Alternative 2 (taxiway on the west) is most appropriate.

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.

