

February 6, 2025, State Aviation Board Meeting

3h 50m 8s

IMPORTANT: PLEASE READ BEFORE USING THIS TRANSCRIPT:

The transcript provided here is automatically generated by Microsoft Teams and may contain errors, omissions, or inaccuracies due to misinterpretation of spoken words, background noise or technical issues.

Please verify critical information against the original recording which can be found [here](#). Use this transcript as a reference, not a definitive record of the conversation.

● **MORRIS Alexis** started transcription



MORRIS Alexis 0:15

And let's see for the guests in the room. Please make sure to sign in if you'd like to make public comment during our public comment section.

And our public comment is limited to two minutes per speaker and I'll turn it over to you, Alexis, OK.

Shall we start with local? Yes, OK.

My agenda is Bill Graham here.

Tim Knight here. Sarah Lucas.



LUCAS Sarah M (Avi Board) 0:41

Present.



MORRIS Alexis 0:43

Thank you, Steve, Maggie.

Frye Frye, President Jeff Pritchard, president, and Katherine Stevens, president, OK.

And that concludes roll call.

For public comment, we're talking about, so I'd like to start us off with.

I'd like to acknowledge that we have received written public comment from Benny Benson with Sisters Eagle Airport regarding the core grant approval and public comment from David Mock from Charbonneaux Country Club.

These comments were forwarded to the State Aviation Board.

We'll kick us off with in person.

Public sign up.

So we have three people, so.

For each speaker, please state your name, city of residence and affiliation for the record.

And then if you do, when you do come up to make your public comment, if you could please stand right here next to Alex so that the speaker picks you up.

Shall we start with David Mock?

And myself.

So I don't get caught.

Thank you all for listening to me this morning and for accepting the public comment I made on online.

I'm David mock.

I'm the on the board of Charbonneau Country Club and the chair of our Civic Affairs Committee, and as you know, Charbonneau's had a stake in the game at Aurora Airport in the master plan for the last 15 years.

We like the Aurora airport.

I want to be clear about that.

We like that.

There are a lot of jobs at Aurora Airport.

We like that.

It's a good general aviation airport.

We respect the history as an airstrip.

It was started in the 40s and it has been used for flight training since that time.

What we don't not very happy with is the infrastructure as it exists now regarding its sewage, its water and its ability to handle people in a public disaster. We don't like the fact that they're trying to expand the airport to accept larger planes because of the extra run.

The runway length it was set at one of the packed meetings that I've attended as well as I believe a quote from a previous owner board meeting.

That a longer airport.

Will result in bigger claims.

The airport, right where your offices are is 11 minutes by air from Aurora Airport and you know this quality of the 751 acres, your asphalt runways, the services, the fire prevention, none of which are available to Aurora.

We're afraid of land creep. And who wouldn't be in our situation with what's going

on in other rural areas, the Amazon warehouse?

Is 6 miles from that exit.

That's too close for vertical aircraft taking taking off and being used at Aurora Airport.

We're right between your big mark, the big market for those possible package deliveries and where that possible airport would be. And I'm over 2 minutes. Thank you for listening to me.

I think I've stated everything I plan to state and we appreciate.

I hope you'll do more due diligence.

On moving big aircraft to this airport down the street.

Thank you.

Our next person signed up for public comment is Charlie Long Landis. Thank you.

Yes, good morning.

I'll I'll be brief.

Good morning.

Yeah, just so I can pick you up.

No, I just would encourage whatever had happened for our path. Is it independence airport?

A big advantage.

There's lots of airplanes represented.

And anyway, that's all I've got to say. And thank you for the opportunity.

Thank you.

And then our last in person sign up is lad and that's Henderson.

Correct. OK. From Pacific city.

Can't prove my variety there, so my my name is lad Henderson.

I reside at 33020 Terrace View Drive in Pacific City.

I've been before this board and two other occasions.

The last one you threw me out but, but I just.

I apparently at the at the October meeting.

You requested the department to come up with a an appraisal of my property located at the end of the Pacific City Airport, and I just received that yesterday and I was amazed that an actual certified appraiser would even consider.

Signing his name to such a document.

But anyway, I thought that probably the board would not see copies of that appraisal make copies of it.

And copies also of my comments to Mr.

Tony Beach about my opinions of the appraisal and how that as far as I'm concerned, it doesn't even come close.

Never seen an appraisal, and I took appraisal classes at chemical.

Where you actually take a difference in the comparable property and deduct it, even though it should be a plus to to my particular property.

He deducted the value of the sewer and water connections, which he gave a value of a 30,000. But there's many other areas in there.

But anyway, that's my 2 minutes and thank you.

Thank you. OK.

So we'll go ahead and and that looks like that was for everybody for in person.

So we'll go ahead and move on to those that are online.

So if you could just give me bear with me while I grab everybody's things here. So it looks like Jared Hillock is the first one.

So I'm going to go ahead and unmute you, Jerry.

Give me just one quick moment.

OK.

Sure. Do you have access to your microphone?



Jared Hillock 7:13

Yeah. Can you hear me?



MORRIS Alexis 7:14

Yes, we can.

Go ahead, Jared.

Please state your name and affiliation for us.



Jared Hillock 7:19

Hi, thanks.

I'm Jared hillock.

I live in enterprise OR I own enterprise electric.

I'm a airplane owner and pilot in Malawi County.

The reason for my statement today is expressed the need for additional hangar space in Malawi County, both enterprise Municipal and Joseph State Airport are out of hangar space.

I have a list of four people, including myself that need hangers.

One of which is an amp that wants to live in while county. He's working on getting his IA.

And he wants to live and work in Wild County. And so we find it, you know, hard to find mechanics and have somebody that wants to move here in need of a hangar is pretty important.

I've been in contact with Mr. Beach and Mr. Olsen about it through the fence program access, but since I was a pilot program, I understand it's been closed.

The Joseph Master Plan has more space in it.

Master plan, but with state funding. I I'm just assuming that that's not high on the list of priorities to get developed.

So I have 10 acres adjacent to the east side of the airport that could easily be developed for hangar space without the state needing to develop any additional land. If we could put together through the fence access.

So my statement today is just to urge the board to develop a through the fence program or to look at Joseph State Airport on a case by case basis.

For that, through the fence access as the need is there for additional hangar space and that's all I have. Thank you.



MORRIS Alexis 8:50

Jared.

Our next speaker will be it looks like it's Betsy Johnson.

You should now have access to your Mike, Betsy.

Please state your name and affiliation for the record.



Betsy Johnson 9:04

I would respectfully like to withhold my public comment until after the century W presentation on the update for the Aurora master plan.



MORRIS Alexis 9:16

A couple comment in the public comment, yeah.



Betsy Johnson 9:21

I'm sorry, I couldn't understand what you said.



MORRIS Alexis 9:24

We're talking about this so.

You so as chair, you do control the meeting and the schedule, and so you can choose to do it. How you how you think it's appropriate. OK, miss.

With respect, Miss Johnson, I would ask that you provide your public comment now.



Betsy Johnson 9:44

OK.

It would certainly be better to be able to react to what the presentation is, but I will go ahead and give my public comment.

My name is Betsy Johnson.

I was the senator from District 16 in the Oregon Legislature for two decades.

I actually, through legislation helped found the department and I ran the department for five years and I think I have a kind of unique status in this conversation.

I handled one of the master plans for Aurora previously.

I want to thank the board for giving some movement on some of the more controversial aspects of the master plan.

I will keep my comments short.

Today I'm perplexed as to why there has been no desire to want to explore anything that would preserve those drain fields.

Apparently aeronautical engineer and a master planner for airports has come up with a proposed alternative.

That has been summarily rejected by the board or by the staff to even hear about a possibility. And so I will limit my comments at this juncture to saying, I wish that the board and the staff would be sufficiently open minded to try to problem solve instead of.

Just saying our way or no way and.

So I'll I'll conclude there. I I get no, I won't.

I'm going to say thank you again.

For listening.

To the possibility that others brought salient information to your deliberations and that you've moved on.

That I still find it perplexing.

And that's why I wanted to comment after the century W presentation.

Why it is that the agency is planning \$185 million project that can't be built. You're going to throw the cloud of condemnation over those houses and businesses along the road that you want to move.

Of a deminimous amount.

O dot is not going to pay to move the road, and even if the feds and I think it's a long shot, particularly given the changes at the federal level that you're going to get that kind of money to to move a road when there's so many press.

Needs and I know that there are different pots of money, but I still think you're going to have to build a pretty tough case to get any federal support to move that road.

And you'll have to come up with a match.

And right now, to the best of my knowledge, when I left the legislature in new.

The Department of Aviation's budget.

You don't have any money to match, so I remain perplexed as to why you're pushing ahead with a master plan that has scant chance of implementation. Thank you.



MORRIS Alexis 12:30

Thank you.

OK. And then it looks like the last person.

To that has their hand raised? Is Benny Benson.

Benny, you should now have access to your mic.

Please state your name and affiliation for the record.

Danny, are you able to unmute yourself?



Benny Benson 13:01

I am.

And that was perfect because my first comment was just to confirm that you can hear me.

So can you hear me on this, OK.



MORRIS Alexis 13:08

Yes, of course.



Benny Benson 13:09

So I I confirm that.



MORRIS Alexis 13:13

Yes.

Hello we may have lost you again there, Benny.

OK, Benny, we're unable to hear you.

Here temporal it hurt you for a moment.

I see that you've unmuted.

Are you able to speak at all?

Yeah, I see that he's unmuted, but it looks like maybe unable to speak.

Mike looks like he's muted.

He is.

He's unmuting and Unmuting, trying to see.

Oh, you sure? I'm mis muted.

I see that he has unmuted his mic.

You can kill it from there.

Sir Stevens, is it OK if he calls one of us or we call him and put him on speaker? Yeah, that'll be fine. Yeah.

Just a second a minute here, please.

Benny, you might be getting a phone call and then you might.

Then we can get your speech over.

Yes, he'll call in.

Stop.

Oh.

Girl speakers to meet up at against.

Can you mute your?

Yeah. Can you mute your audio please?

No.

OK, we're gonna put this you on speaker next to her microphone.

I don't know how well this will work, so oh, have you used the meeting? Use the meeting audio.

Method. Yeah, the meeting.

This will work out on the phone. I appreciate it.

Yeah, everything Icon's played heartily to be speaking in person, but whether this made sense, so thank you for that consideration, and I'll try and make fast based on chewing up my early time. I did send in a letter.

So Benny Benson, sisters, sisters, Eagle airport.

Did send in a letter so that you have that.

So I wanted to point strictly, but I do want to kind of reiterate.

All of the process of of I guess through the last art review what was clear and what my two requests are.

One is based on the rules.

Presented on the aviation websites, Anna's showing for applicable eligibility. I'm asking the board to consider the maximum grant of 150,000 per application.

It is unclear how.

At least 13 grants got.

More in that process, after going through the electronic exercise and the inability to put more than one 50,000 in.

But I understand there was an asterisk saying you could actually apply for that.

Find a little bit insist here that it's on the rules that's presented.

It's on the website and even Oregon Department of Aviation for more than 150,000.

That full I recognize for the smaller airports I go back to the time and it was good to hear Betsy Johnson's voice. When Betsy and Mary Rosenbloom.

We're sort of pantering about the core programming, the ability to support smaller general aviation airports, specifically ones that are non nibious. And this is actually their only source of infrastructure grant funding.

In the process, the as I watched the ARC review and respectfully was muted, and both video and call.

I understand why, but I also found it somewhat insincere that a number of those were priority one.

Of your party, one projects the ARC members that were doing the review that were allowed to speak towards those, even though there was no obvious conflict of interest, clearly were endorsing by a request and basically the benefit of the projects also found it interesting the commentary that a.

Number of the AIP related projects that.

Likely or as my understanding already have matched funds approved, we're asking for the excess of 150,000 which?

As was stated in their state, while they were talking, we are able then to release other phones which in to use for other projects. In some ways floats into a general fund that doesn't fall into projects that have been bedded through this process.

So some of the concern, it can't be ignored or it's hard to ignore that the.

Chair is also the sponsor for the airport is going to receive the most grants in the current approval.

I understand and I know why that is.

I do know there was a historical process when it was core connect where there was a leading or a sharing.

Everybody gets one.

Everybody gets 2.

Everybody gets 3 in order to spread the wealth.

It's a non issue and there's plenty of money to go around, but in that is not the case here and so that.

Hearing would be useful in sort of math.

Just the simple limiting of the 150,000 I'm going to open up almost 25%.

More category 3 airports that would be very reliant on this infrastructure funding, so hopefully you hear me there and I appreciate the startup there and thank you for the time.

I'm very appreciative of both the core, the PMP and everything everybody does. So good consideration. Thank you.

Thank you.

Thank you. Thank you.

OK.

Other couple of problems.

Nope, that would conclude our public comment session, OK.

Great. Thank you for all of who participated in public comments today.

We do appreciate all of your input, so we will move to the next item on the agenda and I think we'll have a bit of a more robust discussion than just the action items ahead of us.

I've asked Andrea to she gave us a memo kind of outlining.

The core grant funding for this year, and I asked her to walk us through that.

And then we'll have a discussion from there for taking action.

All right.

Thank you so much. Chair Stevens and Aviation board.

So I'll start with reading the memo. As chair Stevens requested, and then I have a short.

Slide show, I'll introduce Shelly Hummel, our chair, so she can just talk a little bit about the arc process and how they recommended the applications for approval to

the board.

And then of course, we'll head up to the board.

No you should.

She should be muted.

Her computer should remake muted.

OK.

Maybe having a hard time hearing.

Yeah, Andrea wouldn't mind coming a little closer to the mic meet.

 **LUCAS Sarah M (Avi Board)** 20:43

I can hear Andrea quite well, so I don't know about others online.



MORRIS Alexis 20:48

Thank you so much, Sarah.

I appreciate that.

And I'll stay right here for a moment.

So yes, please let me know if there is any trouble hearing me because I do tend to be a little bit more quiet so I'll go ahead and start with the memo.

So this is regarding our 202425 grant projects and funding authorization recommendation. The 202425 core grant cycle is the 9th cycle since the inception of the Aviation System Action program or ASAP.

Funding for this cycle is \$4 million and the application period ran from October 7th to the 25th, 2024.

57 applications were submitted with a total funding request of approximately \$6.2 million.

Against 71 million in total project costs.

In cycle 7:00 and 8:00.

So the two previous cycles before this one, the State Aviation Board increased the maximum grant request to \$250,000.

Per per grant request, these requests were approved based on additional revenue available in the core program due to closure of previous Aurora grant program and the transfer of that revenue to the port for this cycle, the maximum grant amount is 150,000 but Oregon Admin.

Rule 738-120-4040 does allow for funding requests above \$150,000.

So just to refer to what that rule says.

The aggregate maximum grant award that a recipient may receive under the core program is \$150,000 per project.

