Project Memorandum

DATE: December 13, 2010

TO: Board of County Commissioners

FROM: Alex Grossi  
Department of Airports

SUBJECT: Grants Pass and Illinois Valley Airport Master Plan/ALP

The Grants Pass Airport Master Plan and Airport Layout Plan, and the Illinois Valley Airport Layout Plan Drafts, have been reviewed by the their respective Airport Advisory Boards. The Advisory Boards held public meetings were discussion of these documents were held. All changes, corrections, additions, or omissions are included in the attachment.

As part of this process I have reviewed and approve of all the changes that have been recommended by the AAB’s. I request that the BCC review and submit any additional comments or corrections to me so all changes can be incorporated into the engineers final draft. When the final draft is completed it will be sent to the BCC, and the FAA for review and acceptance.

The primary objective of a Master Plan is to define the magnitude of change in aviation activity that can be expected over time. Given the cyclical nature of the economy, it is virtually impossible to predict with certainty, fluctuations in an airports activity and needs, especially when looking 20 years into the future. However, trends can be identified and used for long-term growth potential. Master Plans serve only as a guideline and planning must remain flexible to respond to unforeseen aviation facility needs and the economic/external conditions giving rise to those needs.

In order for improvement projects to be eligible for Federal Airport Improvement Program Grants, all projects must appear on a FAA approved ALP. The ALP is a road map of a combination of projects to be selected as needed when the need arises. Each project would then go through the public comment requirement before proceeding. The airport needs and priorities (CIP list) are evaluated and prioritized annually to assure our most current needs are available.
IV AIRPORT ALP CORRECTIONS

Page 1 - 5
- Remove the underlined paved designated parking
- Change 2009 to 2011

Page 1 - 8
- In Table 1 - A remove information that does not pertain to the IV Airport

Page 1 - 9
- Remove “the county is seeking a new operator for the restaurant.” And replace with “Smokejumper Museum”
- The last paragraph relates to low income. It should be changed to read “it does appear to be populations meeting definitions”

Page 1 - 14
- Table 1 - B update 08 09 numbers

Page 2 - 1
- B - II should change or reflect B - I small

Page 3 - 7
- Last paragraph: remove the word ‘for’

Page 3 - 12
- Change date to 2011

Page 4 - 8
- Switch Phases I & II Full west side, Phase III east stub
- Change eastern to western

Page 4 - 9
- Fourth bullet down; change east to west
- Fourth bullet down; remove the word “immediate”
- Last paragraph; Switch west & east

12/13/2010
Chapter 5, ALP sheet 2

- Please make changes as per Drawing 2 and index table

Page 6 – 2

- 2011, should add bullet; Perimeter Fence Project completed
- 2014, second bullet; after construct, add “northwest side”
- Phase II, first bullet; remove Construct, and replace with “Complete west side”
- Phase III, add bullet; Construct eastern partial-parallel taxiway stub

12/13/2010
phone line, and only to pilots flying within radio range, as the data does not currently transmit to the FAA.

Landside Facilities

**Hangars.** There are six hangar buildings at the Airport – two T-hangars (six units each) and four conventional box hangars. All hangars are privately owned and managed. Except for five small hangars outside the eastern portion of the Airport, all hangars are located on County-owned property. The Airport Director is currently drafting through-the-fence agreements with those parties whose hangar is off-airport property.

**Other Buildings.** Along the east side of the Airport, nine additional buildings exist. Eight of these buildings are part of the decommissioned smokejumper base. The airport buildings include a bunkhouse (used by the Lions Club), restrooms, mess hall (renovated as a restaurant), dispatch office (now miscellaneous storage), and the parachute loft (leased by an industrial tenant). Two airport caretaker residences are near the Airport’s entrance from US 199.

**Aviation Services.** The Airport currently hosts aviation maintenance and camping. Currently, no fuel is available for sale at the Airport nor is there any official flight training.

**Airport Access and Vehicle Parking.** Access to the Airport is via US 199, Redwood Highway. Airport Drive is along the Airport’s northern boundary and provides access to the two T-hangar units and the adjacent industrial park.

There are approximately 30 unmarked gravel automobile parking spaces at the Airport in front of and north of the restaurant building. The paved and designated parking spaces were removed to accommodate for greater safety separations from the runway (per FAA design standards). Hangar tenants typically park their vehicles in or near their hangars while flying.

Airport Support Facilities

**Emergency Services.** There are no Aircraft Rescue and Firefighting (ARFF) facilities available at the Airport. The Cave Junction Rural Fire Protection District provides emergency services. The Josephine County Sheriff’s department provides law enforcement services.

**Airport Maintenance.** Airport maintenance is provided by the County. During winter operations, the Airport has an agreement with the Oregon Department of Transportation to clear the runway, taxiways and other airport surfaces of snow.

**Airport Fencing.** The Airport has partial perimeter fencing and the County is undertaking a fencing project in 2009 to complete the perimeter fence with vehicle gates. There are no vehicle gates at the Airport’s two entrances and access is uncontrolled.

**Utilities.** Utilities available at the Airport include electricity provided by Pacific Power and Light (PP&L), water provided by individual wells and telephone provided by local franchise companies. Septic needs are met by individual septic tanks and drain field systems.
Table 1A. Zoning Designation Definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural Industrial (RI)</td>
<td>Provides areas for the development of small-scale industrial uses which are essential to a balanced economic base in the county and do not require full urban services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serpentine (S)</td>
<td>A designation for lands underlain by serpentinite or peridotite geologic units. This zone is designed to provide for the beneficial use of such lands as distinguished from other land types in the County. Residential uses are allowed in this zone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Residential 5 