But notwithstanding this, the board may award a larger grant if it finds that a larger award for a particular project would serve the purpose of the program.

Additionally, the rule asks that if an applicant applies for a grant amount exceeding that 150,000, the department may request additional documentation detailing how this grant amount.

Would serve one or more of the program purposes and as part of the application process, we did ask applicants who requested more than 150,000 to include extra information in their application about why they were requesting that. So 13 applicants requested a grant amount in.

Excess of \$150,000.

Seven of those requests fell under priority one.

Applications and six of the requests were under the priority three applications.

The Aviation Review Committee met virtually in cohorts, which is a care of reviewers, with they had approximately 12 applications to score this cycle, and then that was followed by a meeting of all the arc members for discussion and ranking of all the applicants. A major focus of the.

Discussion related to funding the request submitted for more than \$150,000 and the ARC voted to recommend awarding the request as submitted.

Including those requests over \$150,000.

So again, the arc recommendations were to award all applications in priority one. All applications in priority two, and then all applications in priority three above the funding cut line which was I believe 4 applications down at on the list.

And then so we have the simple motions for the board consideration on there as well.

Were there any questions on that?

All right.

So we'll get into.

Our slides here one question.

Jimmy for not knowing.

Is the category selected by the by the applicant or during the scoring process?

The priority or not the priority?

The category category for either 1-2 or three.

So those are during the application process.

So that's the self identified by the applicant. OK, thank you.

So just a little bit of overview of our core grant program, of course we started our application period this past October, did our internal reviews and our previews and meetings between November and January.

And then, of course, we're here today for our board approval. And then once we receive those approvals, we'll begin notifying the new grantees so we can start getting those new agreements executed.

This cycle again, we had 57 applications.

Total project cost almost \$71 million.

Funding request.

Just a little under 6.2 million with available funding of 4 million. And then I just listed there what our previous cycle requests and awards were. And then also what our current open obligations are for the program.

Here we just have a slide that splits up how the applications and dollars were by priority again. So of course, as usual, most were in the priority ones.

Just a couple in the priority two for resiliency requests and then we had 19 in the priority three for economic benefit requests.

Once again, just to go over here on the slide, the grant request in excess of \$150,000, I've got the rule there again, just to reference oar 758-124-0040 and then I just put a couple other.

Considerations here that applicants are still required to meet their minimum match requirements for per the oar.

So even if they are awarded a higher grant amount.

They still need to meet their minimum match for the core program.

And then 13 applicants requested this grant amount above 150,000, and the ARK voted to recommend awarding all those requests.

I have one.

It was kind of a last minute item that we put in here and this is regarding Creative Lake, Klamath Falls application and it came up.

Linda recognized that they are still in a category for minimum match percentage as a commercial service airport, but they are no longer commercial service and the minimum match requirements are.

Basically, based on categories that are listed in the Oregon Aviation.

Plan and.

For the organ Aviation plan, an airport may request a change in their category to the

board if they believe that they're no longer in that correct category.
And so I just put up here showing that currently LMT would be required at 35% minimum match, but the category that they would be moved into would be a 25% minimum match and the amount that we have in for approval for their application. Is at the 25% match.

City of Klamath Falls has put together a request for the board to change their category, which will be sent over to the board today, and then we'll actually present it at the April board meeting for the board to vote on because it was kind of last minute we.

Weren't able to get it on the agenda for this meeting.

So basically the LM TS application is a priority one. We would wait to execute it until the board made a decision on if they're.

If their category would change, so we just wanted to let you guys know that and Linda Tepper is on the meeting. If there were any questions for her on.

OK.

Sure, I understood.

There's no request for deviation.

This is just putting them into one category to the other category that best.

So it's pretty straightforward.

All right, so next I'll introduce our Aviation Review Committee Chair, Shelly Humble. Shelly, if you're able to unmute, go ahead.

 **Shelley Humble** 28:52

Good morning.

Board Aviation Board, thank you for having me.

Can you hear me?

 **MORRIS Alexis** 28:59

Yes, we can.

 **Shelley Humble** 29:00

Perfect. I just would like to 1st give staff.

Kudos the way that they run the core program is fantastic.

They are very cognizant of all of us who are.

Either airport managers or part of the Lane acts or mine is Lane Act. The acts that

take their time out to review all the grounds that are presented.
And to look at Staffs scoring as well as the blind scoring that the ARC Committee does, there's a lot of work.
There's a lot of applications that we read and we do really look individually at all the grants, unbiased look at the projects, look at the funding that's available.
And I wish we could figure out a way to where we could fund all the grants.
Because all the grants are great projects, especially for little airports.
I know it's really hard and it really frustrates me as an airport manager and also as part of the arc that we can never seem to to fund a lot of the priority three grants.
I'm not sure that we have an answer on how to do that.
But I do thank you for taking the time to let me speak.
Bake regarding the core program for 2025. We had great projects.
I don't think there were any projects that any of us thought were unworthy.
We always look at priority one per statute and they try and fund those we they are funded first.
We did have a robust discussion.
Regarding whether or not to award the higher amounts.
And it was a decision by the.
Whole ARC Committee to award them as presented, as well as all the other in priority three although.
I don't believe much of those, if any, were funded.
Again, I come before you to show you the slate of list for Core 25 as recommended by the committee, and if you have any questions, I'd be willing to answer.



MORRIS Alexis 31:36

Shelly, I got a couple questions.



Shelley Humble 31:36

Just want to make sure.



MORRIS Alexis 31:38

Just wanna make sure I understand.

How you guys went about the scoring, if I understood what you said correctly.



Shelley Humble 31:42

Yes.

What?

This.



MORRIS Alexis 31:49

You basically went priority one priority two, priority three.



SH Shelley Humble 31:50

The.



MORRIS Alexis 31:52

There was really no discussion on how to allot awards.

There's just one 2-3. Is that correct?

Did I?

Did I hear that right?



SH Shelley Humble 32:01

Her statutes, priority one is funded first.

It doesn't mean that they're all funded. If there is a project that does not meet the qualifications and or there is a reason to deny that application so the scoring is done first by staff.

Then it is broken into arc committees.

We do not rate our own grants and it is a list of questions.

And I believe Andrea can correct me if I'm wrong.

They are done through statute questions.

And then we just answer them.

There's usually two or three of us in a group that are looking at a handful. I think we had six this year.

That we reviewed and then that scoring is automatically tabulated by the computer also.

So when we come before together, as the committee, the whole ARC Committee, we have a spreadsheet of how all the the scoring came out when we are in that group, we are really looking.

To see if there's any ties that need to be broken. If the funding doesn't go all the way down to the bottom, or if there are any.

Projects that.

May need special consideration.

We look at those and we, as I said, we discussed at length the funding of the grants that requested more than 150,000.

But as a group.

All of the members, all of the committee, the our committee, felt that they were they didn't feel.

That appropriate to reduce the amount to 150 versus what they have asked for.

So that's why we left this late as presented.



MORRIS Alexis 33:55

No, I appreciate you explaining the process that you guys went through.



SH Shelley Humble 33:55

So I appreciate you.



MORRIS Alexis 34:00

That's very helpful for the conversation that we have as a.



SH Shelley Humble 34:00

Uh, that's very helpful for.



MORRIS Alexis 34:07

Thank you, Shelly. State your input.



SH Shelley Humble 34:07

I thank you so.



MORRIS Alexis 34:10

Andrew, can you walk us through the priorities again for 2030?



SH Shelley Humble 34:11

What?



MORRIS Alexis 34:15

Yes, what those are so priority one are any applications that are related to an FAA project.

So the airport has an FAA grant or will be getting one and the priority one core grants help those sponsors pay their FAA match on those projects.

Priority two are considered resiliency grants and only airports that are listed as resiliency airports in the organ aviation plan can apply for that.

Priority and there's I keep forgetting to go back and count, but I want to say there's probably about 20 on that list and then the priority three are for any non FAA related projects economic development.

Basically, anything you know are nonpipous airports that are looking for help for funding would apply under that.

Tools are how the priorities work, and as Shelley mentioned, it is according to statute that the priority ones are funded first and then priority two, and then priority three.

The arc and the board do have the discretion.

The arc to.

Recommend for instance, if an applicant has multiple applications in there, the arc could recommend for the approve one or two of those as opposed to all of them, even if they all are in priority one.

So there is a little bit of latitude and then the board can approve that way as well.

I could add to something else to consider for this cycle is FAA matches. This go round instead of being their standard 10% or at 5%.

So just something else to consider.

Thank you for that.

So I think we'll start a board discussion here.

So I'll probably put people in the queue to talk about these projects.

I hope anybody wants to pick it up, but I've got one question right out of the gate, which is, could you walk us through the priority two projects?

And tell us how they.

How do they adhere to the real resiliency grants?

Criteria.

I guess what I would say about that is.

There is not anything laid out in Rule that specifically says.

What is considered a resiliency project? It more relates to what airports can apply under that priority.

And so typically it's been if it's not an FAA funded project.

And they are allowed to apply under priority two.

They look at the priority twos because they're.

Considered a resiliency airport, I guess.

There's the Oregon resiliency plan indicates 28 reports across the state that would fall within.

What did you say? 2828 and it's from 2013, so probably due for an update, but that's the list that would include.

I I was looking at that same thing too.

I was just trying to understand the criteria for applying.

That's why I asked if the airport or if there's a criteria that you put them in because.

I'm trying to reconcile what some of these group priority two resiliency grants are and do they really improve the resiliency of an airport?

You know, from a purely some of them sounds like sound like they do. And from the applications they did.

Sound more like, you know, economic benefit to me than resiliency.

Yes. So that was just my question as to.

If there was a greater criteria for whether or not they qualify to fit in, there's certainly.

If there are resiliency, if there an airport that's great and all that, but then does their grant fit into a resiliency component?

So this is probably for another entire big discussion, but as part of the last FAA reauthorization, resiliency has also been added now into AI.

So.

It probably means we'll have to update our statute and our rule at some point when we figure out what that means.

So but there is.

There's also the potential that some of the the priority one FAA grants could be resiliency.

So just something else to tell.

Also consider. Yeah, I I think it would be great to have some criteria for the resiliency grants.

And it looks like Sarah has her thing.

Oh, go ahead, Sarah.



Yeah, just tag on to your questions.

I was curious.

What instructions did the Ark have in looking at those priority two? You know, were they directed to look at whether or not they actually improved resiliency or if it was more if the project was, you know, met just the criteria that staff scores on?



MORRIS Alexis 39:18

And again, it is just the criteria of they fall under the resiliency airports as defined in the core rule.

So yeah, there isn't specifically anything regarding the projects hearing you correctly.



LUCAS Sarah M (Avi Board) 39:33

Mm hmm.



MORRIS Alexis 39:35

So if if you are one of the 28 airports and you submits a priority 2 grant or category 2 grant, it doesn't matter what that project is.

Yes, it's just because you are one of the 20 so you can submit an application under category 2.

Fortunately, yes.



LUCAS Sarah M (Avi Board) 40:01

Well, to that I would recommend that that be readdressed for future rounds of core that that's a discussion among staff for the board to look at and if that's a rule making issue.



MORRIS Alexis 40:07

Mm hmm.



LUCAS Sarah M (Avi Board) 40:15

But I think that needs to be addressed.



MORRIS Alexis 40:19

Yeah, I I agree and obviously.

Felt the new categorization at the FAA grant, so does seem like there needs to be

some realignment.

So I've got a couple questions and maybe a different perspective to share with the board.

For the last couple years, I've also been involved with the Spire grant process that is done by Oregon Department of Emergency Management and we ran into the same challenge.

Yep, priority 1-2 and three.

And.

Listening to some of the the public comments earlier in the written written comments regarding this process, it just sort of touched on where we were at with another state agency that was in a very similar situation.

And I'm going to share what we did, but I have some questions going forth.

Why is it that we're approving a project that gets a score in the category one of 184 when the next lowest score is?

Far away from from 184, you know? Does it basically mean that you can put in an application with no time?

You just get your name on no.

No disrespect to who is it?

Jackson County, who got the low score but in essence it's you get your application in there, you're gonna get approved.

And and if that's the way the process is supposed to work.

Fair.

With limited funds, how do we arrive at?

Well, we're going to give everybody that asks for more than 150. That extra funding if we have three sets of priorities, wouldn't it make sense to fund everybody assuming we have a set score? Like if we determine a score number and we say anything above?

Like 169 is going to get funded.

Anybody that doesn't score high enough, you know, let's say you call it.

Below 70%, you don't get funded and whatever funding is leftover for the folks that ask for more money that they get the first priority of funding because they did better on their score.

And that way you know, we are keeping to our values.

You know, there are several of us that are involved with the vision, the mission statement.

And and you know, helping focus where we are as an agency economic development is just as important as everything else.

So if we're not going to fund, you know, a bunch of these priority three applications, are we not supporting economic development or or sustainability of an airport?

I'm I'm I'm kind of troubled by that knowing that you know. Yes, we can give more money to some projects but.

It just the process seems slightly flawed.

One of one of the hopes for the future, and if the board has the ability to make a recommendation today to to maybe be a little bit more giving with some of these other projects.

I think we should take that into consideration because.

As somebody that writes grants, if I'm putting in for a priority three project.

And I'm scoring, you know, 230 or or or so points and my score is equal to that of some of the ones that are getting funded in the priority one.

Where's the incentive for me as an agency or an entity to even put in for a grant if it's not going to get any attention so.

That's that's my feedback for for our team.

My counter argument to that is.

Is not not fully understanding the entire process though. But if the score is designed as a rubric to be a contributing factor in making the decision, such as when I do college scholarship, your GPA is not the deciding factor.

It's a factor of other things, including the essay and things.

So if the rubric was designed to just be a factor, but not.

Along with some other factors, then that argument.

Then hold your your the way you described it is the rubrics.

Score is the only factor.

And that's not a case here. I don't believe the way I understood the process.

Yeah. No, I agree with where your your your.

Your example is is coming from. I guess what I'm saying is based on the money available, we could fund a majority of the priority three projects.

We just won't be able to fully fund all the projects that are asking for more than 150,000.

And I I you know, if we push back on the committee.

The art committee and say, OK, what's your cut off score? So that not everybody in priority three is getting funded, but the ones that actually the applications that

actually meet the requirements of of what the criteria are you know.

Mr. Negev was talking about, you know, how do we know somebody falls into the criteria for priority two if if we're sort of wavering in some of these areas, I think it's incumbent upon us.

To do the most.

For the people and and the airports that are out there.

As best we can and while.

All of this, the projects that are probably requesting more than 150,000.

Are.

Worthy of receiving that extra money.

We can't do everything.

Understood. My just again, the flip side is that being a small city mayor for a long time.

When we go for infrastructure grants.

The mayor's writing the grant request because that's all we have.

So the rubric is about how you, you know, so you have all these professional people writing these grant requests.

I don't have a chance, right?

Because I'm just the mayor doing this on the weekend.

So yeah, I should do a good grant request as best I can.

But there's other factors right above that that I think need to be considered, and I'm not saying I don't agree with you, right, like I could.

I could do my college scholarships to put a cut off at 3.5.

You if you don't have gpa of 3.5, I'm not even going to bother reading your asset.

That's a rough one, right?

Because what that does to me is in my mind of equity that cuts out kids who are who are homeless and things who are doing their best right with what they have. And I can see that in their essays.

So I go both ways.

I'm with you and I'm not with you in. Right. So, but that's kind of where it does cause I've done that. I I wrote all the grants for my city and I've sucked at it. Right. But.

You know, they were valid needs, but.

I didn't get trained as a cramped or so.

Go to Sarah now.

She's got a a comment.

 **LUCAS Sarah M (Avi Board)** 47:29

I just I I agree with what Bill and Jeff are both saying.

There's always two sides to every coin.

Just wanna remind it's not these aren't set up in categories. They are set up in priorities for a reason based on the rulemaking that priority one is a higher priority for the state to fund because it leverages the grant funds from FAA.

So that can't be ignored.

But I I also want to.

It hasn't been this common for so many multiple.

Applications from 1 airport sponsor. It did seem like there was quite a few.

Multiple applications for various projects and what is the history of that and the precedents that this would would make in doing actions for more multiple projects for one sponsor?

 **MORRIS Alexis** 48:20

Yeah. Thanks, Sarah.

Any other comments, bill, Danny.

Sorry, Jim.

Yeah, no problem.

I'm I would be very curious to see a spreadsheet that removes the additional amount of money was over \$150,000.

And and that money, theoretically, then could be used in the category three applications so.

It does seem a little bit unfair and but part of the question is if we don't provide funding over the \$150,000, does that mean that those airports won't be able to complete their projects?

Is that is that money?

We don't have a way of looking to really see that this is critical, that we have this money.

If we don't, then we won't be able to do the project.

On top of that, most of the applications that came to us.

It was a minimum amount of of of contributions from the sponsors.

Over that minimum amount was they didn't seem to for the most part, go past that.

That amount of money didn't find a way to do that. So.

This is quite a precedent that we've really, you know, I see that we're doing it right now.

It's trying to fail.

What do we do about this?

I think it would be really helpful to see because we have this choice today of whether or not.

To fund the extra amount of money for those applicants, if if we say no, I'm sorry, we can't.

We would rather spread the money to all of the applications that could get the funding.

What would that actually look like?

How many of the priority three projects over the last years?

I mean, since since the Ark began, it was everything that we could do to see that we could find money to get into the category 3.

Projects because you know that.

As as we're talking about, those are also important.

I do.

I do strongly believe that category one projects should be funded. Priority one projects should be funded if we have the money. Because of that return of the investment from the FAA. That's kind of the, you know, that's a no brainer.

It's these extras that you know well. We don't know what would happen if we don't get that money to them, but they just. Sorry we we we don't.

We can't do our project well. If that was the case then we would be funding a lot of priority three projects at that at that at that point.

So I don't have an answer 'cause. I don't really have all the answers Jim, because I asked some of the same questions. And so I think Andrea has some answers for us around that.

Which is I? The one question is.

If they don't get funded at the 250 level or whatever, if it's kicked back down to 150, are they still able to do their projects?

And then what happens to the spreadsheet from there?

And how many more projects could be funded?

Yeah. And so the question of whether the projects could go forward if they don't receive that extra funding came up during the ARC meeting and basically what was determined is that with an approved FAA project, the airport has committed.

Their match funds and the core grant.

Funds are not.

You know they're not secure until these approvals have been done. So the airport should not be considering those funds as a part of the match until that's been approved.

So the arc didn't necessarily take that into consideration because it was more seen as it's the airport's responsibility to make sure they have the funding separate from core, and then it's great when you get the core funds and then and have kind of a little.

Extra to your match there.

That way and not have to use the the airport's own funds. And then regarding how the funding would fall on that print out of the file there, the very last column shows grant amounts capped at 150,000.

And so if you're looking at the priority threes, which is just that last section there, the very first cut line, it shows that four priority three grants would be funded.

Per the arc's recommendation.

If all of the applications were capped at 150,000, it would go down to that second line, which I believe was an additional 5. Grants could be funded.

And that would be just funded as they are listed here.

Yes, go ahead Steve.

Yeah. Thank you.

That was going to be part of my questions as well, especially the and I think I knew the answer to the 150 question for the FAA match. The other is.

Maybe an observation?

When we talk about FAA match and and priority one and AIP, the rules associated what is funded by AIP or by BIL or any other federal grants have changed since then and so.

Quite maybe to the benefit of airport sponsors, there are some things in here that. Are hangar development, which is really priority three economic development, but because those categories have opened up. So my I guess my challenge would be I think we should probably.

Absolutely. You know, review what is priority one, true.

Grant matching because Hanger development is great and all airports should work towards self-sufficiency.

But that is not infrastructure in the ground to support the overall airport.

That is, to support the financial economic benefit of the airport and on top of that, the larger spreadsheet that you sent some of those ones are not at the 90%.

Of those are in the 70s and 8%, especially when we talk about hangar or taxi lane or development type of ones, if those were capped at 90% or as Alex, you said 95 because of the grant matching, you know one it's economic development, so go. Find the other money for economic development to do hangar development. If you're looking for a grant match.

But like what money could we pull back if we said, you know what, it's capped at 90%.

And if you wanted 77% or 80%?

Go find that other 10 or 13% in your economic development to match. That will will match the 10%. So I think there's a little more criteria development that probably should be rule made, some rule making between now and the next grant process, especially if.

If FAA grants still encompass this larger sphere of what is eligible now, compared to when this rulemaking was made.

And.

And so my as my out of that, my question is can we limit say priority ones to say 90%, can we say as a board you know we'd fund up to 90% of grants in those, so that would lower some of those numbers to allow more.

Priority threes to potentially come in as well is that an option?

So the way it's laid out currently, the board can determine.

If they want to approve the amount that's been requested or a lesser amount when it comes to like basing it on a specific percentage.

I mean, I don't see why not.

It just would be translating it into the dollar to the dollar amount. OK, thank you.

Brian.

Comment question with regards to who both of your comments about.

Putting the metrics together as I read this, there's a base application score.

You know, maybe your GPA in the example and then the the act does a modifier on that and ultimately the application final score is directly related to the rank and not, you know, we're in this priority two priority three question where if you look at the overall?

Final application rank of phase of the priority twos.

They wouldn't fall in until 12.

Against priority three right now, so the just the overall quality according to this rubric is quite low compared to priority three, so.

As we try to refine this criteria, I kind of consider what that rubric is and how that final score is determined, and then maybe how that could interface outside of the priority one, grant matching maybe other dollar things.

My question is based on.

The request of Klamath Falls to change.

Its designation.

The grant request as I read it is based on that already having happened at 178. That's what we put it in as yes, because we would want the the board to approve that higher amount.

Based on if the category changes approved later, because if you approve the lower amount now and then approve the category change.

So that's.

Kind of the way we put it in, yeah.

So they would get less if we don't approve the category change, which is like, yeah, which is a a feature decision, right.

Next one is if you know, I would say it's a future decision, but it it would be in alignment with how we are treating all other reports.

I don't anticipate that that would be a challenge.

OK, that change?

That was my question, but they're not asking for attviation.

They're just asking us to recognize who they really are.

I see you, Klima. False.

OK.

I just wanted to clarify that.

I have a few more questions. Unless anyone else wants to be in the queue. OK so.

And I've been just kind of scanning this looking at number of grants for airport that have been requested.

So in addition to you know any that are above the 150 mark and I think I've picked out two airports, is that right, Andrea, on the category?

1.

More than one grant request, actually, there are several in priority more.

Priority one.

Priority one.

567.

Grant County Hood River Union County.

Bend and Salem, I believe all have two requests and priority one.

So I I guess I would just say so I will.

Put it out there. I really feel like.

I feel like there's been a a fairness issue around procedure this time and it was different when we had all of the additional funds coming in through the recovery grants during the pandemic, but now we're coming back to our normal budget or core.

And so I don't.

I don't think that it was understood by all of the airport managers.

That we we state that there's a 150 million or \$150,000 cap.

But then kind of this hidden little asterisk that but you can ask for more if you want to.

That doesn't really make for a level playing field, and I I can tell you I don't think.

I think there's some airports in here that would have asked for more if they had thought that they could ask for more. So for to me that's a fairness issue.

And then when we start looking at.

OK.

Well, so maybe we do stick with how we have laid this process out, which is 150,000 cap, but then there are some airports with multiple projects.

So maybe the fairness part of that is to, you know, fund projects up to the \$150,000 cap because some of some of the projects you just won't reach that level where they would need more.

Funding and 65,000,000 thousand or something like that.

But so I can see how there could be a good reason to allow for more than one project per airport, but keeping that cap in place of 150,000 per cycle.

And then I guess I don't know if folks have comments on that. One other thing to anybody wanna weigh in on that, Steve?

I I like that.

I just think about, especially for priority ones like this cycle and those that are.

Anticipating that to match their FAA grant. If we're going to do that, I would recommend maybe that for future cycles and making that clear in the rule making for applicants. I'm just concerned about jeopardizing anybody's projects this cycle.

That would be my only concern. Yeah, and.

I get that, but I think we've already established that the priority one.
Built projects would move forward no matter if it's 150,000 or 250,000.

Is that correct Andrea?

So all of the priority ones are already good to go.

Funding level we set and so then it's, you know, kind of that fairness issue that I just brought up, right.

And then also the the multiple projects for airport, if we adhere to the same type of CAP because some projects are just not large enough to get to the 150 level.

Any other comments on that one thing?

OK. So and then I know there were, there was a question comment around.

The ODAB also asking for above the 1:50, but I think if you could give some clarity around that because the PMP region 1 and region 2 that's not like one project.

Those are multiple projects, right?

Somebody wants to speak to that. Yes. And the so the two \$100,000 ask on that was based on we're looking.

That to help from the airport sponsors matches for their PNP work and typically our PMP cycles are \$1,000,000 a year and approximately 100,000 is the sponsor match. So that's how we decided to ask for the 200 with 100 for, yeah, one and two region 1100 for region two and just for clarification.

That money is being used for what, again?

So the pavement maintenance program, it works a little bit similar in regards to the core grants that when the state goes out to do the PMP work, we fund a certain percentage and then the airport is required to fund a match and they're actually the same exact match.

Percentages and categories as the core grants. We kind of just 10% is kind of.

The most common match for these airports.

So that's what we based the.

100,000 on Bodab has been covering the airport sponsored portion of the match for several years 2021.

Each region consists of.

We can get exact airport numbers, you know, 10/12/16 airports would be receiving this PMP contracted work.

It's not just, you know, one or two that helps, but the airport. You know, it's.

O Dev does not necessarily have to continue paying at sponsor match.

We would like to.

We we do see the value in it, but you know if we don't have the funds, we don't have the funds and then that sponsor match can go back to each individual report to pay for it.

So chair Stevens, just a a question on that.

The reason why I asked for the clarification if if it does come down to.

We drop that these grant awards to 150.

Would there be?

Interest from our group to keep that one at 200, even though we're saying we need to drop everything to 150 knowing that that money for that specifically actually goes back to benefit airports.

Right. Yeah. And and and again I asked for the clarification because not everybody understands the totality of that.

So if there was an exception for that, I wanted to get that on record. That's a good except.

Correct me if I'm, you know the question I guess would be whether it's 200 or 150.

There's still a, there's still a project sponsor component.

You're just buying down the project sponsors.

10% component to a certain degree.

So even in what you're not with that 200,000, we're not.

Find out there's no airport where there is 0 contribution from the project sponsor.

Am I correct?

No, that is not correct.

So basically and the whole reason why we even submitted this application is that previously airport sponsors could actually use FAA funds to help with that PNP match and in 2021 is when that stopped being allowed. And that's when the agents started covering that.

And so we haven't asked for any airport contribution.

0 airport contribution since then and that's kind of what we were looking to at least because we've just done regions three and four to at least cover regions 1:00 and 2:00. So that all four.

Across the board there.

Yeah. And maybe just for our benefit, give us the reality check on these projects and can they support fund any portion of those realistically.

We had a survey that went out.

Can you remember some of the results a little bit better or we can send that out to

the board but.

Just in some rough percentages, there was some airports. It would not be an issue. Others can just flat out not afford it, so we could send with those results were out to the board.

This is definitely not something that we would anticipate being recurring.

Ask you either need to make a we need to find additional funding so we can continue to pay.

That airport match or.

Repeat it needs to go back to the airports.

And they they start paying it at a certain point. So.

It's we didn't want to put ourselves in position where airports were expecting.

I would have to be paying it and let me just tell them hey, by the way, we're not paying.

You'll find you know the extra money late notice.

Thank you, chair.

So if the funding was reduced to 150 from 200, would you be able to rank?

Your yours to help those that need it. And would you still be able to accomplish the PMP program and ask for matching from those that potentially can afford it.

We want to do our best to treat all the airports equally.

We'd probably do something along the lines of going back and seeing what that percentage is.

Are we paying?

8% and then the airports need to pay the remaining 2% or whatever that number is across the board rather than kind of picking and choosing airports.

That that's something we could do if if the board's decision was to amend it to 1:50, we we just reach out to the airports and that's where we go.

So airports that use that PMP funding, how many are not indianapius?

I'll ask it that way.

We'll have to get that number back to you ballpark.

Just that's a good question.

Majority if I'm just.

So nibbias, we have 96 public use airports around 67 or so. And obviously I believe and.

Region one and two.

I'm gonna phone a friend. Yeah, that's fine.

I guess what I'm getting at is James, they're not.

They very likely have no other way to find that pavement manage.

Yeah. And that's true and.

Thank you, James. Kirby was sent to West.

He primarily work with century West on these BNP projects and he just responded about 1/3 or not OK.

James.

So we could.

Oh, it's back. It was just OK.

All right.

Sorry about that, I apologize.

OK.

Any other comments questions? I just make sure back to his original question that started this.

So this only is this the only line item.

That's very unique because it covers lots of airports, yes, as opposed to every other line item. There's no other line item that actually is multiple airports.

Words OK.

So that's what makes this line item unique.

Yeah, it's it's the state saying we want to distribute funding, so we can help other.

It's for specific projects paving generally, but the state is helping other airports with that. Those paving projects, which I that's pretty if if we had all 14 airports apply individually for ten, \$12,000, they probably wouldn't need.

So this is a way of of getting those help to those airports and I think that's why we see staff do kind of a regional rotation around the TNP projects and that doesn't affect the sore projects, correct.

So this is completely separate from the score.

It doesn't affect sore, but there are state owned airports that are that do receive PMP work.

So let me ask staff this question.

So it say, here's a scenario for you and you tell me how cumbersome or not this would be to process because the other thing is that we want to make sure we keep the priority one grants on track because airports depend on that for their FAA grant Cy.

So if we took all of the priority one and.

Max them at 1:50.

And then we allowed. If there were multiple airports, multiple projects for at one airport under the priority one and we would allow that more than one project, but cast that amount total at 1:50.

And then.

So that kind of that's the that's the first I guess, benchmark. I wanted to talk about. I think we do need to have a little further discussion about these priority two and. Maybe we can't solve that this time because I think it we do need some additional rule making on that.

But then with that additional funding and it will kick it down to like you said that that line priority three.

So then we would just assume to make a decision about priority two and priority three.

As staff, how cumbersome is that scenario for you to manage?

Not at all.

It's, I mean the process is pretty much the same no matter how you approve it.

We just go in the grant system and we update it information that needs updated and push it forward.

So yeah, not complicated.

So, chair, let me just see if you're not recommending capping the 150 for priority two or three for. Oh, yes, I would be recommending capping those, but I just think everything they needed, everything.

But I think I think, I guess I'm having some angst around priority too, but I don't know that we.

Yeah. No, I think that at this point, agree, but there aren't any grants that are more requesting more than 150,000 priority. Two, I'm having just an overall. Yeah, the definition, the definition of sustain.

We just, we just need some better clarity around that staff and the board because as you were trying to say is that if I like which where you're going, it doesn't really affect the category two, it it actually expands priority food.

Correct, correct. But but funding some of priority to over other projects within priority three, I think is that is the tension, yeah, is the category potentially isn't it? Yeah, but right now those are the rules for operating under the right can't change that this cycle, right?

Yeah, I would make a motion at some point that we as staff to, you know update.

Priority two rules, yes, with some rule making.

Second, by motion, this will be stop that noted.

So chair Stevens, would it be inappropriate to to get your?

Your thoughts on having our arc representative, who was overseeing this whole process to share some thoughts, anecdotal thoughts on what our deliberation has been?

I mean, they're the ones that scored the grants put in a lot of time.

I I think it would be beneficial.

If if they had.

Any of these conversations?

What? Yeah.

Absolutely. I'm. I'm happy to hear what Shelly has input on Shelly.

Are you still with us?

SH

Shelley Humble 1:15:02

I'm here.

Who's turning off my heater so you can hear me?

We had quite the robust conversation, not just this year, but in prior years. And Jim can speak to a lot of the conversations that we've had on the ARC committee.

It really we do struggle.

With the statutes, the way they're lined out.

It's really hard and one of the conversations we did have.

Is.

And it came into play last year with the bill money, the.

Bipartisan infrastructure law because.

The ruling was changed last year to include.

The bill grants in the FAA, so they were automatically funded more or less.

But that also gave more airports the ability to have several AIP grants, which cut the funding down.

We've also kicked around.

We understand why priority one is always funded first, because we get to leverage our dollars \$0.10 on the dollar that that spreads the wealth around.

But we've always struggled with how do we make it that priority one?

Get some funded priority to get some funded and priority three, get some funded.

How do we figure out that rate?

What are the rules and part of the thing with scoring is they're the same questions for the different types of grants.

So they're the same five questions that we answer that we rate, they don't necessarily meet.

The economic development, so you'll have lower scores or the same thing with. Resiliency. Those questions don't really fall into those categories or those categories, don't really. It's like putting a round peg in a square hole.

So we've talked about that at this last meeting about seeing if there was a way that we could add.

Some supplemental questions to help with the rating because we would really.

I'm a small airport.

I'm the only grant writer.

I have 1.6 FTE. So what?

The gentleman said about the 3.5 GPA.

It's very true for a lot of the Oregon airports is they don't have grant writers.

They may have a Council member, they may have a volunteer and grant writing is not.

Their their expertise.

And so they do.

The best that they can.

And but.

Small airports live for these possibilities of grants and core. Grant is one of the few grant systems available for them.

So I'm right there with you.

Anything any way that we can improve or make it a better match for those grant funding priorities 1-2 and three, I'm all for it.

I have a real hard time asking for more than 150.

I understand at times that you need to and I know connect Oregon does not work for most small airports because it becomes a political nightmare.

So yeah, I mean, we've had several discussions and we don't have any really good answers right now.

Now.

And I know everybody tries.



MORRIS Alexis 1:18:22

I think.



SH Shelley Humble 1:18:24

Everybody tries.

They put in multiple applications because they're hoping they get one.



MORRIS Alexis 1:18:30

Yeah. Thanks.



SH Shelley Humble 1:18:31

Yeah. Thanks.



MORRIS Alexis 1:18:32

And I appreciate your input and it's it's, I guess reassuring to hear that you also struggled as an act around these very same issues that we're discussing right now.

Also, I very good grant writer, yeah.



SH Shelley Humble 1:18:44

Open.

Face.



MORRIS Alexis 1:18:49

Brian, thank you, Chair Chellie, as the statute's written, it's requesting additional information to justify the above 150 K ask.



SH Shelley Humble 1:18:50

Right.



MORRIS Alexis 1:19:01

And I'm curious the arc got and because I don't see that you guys adjusted any of the asks individually.

SH Shelley Humble 1:19:03

Thank you.

 **MORRIS Alexis** 1:19:11

It's kind of all or none as presented to the board.

SH Shelley Humble 1:19:16

And our conversation lasted quite awhile on this.

There were several of them that we looked at that we could possibly reduce down.

And then discussion worked around what's fair.

What's not fair?

Was it fair to reduce one but not the other?

In the end, after all the.

The conversation, part of it was we looked at how far down the line in priority three we could get.

And we understood that part of our thought process was also the bill.

Money is a five year project.

Well, at this point, five years will be maybe short on that with the new.

Federal mandates coming down the line.

So that's a rare opportunity for airports.

To be able to get some of that and Steve Nagia is right.

Some of the economic development under the bill money.

Which most small airports would never see in a lifetime if they didn't have the bill money.

So we were weighing.

It was like a minefield.

Which way do you go?

Because some of these small airports, in order not to try and be self-sufficient, need that hangar build.

But they can't get that hangar build because it's against FAA regulations for AIP.

But yet the bill money is available now so that they can get the infrastructure in that they need.

To do the hangar so that they can hopefully become self-sustaining or not run the risk of being closed because they aren't self-sustaining so it's.

It's really hard to justify cutting them, but it's really hard not to have angst by not cutting them. And I know that probably sounds like a political speak and it wasn't meant to be. But I'm looking at both sides.

I'm on both sides and it's really hard.

For some of these airports, that's their only opportunity that they're going to have to maybe get a step forward where that it would not be there without that bill of money.

So we did not feel at this point that it was.

The right thing to do by reducing them, and we felt either you reduce them all or you don't reduce them.

And there were some that we thought that maybe could be reduced, but then on fairness, are you being fair?

Are you looking at all the pieces?

It it was an extremely tough.

System this this time and part of it and a lot of it is the bill money.

But thankfully, these small airports do have the bill money.

It's not a lot, but it's enough to at least get maybe one piece of a project going.



MORRIS Alexis 1:22:10

Yeah, thanks for your input, Shelly.



Shelley Humble 1:22:10

Thanks for.



MORRIS Alexis 1:22:11

Really appreciate it.



Shelley Humble 1:22:16

No problem.



MORRIS Alexis 1:22:16

OK.

I'm just asking vacation on going back to your last big comment, when you said people who have two applications, were you saying the total that they would get would be 150?

 **Shelley Humble** 1:22:22
What?

 **MORRIS Alexis** 1:22:31

So they would get 7575 basically.

Or or just pick one and cap it at 1:50. Or no, I would say. But you know, they put into the ones I'm looking at.

You know, they don't reach the 150 level, but.

Combined, they are sort of close.

So just allowing the the funding up to that point, so the the combination of one airport would not get more than 150 if they had five applications.

The one airport is capped at 1:50. Just making sure I understood correctly.

I'm I'm.

Yeah, I would ask.

I understand that too.

I would actually ask staff to run the numbers in that instance.

And would we actually be leaving money on the table because there are several airports with that are in there with multiple one 50s and I don't think so. But I think we'll go all you know, we'll probably go all the way down into the the priority threes but.

I just would also not want to leave any money on the table and not award it so to speak, so that you know I just want to make sure that that doesn't happen either.

Anyway, I don't know if we become too restrictive or not restrictive, but.

22 You know directive and then all the sudden but also that incense the undesirable behavior that we just asked for one every time. You're not going to get, you're just going to say one.

Give me 150.

All right, so there's the undesirable effect of that, right?

But that is that is how we operated before, you know, before we raise the CAP at 20, right.

So that, yeah.

So just pointing that out.

Right. So so to clarify what you're saying is that if they have multiple applications?

And say, OK, they have two and both are at 1:50.

You're looking at approving just one of those, but if they have multiple combined I I well, just looking at the projects, I don't think we have that scenario.

So what?

I'm what I'm looking at is so just for example, the Grant County fuel upgrade and then the Grant County.

Install Runway Pappy system.

So both of those are below 150. So what I'm saying is we could fund both as long as the total amount stayed under the 50, OK.

So then if they have two applications and those two combined go over 150, you only want to approve one of them.

Well, I wouldn't.

I guess in a perfect world I would say you fund both the projects, but you only give them a total of 1 point fee.

OK.

So we're gonna try to catch you.

Yeah, I haven't looked at anything like that, but we could take a few minutes just to see, but that scenario would be leaving it up to the airport to decide on the amount then.

And that's my question is, I know we're looking at today's numbers, but I'm also thinking ahead like we're right, gonna write policy on how we're gonna do this for the rest of the years.

So we won't know the numbers.

So should we equally divide it between the two projects or should we have the airport?

Well, I'm not sure right how to write the right policy for the next year's grants so people understand what's going to happen.

I.

I guess I would say for this year, maybe it would just be a percentage of based on what's.

Going to say, but you've got the two projects. There are over 150.

You take a percentage of how much you have to cut from each, and then that's how you wind up with this final number.

And I should say I was only looking at priority one because I think a priority three there there would have to be a club made at least at one airport.

So chair Stevens.

Again, I just want to make sure I understand what you're proposing. If somebody if if an airport has submitted something for priority 1-2 and three.

They're only gonna get funded up to 150 as opposed to some of the airports that have projects, you know like 2.

And what is it?

City of Cresswell.

They've got three applications for priority two that would make sense if what would make sense to me is if we keep the 150 per category priority one priority two, priority three, if you put in two projects under priority one.

Then you're gonna get up to 150.

But if you are in a different.

Priority category that meets different requirements. OK. And I think we should, you know, really think about the, the the benefits of the categories themselves.

I don't think we should fault an agency for putting in in the different categories because there's a lot of the grant programs I'm involved with.

That, that, that has a different purpose.

So is that something that could be considered by our group?

Yeah, that's actually I agree with you. And I that's really what I intended is that.

By priority is OK that the caps would be imposed. Good. Oh, that's clear.

That makes it clear for OK now, I think that'll help staff too, OK.

Yeah, Jim, why not let the airport choose rather than split the 151 of their projects?

Could be far more important to them, more urgent than the other, so.

That it could work better, I think just that would be better to let the airport choose.

Yeah, I do for operation.

Think they could work that out with staff? I think.

The the main thing is we we wanna make sure we're hitting their grant cycle for the federal funding. And so and then I think moving forward we could probably have some better clarity around that by making sure we spelled out the rules you know more clearly without this.

Nebulous. Well, you can ask more.

Chair Stevens. Maybe one last consideration, assuming there is funding leftover, right?

I.

I I think it's incumbent upon us to make sure that we're utilizing these dollars to the best of what they were intended for.

Would it be unrealistic then to say?

You know, let's say there is an airport that put in for two projects because they scored the highest.

Maybe we allocate some of that funding to the the people that score the highest.

Now that that does cause a challenge because as we heard from one of our volunteers.

Not everybody's a professional grant writer, but it seems like the most logical way till we come up with a true rubric or metric on moving forward so that we don't leave any money on the table.

Yeah. And I don't know.

Do you have a read on that and if and under this scenario, would we have a? Would we get all the way through priority three well committed even more to we don't currently have a mechanism in statute or rule or even our processes to where you know we.

We're.

We would approve and start executing over.

The board decides that approval is going to look, but if, for example, a project doesn't happen because for whatever reason the FAA doesn't, they don't get their FAA grant or the airport decides to not do that project this year, we don't have a mechanism to to then take.

That 150 and move it down the line to the next grant or two.

So that just provides another, I guess complication of at least at this time until we redo our statute or or rules.

We don't have that mechanism in place. We just really have to base it off of whatever the board decides are going to be the approved projects and that's been the case in the past where for some reason a project wasn't able to move forward it we did just.

Put it back into the general pool.

So I feel like we're getting kind of to a point that doesn't feel very clear to me yet on how we're going to approve these projects.

And fixture. Why don't we start with priority one projects and then see where. Now see where we stand and what to do rather than trying to solve all three priorities.

The first one is the easiest one to do.

I think so, yes.

I think you're right. So we could make some, we could move on, OK.

So I think probably we can move to motions.

And I can give a run at language if you would like that or if somebody else wants to.
I'm concerned try as well so.

Try this on for size for a motion chair for priority one.

Grants there's a recommendation the motion would be.

To approve the priority one grants.

With 150,000.

Tap for Grant and the 150 cap applies to multiple grants.

Per airport sponsor for priority one.

I'll second that.

We have a motion and a second.

Is there any additional discussion?

Any pain coming from staff on that? Oh, sure, yes.

And got a second from Jeff.

So my my question comment is to staff.

You can do that.

OK.

Just making sure that there's not a lot, yes.

Start using my brain a little bit.

OK, we have a motion and a second on the floor. All those.

Would be Sarah if there's anybody.



LUCAS Sarah M (Avi Board) 1:32:24

It looked like Linda Tepper put her hand up momentarily.



MORRIS Alexis 1:32:30

There's no.

OK.

So we have motion and a second all those in favor say aye, any opposed.

OK, that motion carries for priority one.

I would make the second the same motion for priority two projects that they're capped for multiples at 1:50.

And approve the list and it's presented in front of us by staff.

I will second that again, OK. We have a motion and a second is there discussion about priority two?

Same question you guys can do that right?

Yes, just we recognize that.

In future cycles, we'll have a better two options.

We have, especially with the most recent FAA reauthorization, including resiliency and just what flexibility we we have and in our our rules and our it translates that that we we have an action item.

For this year to come up with clear rules for the next cycle, yes, right.

I didn't wanna put that into motion. I figured that because from just approving the the list in front of us, it's not setting precedence for the future. Correct, right.

Alright, so we have a motion and a second for priority.

Two projects.

All those in favor say I any opposed?

 **LUCAS Sarah M (Avi Board)** 1:33:57

Hi.

 **MORRIS Alexis** 1:33:59

OK, that motion carries.

That motion came from Steve, Maggie and the 2nd from Jeff.

I'll save for the third.

The third motion is similar to motions one and two for priority three, with the exception that for the ODA grant, in order to maximize the grant efficiency and effectiveness, or grant effectiveness for state for the airports, and is it?

Regent PMP in regions one and two that we accept that and allow that if it's original 200,000 requests since that would be.

For the benefit of multiple airports, not a single airport sponsor.

2nd.

Motion and 2nd, is there any further discussion unit staff do that?

Yes, I have a question chair.

So now that we're rolling down our is will this motion.

Apply to leftover funding.

So are we going to be that funding?

Yeah, correct.

So additional funds in this motion, additional funds would fund more projects into priority three, with the funds remaining from.

In what order in the order in the list?

In the order of the list, OK.

Just making sure we stay obvious answer, but just making sure we set it right.

And typically we also do have the board do a motion to approve funding of the total amount for the cycle.

So you would approve a full if I finish this one, we can go down the list to.

All right. We have a motion and a second for the priority three.

Court grants all those in favor say I.

Any opposed?

That motion carries as well.

Thank you for that robust discussion.

That was on pretty heavy lift for a shorter period of time, and we plowed through that so.

Yeah. So we've got to approve the funding as well. I know we will do that, don't worry.

Sorry, just to make sure I have.

This is the third.

Agenda that it should be the very bottom one.

So the draft motions are based on the recommendation and at the very bottom one I believe is.

All right.

So you see, it starts with the approved funding authorization for 2024-2025 core grants in the amount not to exceed.

4 million.

So whoever would like to follow that motion?

You can just say so moved, so moved second second.

Right, that came from the motion.

Came from Jim knight.

Have a motion and a second and any discussion.

It'd be nice to see a final document of how this all should be, of course.

Yeah. And we can ask that.

Right. A motion is second. All those in favor say I.

Any opposed?

Passes. There we go, staff. We got it done for you.

OK.

Very good. Thank you.

How are we all doing on file breaks?

Things like that we may need to reshuffle or schedule a little for sure.


We take a 5 minute break.


I know we're going to run up on the lunch hour, but I'm just wondering, Kelly, for all her work and contributions and really clarification of the process from her perspective.


So thank you very much.


Yeah. Thanks, Kelly. Appreciate that.


Echo what Jim said, but also to make sure we.


 **Shelley Humble** 1:37:57
Thank you. Anytime.

 **MORRIS Alexis** 1:38:02
The rest of the volunteers that Shelly got to work with.


 **Shelley Humble** 1:38:03
What's the?

 **MORRIS Alexis** 1:38:06
Yes. Thank you, Shelly.

 **Shelley Humble** 1:38:09
Thank you guys and I look forward to conversations later.

 **MORRIS Alexis** 1:38:10
All right.
Yes, thank you.

 **Shelley Humble** 1:38:16
Yeah.

 **MORRIS Alexis** 1:38:17
I think we've obviously started that discussion where we need to have some tweaks made to our process. So we will look forward to that coming in the future.

Are you all in agreement to take like 5 minute grade? OK, we'll do that.

Join up after lunch for the Aurora Master Plan update.

Great. Well, thank you and good morning, everyone.

Just confirming I don't have to unmute my screen.

Everyone can hear me OK?

And getting a nod from Sarah.

So first before I jump into the presentation, I did want to just provide some information on the comments that we had this morning. And so Mr. Mock, thank you for your comments.

Do appreciate it.

Thanks for coming by and and we look forward to discussing in our upcoming meetings. Thank you.

And not yet. Not yet. OK.

And then on Charlie's comments. Thank you, Charlie.

We we do understand that pappy's are are sorely needed that independence.

We actually have recently received a quote from a vendor from a supplier on Pappy's and right now we don't have funding to put them in right away, but we are looking at, you know, FA reimbursement and project where we could replace both of the pappy's of.

Independents and that project calls for a shifting of the runway.

And so the pappy's themselves would shift as well.

So we're we're looking at how we can implement that.

Out there.

And let's see Mr. Henderson's comments.

So some of that was probably a surprise to to you.

In October, when Mr. Henderson came and commented, there were some, there was some confusion over.

Our airport land use compatibility guidebook and and how F airport 77 surfaces affect development obstructions outside of airports and we have since met with him and and clarified those issues.

But we also step, we started looking on the appraisal that you mentioned and we're discussing the potential for the state to acquire that property from him because of some of the challenges and the benefit that it provides to the airport. So that was something that we worked on.

And as you mentioned, we did just meet yesterday to go over that phrasal.

So happy to provide any additional comments or answers discussion on that. If you would like for Mr. Hillock, totally understand and agree that hanger space is in high demand and I am going to have an update on through the fence. We are working on, but we have a few locations where we can develop hangers and we're working on on.

A few applications we have forward development in those locations at the Joseph State Airport. Let's see and then.

For Etsy Johnson.

Seam for the master plan.

Appreciate her comments and I spoke with her.

Just the other day on the phone and encouraged her to attend our upcoming pack meeting where she can give public comment as well.

And then the last comment was we just discussed for course I'm going to share my screen.

And you're with me.

OK.

I think this will work.

Yeah. OK.

This is a photo of the Cape Blanco State Airport and an update on that here in just a minute.

Because we were in winter and expecting winter conditions throughout most of the state, I did just want to give a quick reminder that we don't.

We don't have extensive plowing capabilities, but we are reporting service conditions when we observe them and then we are reporting we are issuing notes that surface conditions are not reported when when we can't observe.

And that's for all 28 of our state reports statewide.

The most frequent issue or vicon know them, so we're issuing are at the Joseph and the Aurora State Airport.

We do not have the ice capability at any of our state airports and we do encourage pilots to just check in with us.

Check no themes for latest conditions and and let us know if there's anything else that we need to be aware of.

This is just one of our our three smaller trucks that that have plows based here in Salem.

We do have one larger but older truck over at Joseph and again we do what we can

when conditions are suitable for plowing.

And then just another reminder that our four seasonal airports are closed through May 1st and that is an estimated date.

We do go out and inspect those airports, put up the windsluck again, and then if the conditions do not allow.

Issue a note.

I'm keeping them close until they are suitable for operation.

And then this time of year, the Pacific City State Airport.

This photo was provided by the Friends of Pacific City State Airport and this is the time of year the airport does receive some flooding and I think we're past the worst of it. With the king tides being over.

But we do have remarks for the airport master record that it may be underwater during high tide or have occasional driftwood due to flooding.

So just another thing to be aware of.

I it's still ongoing.

I think OK, just wanted to.

I OK.

Give me one quick moment.

In a swat like.

Apologize.

There we are.

I may have to swap the IT is thinking real hard.

To begin, splice and I'd only pick up on display, but it's working.

Yeah, I have to change the primary computer here.

Give me. I'm very sorry.

OK.

I think we did file. I think we've got it work.

And everyone online.

And everyone online and seven cups.

Can we be heard?

We are heard and believe we are.

 **LUCAS Sarah M (Avi Board)** 1:52:44

Yes.



MORRIS Alexis 1:52:47

Great. OK.

So this equipment is on order and we're expecting delivery either the end of this month or by next month and just in time before nesting season. So we can out and hit some of our highest priority airports.

Especially in the South.

So and including that the Pinehurst Theater for where we do have quite a few trees out in the city area.

So we are prioritizing.

We expect to get great use out of this machine for several years to come, and then while we catch up on on a lot of growth and then get into maintenance. But we're prioritizing the trees that are on state property at our airports and those airports that have.

Projects so shape bump airport where we went in and did a bunch of work a year or two ago and still have some additional work there. The prospects to airport where we are.

Have a project coming up soon and then.

And then a bunch of other reports throughout the state that have significant obstruction needs.

Painting this year, we are looking at this list of airports banned in Cape Veraco Conda and Joseph McDermott Bay and Wasco. We have over the last two years since we acquired the new machine we have painted half of the state airports and we estimated between 80,000 to.

130,000.

1000 and savings by doing that in house and or per year and that's not it's a savings but that's just that's not that we paid that for a contractor to go do every year.

We just weren't getting that work done, so we're doing it cost effectively.

But this is a new level service that we're doing in house by getting these airports on a on a four year rotation to keep the margins updated.

And we are listing.

You know, we have a lot of gravel grass strips.

They still have things that we that we do paint, maintain winsock poles.

Tires to Denmark or other mats to to mark the thresholds and other things. So so we do keep them online.

Quick question.

Yeah, if you don't know the answer, but I was just asking, who does the engineering for your payment and marking so that it meets legal standards?

So who who does that?

So the for a project where we have to put new markings down, we contract that. It's part of our contract services with our engineer, excellent engineers and and primarily that's century West.

And then in house, we're just refreshing what's already on there, just just maintaining what you have, so, OK.

Just a quick project update. The Aurora State airport because my last update to you all was in October.

I just wanted to mention that that project did conclude.

And it had its last code of markings.

And if you haven't seen on Google Maps, Google Earth, they updated their satellite imagery with the latest and it looks great.

I should have included a photo here.

Bring it up at lunch, yeah.

Oh, definitely.

The upcoming our our next pack meeting for the Aurora Airport Master Plan is February 11th and.

Then on the Cape Blanco runner rehab so starting.

Next week we are resuming the closure we had.

We reopened the runway when the pavement work was done and waiting just for longer lead times for electrical items.

So those are now in stock and we are getting back to complete the electrical work and wrap this project up.

By March is what we're anticipating.

And then for prospect that runway reconstruction project, we are anticipating A2 month closure starting this spring to do the full pavement and electrical improvements there as well.

We did have a brief closure at Select Bay for partial electrical improvements, but we expect the bulk of the work with the pavement and electrical improvements to start the spring and summer, and we'll be sharing a bunch more updates on those.

The Aurora State airport obstruction removal.

The EA rewrite that we have been anticipating for quite some time, we received the

Fonzie last month and so we are now moving forward.

On appraisals for that and the other obstruction level projects, we have it Molino and Chilaquil on Mulino. Last year we did complete the obstruction removal for onstate and properties that we had easements for those obstructions and this is going to do the remainder of the the trees that.

Are that we don't have instructions for Tony.

What's fonzie? Sorry. A finding of no significant.

Sorry, I know if Kenji were here, he would have gotten on me about that.

So technically, since our last meeting was December, we have had zero new vpds.

But my last update was October, so we did have two after our October meeting. But knock on wood.

Those were the most recent, so I do. And I I told the the folks over at the Aurora Airport that I I believe this is.

A result of everyone's combined effort and really appreciate the steps people have taken so far.

And we are continuing our work with them.

In developing drivers training and I have been mentioning our rule making that we are anticipating bringing forward to the board here in the the next meeting or two.

So we are continuing to work on that and and I look forward to the discussion.

As we work on that rulemaking.

Just a a photo of the Cape Long Coast Airport.

So this is what?

The pavement work done and the brand new markings you can see here that we did reduce the runway with from 150 feet to 75 feet wide, but it maintains its full length and this was late October.

Our staff got out and got great photos with a drone and we really look forward to unveiling the finished product here.

In the coming weeks.

I have shared this information before.

Just a reminder that the Nehalem Bay State Airport is has appraised prior permission required.

Known of issued so this is a result of state parks completing a a large scale project and the the park is closed outside of the airport grounds, but they have allowed folks to go access the airport. So that's where we have set up a prior permission.

Required for full stop landings and just trying to make sure that folks know, you

know, weather restrictions are in.

Operating accords with those.

On our homepage oregon.gov/aviation we have this link to subscribe to these emails for updates on whether it's in Nehalem Bay State or ports.

Operating restrictions on the Cape Blanco project and all the other projects I've mentioned.

So we're sending out both the liveries for all of those.

And anyone listening, be sure to check for all the topics for each individual state report that they'd like to receive notifications for.

And then you can also click the link at the bottom of a notice to manage your subscriptions.

Lastly, because I don't wanna keep you all from lunch.

Here I'm I'm right on time, OK?

Well, so lunch hasn't arrived, so I did.

Reach out to Mr. Hillock and and I did wanna have some discussion with the board but mostly wanted to let you know in this meeting that that.

We have a number of airports with through the fence and and we do have a pilot program.

We have the Aurora State airport that's included in the pilot program, but then we have a handful of other airports with through the fence access and we only have rules or policy on that pilot program. We don't have rules or policy on how ODOT should.

Implement.

Through the fence elsewhere. And I did put an asterisk because there is one policy.

There's one rule, an administrative rule, that.

That appears to be a kind of prohibition on through the fence until that airport is fully leased at any airport that doesn't currently have through the fence. So.

I look forward to having discussion with the board.

And also with airport folk.

From our whether there are tenants or just folks throughout the state on on how and if the organ harm and aviation should conduct through the fence access agreements at our airports.

And if we do, how how exactly should we do that so we can do it consistently and fairly?

We don't have any guidance on that currently.

Yes, on the on the previous slide, you don't need to go back, but there was a through the fence, non aviation. What is that?

What is through the fence? Non aviation.

How does that what?

What would that be?

Non non aeronautical.

Oh yeah, lemon.

It was for emergency access. Fire action. OK. Gotcha. That that Tadmi's had scratching for.

It's like, yeah, it it really picked up just to one hanger.

Levin is really interesting where there's a bunch of hangers that go right up to the edge of the fence and.

End on the other side of the fence is a bunch of industrial buildings.

So there's limited access.

So this statute you just showed us, it's in the Ors. So Oregon administrative approval.

So back to the.

So back to the previous two slides, Tony.

Was through the fence pilot program, was specifically designed for aviation use because airports can have through defence agreements for non for non aeronautical uses like you said for accessing a piece of property adjacent to you for emergency purposes that's.

Doesn't run.

In conflict with FAA really FAA gets.

Wants to put you know the emphasis on through the fence aviation activity.

So going back to your previous slide, we're really only talking through the fence.

Aviation activities are at Aurora.

Independence, correct?

And we're, you know, of those like you said, Lebanon is for a non aeronautical.

So if Pacific city, those non commercial residential, those are non aviation or they're aviation, they're aviation, OK.

Yeah. Everything except for 11 and up there, I believe is aviation and.

And so the pilot program.

Specifically, refers to industrial uses.

So commercial aeronautical activities and outside of.

Commercial agriculture operator at Wasco Aurora is the only industrial or or

commercial operator.

Through the fence agreement that we have residential right and the rest are residential.

So they're not necessarily part of that pilot program and that's the Gray area that we don't have yet.

I thought that wasn't that put in place. The pilot program at Aurora, that was the legislative.

Yeah, yeah. Aurora's also the only one with a tower, right, right. So I'm just kind of bringing up that I expect we'll have some further discussion and and I'm happy to facilitate that both.

With the board and and out with our pilot communities.

But right now, because we don't have guard rails, we do have a number of applications for through the fence and including people who have purchased property with the expectation that they would be granted through the fence.

And So what?

What I have let people know now is that we we are not going to grant through the fence until we have a mechanism to do that.

Consistently and fairly, and those those requests are.

Commercial and non commercial.

Or both.

Yes, OK.

And then how do you see that policy making transpiring? That would be a yes, that would be a rule making that we would bring to the board and we would.

Make Seth's recommendation and and bring the public input that we have. Also, we can have you know the board can be included and I believe should be included throughout that process as well.

I look forward to bringing everyone together to to talk about it.

So we look back at the the existing administrative rule.

The goal with that language as I read it, is to make sure that we're building out property on state owned airports before we would allow for through the fence, right, which goes directly to making sure those airports are self-sustaining as possible.

OK.

Do we need a recommendation?

Back to the staff here or or. Or do we need direction?

I guess chair back to the staff or is that what they're looking for already in motion?

A timeline for when you would bring that back to the board for.

Proposing a rule making process. I don't have a timeline.

We do have because we have the pilot program there, there's already.

Some.

Framework present and and so we can. You know. I don't know what that engagement the outreach process is gonna look like.

Just how many meetings are we gonna have?

But I I do look forward to bringing this back within this year.

Well, and I'm I guess I'm thinking because you do have several requests that are with the agency right now that you know, I think we should definitely take put a schedule together.

Actively addressing those requests, and if that means that we need to spell out what if you know rule making process is going to look like and put some timelines to that so that those folks asking for this understand what those timelines are.

I think that's a fair thing to do.

You know, I personally, you know like to have.

Org or input or participation with some work sessions during that as part of your outreach as well, not just until the product's ready to come to us, but.

At least having some work sessions with us would be good.

Yeah, I will for for our next pack meet or I'm sorry. Our next board meeting, I will have an update on schedule and some process and if if the board.

Wants to select.

Committee members to sit on those room making discussions.

Happy to include anyone.

Great. And I would say in that framework, when you're bringing that back to us, just make sure you're educating us all on our airport sponsored grant assurances so that we understand the framework that we're having to work from as far as how the grant assurances should be inform.

Policy. Yeah. And so part of this is answering the question of should we do this and? And because the board is ultimately going to.

Approve approve any rule making you know. I guess if the board wanted to have some discussion and then provide feedback back to staff or inform you know this process as we have those discussions then.

I think that would that would be an important consideration. Cool.

Very good.

Any other questions for Tony?

Yes indeed, for through the fence issue that we're talking about, you're just talking with state owned airports or are you track it all?

Yeah, this would affect only state owned airports where adjacent properties that are fairly owned would would access.

The the public use state property.

Didn't Steve to go crazy?

Wait a minute. It's Meyer.

Are we? Since the only first state airport?

OK.

Any other questions?

All right.

Thank you, Tony.

Thank you.

I think that brings us up to lunch, so we will break for half an hour for lunch and then come back and next on. The agenda will be the Aurora master plan.

OK.

Just one quick second. You'd kiss off.

Suppose you have a quick second.

OK. And we should be backing up Okie Dokie.

Welcome back, everybody on our lunch break.

We're going to move into the master plan update.

Yes. So everyone can hear, correct.

OK, getting the thumbs up.

So good afternoon again and.

You know, staff in central W really happy to provide this update.

On the Master Plan project, our last update was September. In a work session and just like in that meeting, we wanted to be respectful of the public process and if the board has any clarifying questions, we're happy to answer those. If the board has input they'd like to.

Provide please provide those through Chair Stevens, who is our board pack representative on on the master plan.

We are going to provide an update since that September meeting.

But and we have shared the refined preferred alternative with the pack.

But we have not yet discussed it in the meeting with, so there may be questions or if

there are questions we may not be able to answer those until we've had an opportunity to have that meeting with the pack here on February 11th. And then again if you.

Wanna get your questions? If you do have any other refined preferred alternative to Chair Stevens, and then we can get those answered.

Next week, with that intro, WI believe is on the call and I'll turn it over to them.

 **David Miller** 2:48:24

Thank you, Tony.

And let me see if I can.

I'll click the right button here.

Hopefully I'll share my screen.

Can everyone see that?

 **MORRIS Alexis** 2:48:43

Yes.

 **David Miller** 2:48:44

OK, alright.

Sure. I don't push it on the wrong button here. OK, so is that is that a full screen view for you all?

 **MORRIS Alexis** 2:48:54

Not really.

Yeah, it looks windowed.

 **David Miller** 2:48:55

Oh, OK, OK.

Let me push a couple more buttons here to see if I can figure out how to do this.

Excuse me.

 **MORRIS Alexis** 2:49:10

That's good.

That's good. Yep.

DM David Miller 2:49:11

Better. OK. All right.

Thank you very much.

So thank you, chair Stevens and board members.

I'm David Miller, Member from our last briefing in September on the leading airport or aviation planner for century W Engineering.

We're the lead consultant for your Aurora Spader Port master plan.

I've also got on the call today with us James Kirby, who is our technical lead on all things engineering at the Royal State Airport.

So if we have questions at James can help clarify then.

I will.

He's available to jump in.

See.

Stand by. So I'm sorry.

Try to get figure out my buttons here. OK, so we've got a fairly brief presentation today. I know your time is valuable.

We'll try to keep this concise.

So just as an agenda overview, we're just going to provide an update where we are in the planning process as Tony alluded to. And really since the last board meeting presentation in September, we have.

Reviewed the preferred alternative with the pack and also.

Looked at refinements to that.

So that occurred during pack meetings 8 and or I'm sorry, seven and eight in October and December.

And then there's more information on next steps on the project website.

So just a quick overview on the schedule we are over on the right side close to that we are here.

Arrow, essentially the the next pack meeting as Tony mentioned is on February 11th and that'll be our 9th PAC meeting.

We've also had a number of study sessions work sessions with the pack and Public Open house so.

That is drawing as you can see from the graphic that is drawing us to the last couple of pieces of the process.

In terms of taking the preferred alternative and and finalizing the draft airport layout

plan and capital improvement program.

So again, a little recent history. So as I mentioned the the preferred alternative was presented to the pack, the pack meeting on October 15th.

There was feedback provided at the meeting and then subsequently and the next scheduled pack meeting, which was held on December 10th was actually we made an adjustment based on the input that was provided during the pack meeting 7 to provide an opportunity for more collaboration with the public.

And the pack. So the December meeting was really a discussion around table.

Letting all the members provide input on.

The preferred alternative that was presented back in the October meeting.

We also presented the preliminary noise analysis both current year and long term noise exposure maps for that and then.

As Tony mentioned, based on the feedback that we were provided following PAC meeting 7:00 and 8:00 during and following.

Refinements were made.

Some evaluations occurred within Ode's.

Staff and refinements were made to the preferred alternative and that referred referred alternative graphic was posted on January 6th, so it's been available for public review for about a month and we continue.

So again, this is kind of looking backward a little bit.

This is what was presented at the pack meeting #7 in October and it was essentially the preferred alternative, the goals of which were to this was through the long process of evaluating things like the east shift of the runway versus the West shift or the highway versus.

The runway shift, you know the north extension of the South extension, things like that.

So this preferred alternative really.

Zeroed in on the Hubbard Highway and Kyle Rd. realignment.

Removing the drain field in the runway safety area at the South end of the runway, relocating some of the non standard items in the object free area of the weather system and AWAS and segment circle and then it looked at property acquisition related to all that and then.

Some other improvements to open drainage, which is on site.

There were projects that were part of that preferred alternative that included the.

Proposed parallel taxi lane along the east side of the parallel taxiway and also

proposed.

Vehicle service road that would run parallel to the to the runway taxiway system.

Those recommendations came through the planning process and were suggested by pack members and I think there were some direction from the runway safety action team as well.

So that's why they ended up in the preliminary preferred alternative.

I think what we distinguished at the time and sense is that.

The first group of projects were really required to mitigate FAA non standard FAA conditions. The ladder group, the safety or the parallel taxi lane and the vehicle service road were really intended to improve efficiency and safety.

They weren't necessarily intended to correct a deficiency and standards, and that's kind of where the distinction lies on those two.

So this is the graphic that was again, this was the preferred alternative that was presented back in October and again discussed in our December meeting.

And if, if you recall from earlier presentations.

The preferred alternative really contained 4 phases.

And they were not in any particular order necessarily, but we distinguished between.

Bringing the runway object free area runway safety up to standards, which meant removing a lot of the conflicting items.

Just like the Hubbard Highway, Kyle Rd. etc. There was the runway extension piece at the North End. There was the vehicle service road piece and the taxi lane parallel taxiway.

And so we pointed out that this view represented the long term development picture for the airport and that those individual phases would were intended to be implemented sort of on.

A.

On a not necessarily a sequential basis, but they were.

Individual projects that could be could be undertaken.

A lot has been discussed about the reserve, the property area, the yellow shaded area.

This is simply an area that was identified as as off airport property currently in aeronautical use. For the most part that could be incorporated into the airport if if there was a situation where there was a willing seller that wanted to approach odev and sell property showing that.

Property reserved on the airport layout plan opens the door to using FA funding for

that.

There was no intent by ODAF to actively pursue property acquisition for.

The through the fence developments, for example, other than property that was needed for the conformance to the FA standards.

So the input we received.

In the during and following the pack meeting 7:00 and 8:00, so October and December was that there was, you know, the development options were what they are, but we should really be considering no build action and that was just simply do nothing and avoid the the changes.

That was not carried forward because it failed to meet the F as requirement that the that the airfield meet standards for when we safety area.

And object free area on the approved plan.

Also suggested input was to reduce or eliminate impacts to the existing hangers, predominantly on the east side. Large collection of hangers on the east side of the South end. Also just input that the parallel tax lien wasn't needed.

It might be nice, but in this situation really not necessary.

Is also proposed that the vehicle service road that was proposed be relocated off airport property through the existing through the fence Hanger area.

And we pointed out during that conversation or those conversations I should say, and I think FA weighed in on this as well, that the airport master plan is focusing on ODEV owned property.

So improvements that would occur off airport property Odeb owned property would not be part of master plan and there were some conversations about whether.

The property needed to accommodate the through the vehicle service road could be purchased.

Storm leased.

There was a lot of back and forth on that so.

That was, I mean, it was essentially the case that ODA would not be funding projects off airport property.

So unless that changed, that was sort of the the distinction there.

There's also quite a lot of conversation about the Greenfield at the South end and I know there's been a lot of back and forth and this is where James could jump in. If I get too far off track. But.

Our basic approach was the Greenfield as it currently exists, does not meet FA standards.

And either on grade and surface compaction, and also the ability to bear weight of a vehicle over in our craft over top of the drain field which is within the safety area.

And then the highway.

There was a shift.

The The There's been a lot of conversation about the need to shift the highway and if so, how much? And we reported that our planning assumptions were based on input provided by O dot during preliminary conversations.

And it's a very conceptual and their basic feedback was that they their preference would be to keep their existing right of way width.

So all of our options related that brought the road and the right of way over necessarily and and keeping the road centered, the roadway centered in that.

So that's kind of the feedback we heard.

The so based on that, both, as I said at both of those meetings in a lot of comments that were provided.

Through the project comment apparatus through the website.

The preferred refined preferred alternative was posted on or published on January 6th.

So the main changes between the original and the refined version is that the the parallel.

The east parallel taxi Lane and the vehicle service roads were removed.

Eliminates the need to acquire property that would have impacted.

That a large group of hangers along the southeast side of the airfield.

And along the by limiting the vehicle service Rd. component, there was also the ability to add in return some existing or some aircraft parking helicopter parking positions that were eliminated in order to accommodate the vehicle service Rd.

And the the big take away on that is that it reduced the required property acquisition to just the areas needed to meet the FAA.

Object Free area taxi object, free runway object, free area and runway safety standards. The reserve is still identified simply to keep the door open if there's a willing seller that approaches odef.

And they could then potentially use FAA funding to acquire property that becomes available and the underlying intent with that was to ensure that the.

Adjacent lands, which are in aeronautical use, stay in aeronautical news, which I know that is the current Nintendo RE owners, but as an airport owned land that would that would ensure that.

So there were some changes based on that, but then there were a number of items that remained unchanged from the preliminary preferred alternative presented in October. The North runway extension, the relocation, removal of the drain field outside the South end of the runway safety area, open ditches and.

The ditch that runs along the parallel taxiway would need to be covered.

As well, and the shift of the Hubbard Highway and Kyle Rd.

Outside the object free area, relocation of the ASOS and the wind cone.

Some reconfigurations of apron tie downs and mentioned earlier and then also the hanger sites that are on odev on property.

And the refined version of that looks very much like the other, with the exception of the impact up. I can't see my cursor I'm sure, but over in this this was the area that was most directly affected by the proposed parallel taxiway in the.

Vehicle service road so.

With that, we're good on time.

So I can go through the next steps. Tony's already alluded to this.

Our next meeting is next week, Tuesday on the 11th, we'll be presenting the and discussing with the pack the refined preferred alternative.

We are also presenting.

We will be presenting the draft capital improvement program.

We presented preliminary cost estimates at the earlier meetings.

That were our first run at the at the costs including property acquisition and we have refined the those numbers as well to reflect the most recent changes and refinements in the preferred alternatives.

There's obviously a significant cost savings with the elimination of Henry requisition in east side, for example.

So that also takes the cost and the projects and sort of divides them into.

Short term and longer term projects that really we're looking at the next five years and then and then beyond.

So that is going to be presented to the pack as well.

And then the draft airport layout plan drawing set the right now the airport layout plan drawing the terminal area plan and the sheets that contain most of this information.

So we'll be presenting that next.

Beyond that are one of our final steps in this process would be to prepare the draft final report.

And draft airport layout plan drawing set which will be submitted for ODEV review. It'll be available on public review and pack.

Review it ultimately is submitted to the FAA office in Seattle, where it will they'll coordinate the official FAA review. Normally, when I say normally because there hasn't really been much about this project, that's been normal in terms of timeline. The normal time frame for an FA review on a draft final airport layout.

Plan a master plan document is 90 days, so we're hoping that all the lines of business in the air space reviews are completed within 90 days. So that will that will be a spring submittal to FAA and that would suggest that they would be looking at final review.

Completion by early summer. So with that, I think I will stop.



MORRIS Alexis 3:04:48

All right.

Thank you so much.



David Miller 3:04:48

Mm hmm.



MORRIS Alexis 3:04:51

We'll take some questions from the board.

I have one for for you right off the top, which is. Could you give a little more detail around the drain fields and just? I know you've all explained this before but just a little more detail about the challenges around the drain fields where they are now and.

Why the need to move them?

Or to I should say, not necessarily move them, but to find a different solution.

Chair Stevens. Could you have him go to the graphic? Just so, Steve, where that's at. OK.



David Miller 3:05:18

I can.



MORRIS Alexis 3:05:19

I'm kind of a visual person, sorry.

DM **David Miller** 3:05:21

We're talking down here. Sure. Yeah, the green, OK.

 **MORRIS Alexis** 3:05:21

Yeah, there we go.

So the green areas.

DM **David Miller** 3:05:25

Very good question.

Thank you, chair Steven.

So this is where I'm going to lean on James Kirby.

If I get so I'm the planner in the world and James is the engineer.

So it's an engineering issue.

I'll describe it as best I can.

And then James, feel free to jump in.

So the first part of the answer is that when the drain field was constructed many years ago, the design standards that were applied to runway 1735.

We're in the B2 category.

And what that really means is that the runway saved here at that time did not extend that far South. So with the C2 standards that have been in place now for a number of years, the drain field is not considered compatible with runways, FA runway safety area.

Standards.

So the question why then?

And or why not then and why now?

That's really because the standards that are in place today, the footprint of the protected compacted surface that runway safety area has grown.

James weighed in, gave me some feedback on a couple questions earlier, and basically what it amounts to is the the undercurrent, C2 standards, which have been in place for quite a long time, aren't really isn't really a change based on future activity.

It's what we need today.

The Enfield doesn't meet FAA grading standards or load bearing load carrying standards.

So there are a lot of design related issues with that.

So the the simple.

Issue is in the FA world is the.

Grandfield doesn't meet FA standards currently and the FA looks to the plan to recommend a way to correct or mitigate that.

So this is something that odav and the FA have have evaluated.

Made some preliminary decisions on and the recommendation from the plan is to relocate the Greenfield outside the RSA.

It's that's kind of where that goes.

I think you know this is a great example of something where when.

The airport master plans, as you all know, or conceptual planning tools, and that the recommended projects are refined through both design and environmental processes. So.

You know at this point.

The.

Right. I should be out of town here. Sorry.

So the the design process can end up with some refinements.

So just as a conceptual guide, the recommendation is to remove the Greenfield to meet the standards.

I know there's been a lot of conversation between the tenant, the Greenfield is on the least piece of ground. So you know that.

I expect that will continue but.

From a planning perspective, the FA priority is to clear the runway safety area.



MORRIS Alexis 3:08:12

I just have a couple of follow-ups on that then so forgive my ignorance, but what are the drain fields being used for exactly right now and what would have to be? What would be the fix for those areas then and then Tony, I've got a safety question for you next.



DM David Miller 3:08:29

I I would defer to Tony on that. Thank you.



MORRIS Alexis 3:08:29

David.

If yeah, I'll, I'll answer that first question.

The there are a few different greenfields, so we show.

Three in this image.

And the South end, which is on the right side of the screen that is the.

The primary drink field that's kind of in the focus of the discussion and area.

And this was identified.

I wanna say three years ago and we've had this fairly significant discussion on it over compliance with the FA standards for safety areas and.

And then.

As we've worked through the.

The master plan process, we, you know, we've taken a holistic look at our greenfields.

We have a couple others, David, if you're able to go just to the left.



David Miller 3:09:24

Yep.



MORRIS Alexis 3:09:26

To the midpoint of the airfield, Tony, can I just ask you? So is it just literally like, run off from other parts of the OR what is it?

Sorry, so this drain field. This is for waste discharge for.

The S 3rd or so of the airport from from top airport or private property.

Run after runoff, right?

Uh, septic sewer, sewer run. All right? Yeah. Mm hmm.

So, umm, uh mix of I.

I don't know if these are the correct terms, but Gray and brown water.

And uh, but it is specifically septic for the through the fence uses on that S 3rd or so layer field.

And then similarly on the midpoint, just north of state, the state apron and hanger area, there's a little arrow pointed.

You know, labeled air corner at Greenfield, and that's within the taxi received area and that also is for those white box hangers, which are also private through the fence hanger uses and.

And so part of that was.

You know, it was an existing Greenfield, but the runway extended.

Same thing for the South end as well. The runway back in the late 2000s extended to

the South and and so then we found ourselves with this condition where the green fields now within the runner safety area.

So similar thing here with apparel taxiway.

And then on the North End, that is for Columbia helicopters, that Greenfield, which currently is outside of the city area. But as shown with the 497 foot runway extension to the north would become.

Within the the RSA and all of them are for.

Sewer, sewer and grant.

And then so my safety question is, what happens when an aircraft comes in and is short on approach or as an excursion off the other end?

What is the safety issue?

The standard for Run or safety areas is the the area under dry conditions can support the weight of aircraft and emergency equipment.

And without causing excessive damage to the aircraft.

Because because of drain field naturally introduces moisture to the field it is.

It is not allowing proper drainage and it is exacerbating the OR or James could really provide a lot more technical response here but but it it.

Does not allow for it to.

Support that aircraft or emergency equipment because it it introduces moisture, right?

And then there's also that's an FAA requirement, right that any runway safety area be able to withstand the weight of an aircraft or an emergency vehicle, correct?

Yes, but there's also.

There tiles and other vents and other.

Equipment within that drain field that you know may.

Not be frangible or you know we we're looking at, does it meet OFA and RSA requirements as well?

So break that down for us 'cause. I know what franchise?

So the FAA requirement, I'm sorry, yes, the FAA requirement is 3 inches above grade.

That it has to break away without causing excessive damage to the aircraft or causing loss of direction.

And so that's something we're looking at because.

The drain field is there. You can usually spot it on a map because we're not able to get in there and mow it, so it it also creates a vegetation control issue that we can't go in and and.

Mitigate wildlife hazards and just again.

Best management and drainage. Encouraging proper drainage of the the safety area.

 **James Kirby** 3:13:29

Yeah, I I can add one more thing to that too.

 **MORRIS Alexis** 3:13:33

What do you say? What?

 **James Kirby** 3:13:33

One of the big things about RSA is grading requirements. They have to meet grading standards in terms of the amount of vertical curves you place the lips, the dips, the humps.

In this particular drain field as well as you know others at the around the airport because that water table at the airport's fairly high, they've been forced to use in a lot of cases a capping fill design.

Which means there's actually a hump out there where the drain field is as well.

So the grade rises at the edge of the drain field stays high through the drain field and then drops at the edges.

So there's actually a non standard grading condition to go with that as well.

Besides, you know the the non load bearing structures and those kind of things too.

 **MORRIS Alexis** 3:14:19

Thank you, James.

Where would the Greenfield be moved to so that?

In in the current configuration, there's there's no.

Airport property that the drain field could be moved to that we have identified and.

At this point in what we identified about 3:00 or so years ago was that the drain field just needs to be outside of the safety area.

And.

I did want to point out that.

We have been working with.

With the lessee for that drain field on some improvements they claim will help make it meet FA standards.

We have had a lot of back and forth on that and we have not had all of our questions

answered to our satisfaction.

So we right now our our position is that it still cannot meet standards and needs to be taken outside of the safety area.

Safety is is absolutely a concern of ours and we we do not want to cause any excessive damage, personal injury or death as a result of an on standard condition on our report.

Do you have? Do you have any of the other state owned airports?

Are there drain fields in any other RSA?

In the FAS direction on this is we had some back and forth with the FAA when we initially were looking at this and the direction we formally received was evaluated through the master plan.

Our evaluation is the drain field needs to be taken outside of the six year.

Great. Thank you.

So whose responsibility would that be?

For our our that's a contractual.

Condition in our lease agreement and the termination and restoration of the the premises is is explained in that agreement and that would without looking at it directly, that would squarely be the lessee's responsibility.

Changing the subject a little bit, looking at the property acquisition.

Around this proposed master plan, how many buildings would be taken out?

That's correct, 00 really 'cause.



David Miller 3:16:50

On the airport airport buildings, is that a question about airport owned or air hangars etcetera?

Or all.



MORRIS Alexis 3:16:57

I'm assuming so. When we look at the yellow area, the yellow area is if it would be designated so that down the road.

If the state wants to purchase that property, that's what it's going to be designated at.

But when we look at the the the shaded areas.

It does look like it's going to affect a couple buildings just up to the front, just the ramps, the blue shaded for priority acquisition does not, at least on the airport side.

Does not impact any existing structures in Iraq.

Leaves them with the highway relocation. There would be some structures. Some houses impacted on the West side, but on the east side there's there's no structures impacted by this refined.

Preferred alternative now.

Looking at all this, if the master plan were to be accepted, does that mean that the road has to move immediately, or is that just in 100 years?

The goal is to get the road moved.

The master plan looks at a 20 year plan period and we part of the CIP that that we're gonna be sharing soon.

We'll look at the time frame for that project, so we will answer that Question Paper relevant, but it that could go beyond the 20 year master planning time frame.

That's it.

All depends on when it's on exactly.

It's all contingent on funding and right?

Tony, maybe just a more simple question.

How long has the airport been in AC2 category since the previous master plan?

Since about 2012. OK. And that's when the FAA moved it into this through the master planning process, moved it into the C2 category. And so compliance with C2. Standards.

Has been essentially in the air since that change in in category design group category. It was a recommendation of the last master plan to evaluate compliance with design standards and then OK, the recommended the recommendation was to obtain a modest standards which we attempted on multiple occasions and.

We're we're not PFAS.

Loaded anymore.

And just to piggyback on that.

So the 2012 when that designation was made, it's because we already had that aircraft activity level, correct?

And so this master plan.

So yes, the the design aircraft was AC2 then and this master plan has through its own analysis, looked at the traffic and determined the same C2 aircraft is the design aircraft for for this planning period and that's an existing and.

Future condition throughout and since the last master plan, it's consistently been operating operationally wise with 500 and or more greater C2D2 operations every

year since then or at least or I don't want to say every year, but but at least through our our.

Inventory in at Chapter 2 inventory it's forecast period, yes.

DM **David Miller** 3:20:20

Yeah, I you're correct, Tony.

I I think that as we talked about in the forecast, what we what we were able to document through various means is that the airport clearly is in the design Group 2 scanner category has been for many, many, many years even before the 2012 plan and the.

Combination of approach category C&D aircraft which effectively are combined because the design standards are the same.

Those numbers.

Apply to the designer are applied and then the design Group 2 numbers are applied.

So C2 is effectively representing the critical aircraft or the design aircraft.

So those standards were or that traffic was evaluated, you know prior the last 10 years or so in terms of instrument flight plan data and that kind of thing and tower of course doesn't track by aircraft type by design. But that was all detailed in the forecast which.

Which the FA did an extraordinary amount of review on and ultimately approved the forecast. So yeah.

 **MORRIS Alexis** 3:21:24

OK.

Yeah, I'm just wanting to, you know, make sure that we're on record is understanding that C2 has been there for a while as well established and through the planning and through the forecasting process has been demonstrated that that is the airport's design category, C2D.

2.

DM **David Miller** 3:21:42

See, that's correct.

Yeah, a similar point was C2.

Yes, I I think also there was a comment made earlier in reference to runway length and extension.

I just want to tie tie that back to your comment earlier and that is the the analysis that was completed in the facility requirements section of the master Plan determined that the where we end up with this 497 foot runway extension that. That length.

That ultimate 5500 foot length.

Is justified today based on the design aircraft and the category of aircraft.

So I think there's a.

Maybe a misunderstanding or a misconception that the extension is just intended to accommodate larger aircraft, and that's not really the case.

The fact is, if you extend the runway, then potentially larger aircraft could use the airport.

But that isn't the intent of the design.

It's really to accommodate the traffic that's right now.



MORRIS Alexis 3:22:38

And David, correct me if I'm wrong.

But the in the run rate length analysis that is for to capture 95% of the fleet mix at 60% of load, is that correct?



DM David Miller 3:22:50

That's yes, I believe that's the metric that we used, right.

So yeah, it's a wide swath of the fleet in that category, but it isn't the the highest level, if you will, that 100% of the fleet at a higher useful load.

It's the one that the level that the FAA supported through the analysis in the forecast.



MORRIS Alexis 3:23:12

So even.

Even the aircraft using the airport today are still operating at a reduced load even after 5000.



DM David Miller 3:23:20

Right.

Yeah, yeah.



MORRIS Alexis 3:23:24

Will be constrained in operations during certain times in certain conditions.



DM David Miller 3:23:30

And then we find that virtually every airport we work at summertime conditions, hot weather, hot day, density altitude. There are just some aircraft that need to reduce their takeoff weights.



MORRIS Alexis 3:23:35

Yep.



DM David Miller 3:23:41

Their passenger fuel loads. It's very common, so yeah.



MORRIS Alexis 3:23:42

Hmm.

OK. And I because I know Miss Johnson wanted to speak after our conversation here, but so I'm trying to reach to head on some of her, her points and so.

She mentioned, you know, this is \$180 million project over time.

That, she says, is not achievable and that it puts a cloud of uncertainty over leaseholders.

But in this scenario, there's nothing changing for the leaseholders.

Correct other than other than the.

The drain field issue that we're discussing, correct?

Yep, the drain field would be the only lease change.

Outside of some reconfiguration of of some hangers to maximize 'cause, that was the one of the main outcomes of the facility requirements.

Land site anyway, was looking at maximizing hanger storage so on on one of the aprons on odeb property.

David, if you're able to just go back a little bit north?

We are just showing a reconfiguration, but that's again just to maximize in your storage.

So we, you know, we would be looking at.

Continue working with our existing tenants on on various changes and all the again

to kinda to maybe address some of that concern or question all the yellow that's identified as future acquisition is willing selling, willing selling seller, willing buyer type of thing.

It's it's very common practice to show on a master plan.

Future acquisition doesn't mean that it you're going out in any way actively, but if. Sale becomes available then that's identified as.

Additions to the ALP additions to the airport correct, which which having it on the master plan allows us to do that with federal funds with federal funds. And it's we've had multiple requests from.

Private property owners with the fence access to have their throughout this process right?

But that doesn't change the uncertainty of the other property owners that they will can own their property as long as they choose to own their property.

Correct. So that doesn't introduce any uncertainty there.

From that perspective, OK. Thank you.

And then the other point that Miss Johnson made was that the the road realignment, the road moving the Hubbard Highway.

She asserts that this would never be funded by ODOT, but that's that's really not our issue, right?

 **David Miller** 3:26:18

Oh, sorry.

 **MORRIS Alexis** 3:26:19

Our issue is making sure that our master plan will be accepted by the FAA.

Correct, correct and.

 **David Miller** 3:26:25

Correct. Oh, I'm sorry, Tony.

 **MORRIS Alexis** 3:26:28

Oh, I was just gonna add. I mean, I think many of us that are airport sponsors have similar type of issues where roadways or other public improvements either traverse.

Runway protection zone or some other building restriction area, and the FA wants us to identify those.

The ultimate configuration for them and then to work with those other jurisdictions, whether it be city, County, state so that.

As they are developing their or developing their transportation plan long range, they can incorporate these into those. So as an example here, if there was ever a redesign or reconfiguration of Hubbard highway in this area, they are on record through the FAA. Through this process. You know what?

Configurations for these interchanges and intersections in the future would look like so that.

In this case, O dot could take that into their planning.

There might be a federal component at that time.

You would want to.

Participate or get FAA participation for to make up the difference for relocation for interchanges or those.

But that's again negotiated as part of either.

When? Excuse me, from what I understand, from when either odav moves us forward or when ODOT, the owner, owner of this roadway, moves it forward in cooperation together, you'd have that conversation correct?

Yeah. We have had conversations with ODOT and and they said that this would require further, you know, planning and adjustments to their their plans which they.



David Miller 3:27:57

Yes.



MORRIS Alexis 3:28:09

Discuss their their process for doing right.

So the other piece is the airport master plan. Once it is accepted by the FAA and then.

And then approved by the board, it then goes into a series of adoptions into other transit plans, right?

And I know the name of them for my region, but not necessarily for this region.

Yeah, for compatibility with our local comprehensive plan.

And that's what we're working on as well.

So that would be memorializing.

That, you know, this has been studied. And so when O dot goes to do their master planning and they can see that this has been a recommendation that's been made

right and the other jurisdictions in their region, 3 on the on the same master plan, I was gonna.

To say and then other regions for for whether it be county or city for their comprehensive plan.

This would get folded into as well.

Also point out for someone who lives right about.

Last four years, ODOT has been actively doing a lot of work on 551 both intersections at the airport.

Totally different since I first moved in there.

They're rebuilding the Aurora interchange.

There's a lot of activity on the traffic flow that you're looking at right here. And so and you know, I guess we should also acknowledge that yes, a master plan is a 20 year.

Planning tool. But master planning doesn't have to be limited to 20 years and so taking a look much further out, I mean just for my experience at our airport, we we looked out 50-60 years because we want to make sure what our twenty year plan is not.

Going to cause a problem out, and then whatever the 50 year mark might look like. So including this in a plan now puts us in compliance with with FAX expectation is, but then also kind of sets that framework.

Forward.

DM **David Miller** 3:30:09

I yes, I was gonna add on to that our conversations that we were party to with with some of the O dot folks last summer, I think our conclusion, our planning assumptions were based on the fact and so this was validated by some of the comments by some.

Of the O dot staff was that the their their preference would be to keep the existing right of way width for the reasons that you all mentioned.

They haven't even contemplated.

Long term, what changes to the Hubbard Highway would be needed?

In terms of number of lanes, divided lanes, signalization beyond what's already planned.

So they're just operating as a conceptual planning approach.

Let's keep our options open.

We'd like to keep the right of way as wide as it is today. Shifting it might really didn't present a technical problem for them, they stated.

But having said that, there you know questions about, you know, at the end of the day when and also.

The fact that whatever the highway design ends up being, it's it's really in the purview of O dot.

This is decision, and once that environmental and design process runs its course, the final configuration could be quite a bit different than the conceptual.

So this is as was stated, this is really just a placeholder, but there is it's a very. Long and complicated process.



MORRIS Alexis 3:31:30

OK.



David Miller 3:31:30

We need time dealing with highway right of way and property acquisition or right of way acquisition.

So that's understood.

The other point I was gonna make and it kind of ties into the earlier observation that this is a 20 year plan, but the likelihood given the complexity of these issues and the complications, is that implementation of of this master plan is likely to take.

Well, well longer than 20 years at least for complete implementation. And I think as Tim House and the FAA said, a number of times, it's a, it's a plan. You know it's a, it's a goal.

It's a target and the FAA is looking for incremental steps to work toward that.

So no one, I mean at FAA or anyone else believes it.

All this work would be completed in one single project in a brief period of time.



MORRIS Alexis 3:32:17

And.



David Miller 3:32:18

And I, yeah.



MORRIS Alexis 3:32:19

David, if I can just jump in too, I wanted to comment on one other thing that you had mentioned on the funding or the cost for the projects.

So we haven't updated or we haven't shared the the most current cost or planning level cost estimate for the overall project shown, but it will be substantially less than than the original 185 plan and.

Because we have scaled back on a lot of the the hangar.

Property acquisition.

The existing hangar property acquisition in the construction tax line, so that will have.

Yeah, I think I'm very positive impact on the overall cost that again, we look forward to sharing February 11th and and even then the FA has been very encouraging and supportive of us achieving standard because as you said they they are really pressing for areas in our region.

To.

To work on some some significant standards issues, we believe that funding this is realistic. This is feasible and.

And and so that's. That's what we what other I guess kind of.

Observation along through the process and certainly through your comments to us over the year or years approval of this plan and addressing.

These non standard issues is part of the F as I wouldn't say contingent upon continuing to fund improvements on the airport.

Not addressing these issues well, you know, addressing them in the plan and then having a follow on as to when they are actually improvements can be made. But but ignoring and not addressing these in the plan is a non starter from the FA viewpoint because then we're talking.

About access to federal funds to do anything like even maintain the runway, maintain the airport, the existing infrastructure that is there so.

Improving a master plan that has some long term.

Changes in the both on airport and the surrounding community allows it addresses them again, may take a long time to do, either through O dot or you know property acquisition takes a long time to do as well. But that also allows the more immediate intermediate and or immedi.

And intermediate things to be done.

Pavement, runway work, pavement management, the runway extension.

All the things that are key to.

Operation at the airport are contingent upon addressing these nonstandard issues

from F as perspective, and that's what I think we've heard from you quite loudly over the years.

Exactly. And one great example of that is our runway safety action team, one of the action items is for new signage.

We we have very little lighted signs on the airfield and it's nowhere near sufficient for all the connected taxiways.

And everything that we have.

That we could not find that project.

With our current funding, without a price quote, yeah.

Thank you.

 **David Miller** 3:35:31

I know you. I'm sorry.

 **MORRIS Alexis** 3:35:32

So.

So somebody by changing the western boundary of the airport, does that make that new area eligible for FAA funding?

I mean, so when it comes to the cost of road and the cost of property acquisition is, will that be possibly funded by FAA?

 **Shelley Humble** 3:35:47

And.

It's just not real.

 **MORRIS Alexis** 3:35:57

Potentially yes, because of the boundary changes.

 **David Miller** 3:36:01

What?

 **MORRIS Alexis** 3:36:04

I'm sorry, David. Did you wanna do you have a call that?

 **David Miller** 3:36:05

Oh well, I would.

Yeah, I would say the simple answer is because the changes that are being proposed are driven by the need to meet FA standards at an FAA eligible airport. Then much of that work would be eligible for FAA funding the boundary adjustment.

Essentially, what would happen is that the the Western property line of the airport would be shifted to the West.

To the essentially to the edge of the object free area.

Yeah. Then on the opposite side of the highway, there'd be an offset of additional property acquisition needed in order to maintain that right of way that Western addition on the right of way would not be owned by ODA.

That would go basically into the ODOT highway.

I think it's a trust or something essentially, so it'd be a situation where there would be a small.

Marginal expansion of the airport footprint.

But then the reconfiguration right away would not involve odev ownership.

So that's and I all of that to our understanding in talking with FA and under current funding guidance would be eligible.

It's a lot of money, so it's not an easy project, but it's it falls under the criteria for eligibility.



MORRIS Alexis 3:37:25

Thank you.



David Miller 3:37:27

One last thing, I was just gonna short a time.

Got a busy agenda, but I was just going to acknowledge couple things and there's been a lot of comments made about the feasibility of the plan or that there's never enough money or the FA will never fund it. And I I wouldn't presume to to speculate on that.

We know that it's challenging, but the FAA and their current airport design advisory circulars have built in some pretty specific guidance that they've been consistent in providing throughout this and essentially what it's saying is.

As inconvenience or impractical, impracticability does should not.

Justify doing nothing doesn't represent justification.



MORRIS Alexis 3:38:06

Mm hmm.



David Miller 3:38:09

To maintain in non non conforming situation so that they've said that consistently throughout and we've tried to maintain that.

I know that a lot of people there are a lot of other airports around the country where people will point fingers and say, well, they get they do it there. Why can't we do it here?

Here and I think the simple answer is they're not wrong and but the FA is changing and has changed its guidance to dealing with non conforming items.

And really, prioritizing that and Tony touched on the rehabilitation project or some of the other projects, the other thing the FA and this factors into the preferred alternative, the other thing the FAA has.

Has memorialized or codified in their advisory circular is they make a distinction between future?

Construction or reconstruction.

Projects versus rehabilitation projects and what the current guidance says is that the FA will not fund reconstruction or new construction at an airport that is in nonconformance.

So that specifically could affect the runway extension.



MORRIS Alexis 3:39:10

Mm hmm.



David Miller 3:39:11

As an example, rehabbing the current runway is, I think Steve mentioned or another that yeah, those are.

Those are the kinds of things that can continue to occur, but the bigger.

The bigger upgrades, if you will, are really tied to meeting standards.

So it could be a long.



MORRIS Alexis 3:39:29

Or lighting.

DM **David Miller** 3:39:31

Well, possibly lighting.

It just kind of depends if it's considered an upgrade. You know I think possibly, but I'll pull back on judging too much on that.

 **MORRIS Alexis** 3:39:45

Alright, thank you so much for all of your input.
Appreciate that.

DM **David Miller** 3:39:50

OK.

 **MORRIS Alexis** 3:39:51

Anything else I can keep moving on? Thanks so much.

DM **David Miller** 3:39:51

Well, thank you very much.

You bet.

Thank you.

 **MORRIS Alexis** 3:39:56

OK.

Thank you, Tony. And we'll move on to our Finance manager update. Chris, OK.

So let me turn my screen here.

OK.

I just have a short presentation for you.

I just want to give you an update on what the budget looks like right now as I'm going to tell you what the governor's budget is looking like and then an overview of where we are in the budget process.

So we are right here.

So the legislative session has started and we did our presentation to the Ways and Means last week.

So we went before the Subcommittee on Economic Development and Transportation.

And that went well.

And then the bills, the legislative concepts that we have put forward in the Bills, are making their way through the legislative process. And then when the session is complete at the end of June, those will all come together and that will be our legislatively adopted budget. And then?

We can start executing on that in July.

So these are the bills that are going to be part of our budget.

So Senate Bill 5504 is our budget bill.

Also, that's what we had our public hearing on last week.

Senate Bill 5507 is the capital construction bill.

And so that how that works is it's made-up of all the capital construction projects for the other state agencies as well.

And so we have our Milano runway rehab project.

Oh, I'm sorry.

No water line and hanger project and the Oak Ridge Runway rehab project in there.

Then we have House Bill 3479 and that is the commercial UAS Insurance and Senate Bill 792 is the one where we can put our fees into dual instead of statute.

So those two are ones that you approved as legislative concepts last year?

This is a summary of what we have for the governor's budget right now.

So in light blue is the lab from last union just to compare and then the dark blue is what we have right now for a budget?

So we're looking at a little over 45,000,000 and I have it broken down into program here.

So we have capital construction for airport projects. We don't have any funds in there this biennium.

So that's for general funds.

So we're not receiving any general funds this biennium, and then we have aircraft registration, pavement maintenance ASAP, which is the largest program OPS. And then general aviation entitlement.

This is just a high level overview of the revenues that we put into the governor's budget. So 47% of those are from federal funds. And then the second largest revenue source is our fuel tax, which is 38%.

And then we have 5% from the Connect Oregon grant that we bought from Oakridge, and then the rest of the revenue is coming from aircraft registration fees and then various fees at the airports.

These are the policy option packages that we put into the governor's budget. So Pop 100 is the general aviation entitlement projects. So that one is almost 8 million dollars, 90% betterly funded.

So right now we have 16 different projects planned at 10 different airports. Pop 101 is the UAS insurance.

So we've forecasted a little over \$700,000 in revenue for that.

Then we have Pop 102 is the software for the aircraft registration, airport leasing and so I presented that to you that previous board meeting and then the last two packages are ones that we didn't have in the Agency request budget because they came about in between.

Budgets. So we're able to add them to the governor's budget.

So that's the Oak Ridge project.

We did receive the \$1.7 million connect Oregon funds for that one.

And the matching funds are coming from soar.

Add on the Mulino Water line project and that one is going to be 95% federally funded.

And that's all I have.

I just went through that pretty quickly and our governor's budget, we put it on the website.

So if you get a chance, you can look at it.

There it is.

Very long, 300 pages. But if you wanted to get anything in more detail, we do have that on the website.

So do you have any questions?

All right. Very good. Thank you.

OK.

Are up to board updates, so this is the time provided for board members to share any news events related information.

Anybody have anything you'd like to share?

Some sharing mood today, OK.

And through the new terminal twice, it's incredible. It's incredible.

It is awesome, yeah.

I was only gonna add if there was nothing else we did talk about showing the new.

Oh yeah, do that and then I was gonna. I was gonna do staff direction staff but you could show the picture if you want to.

I do wanna show off.

Thanks.

OK.

So this was mentioned briefly in my my update this afternoon and Google Earth and I believe I'm just regular Google Maps.

They've updated the satellite imagery and it shows all the new markings and maintenance from our recent Surface seal projects.

So we're showing the the new stencils, the on ground text that we put to.

Vehicle and pedestrian access in the movement area.

Yeah, we changed our movement the non movementary boundary marking from a six inch wide marking to a 12 inch wide marking.

So it's much more conspicuous, and this project added the enhanced center lines for each of the connecting taxiways.

So along those lines, we.

It covered everything on the state, taxiways, taxiways and aprons.

Everything that refreshed, we included.

New Island markings that we did not have previously. This was kind of a confusing area where the non movement line went through this area which is not usable for aircraft and then similarly all the way down along the continuous access point. Again new stencil text.

The wider movement marking and the movement everybody marking and then piling in area that that was marked as an island.

Excellent. So it is, it looks great.

Perhaps that is added significantly to the reduced number of.

Bpds.

I believe so this project.

It reached full completion in early October.

Have new hangers getting this cross beam trusses put in this week cap.

Yeah. OK.

Sorry, we went to. If there's any other business that board or staff would like to bring up this point.

And other than that under agenda input, I don't know if this is the appropriate place, but do you need?

Do you need more clarified direction on what we're looking for for the core rulemaking and or legislation recommendations around?

It's just defining the core priorities a little bit more clearly and specifically around priority two and then also other considerations like the CAP number of projects for airport management.

Yeah, if you wanted to maybe send me like just summary e-mail, just to make sure that all my notes are good.

Sir, I see.

Do that on the record.

Talk about.

Your role and responsibility working in the future.

Good. Good point. Steve, when you talk about that?

Be good for that. From the board's perspective, to have a look session about.

The board's role and responsibilities in relation to a lot of input that comes to us.

For the board to resolve issues associated with staff or through the department or the position of the of the department, and I think it'd be really great for us to have both the work session help with staff, with Council to talk and then establish some those guidelines and.

Be able to refer those to individuals either when they come to us about a specific project.

Or about during public testimony.

So if we could work on that in the coming year, I think that would be helpful for us as board members and for the public as well.

Thank you.

And I think ideally you know a communication that lives on our website, but then also maybe a briefer statement that we can utilize before every public comment period.

So it's there's and restating.

Our abilities and then what staff is really responsible for?

OK.

Very good.

I think we made it through our full agenda and by golly, I think we're on time.

So thanks everybody and we'll look forward to seeing you next month's meeting.

Meeting adjourned.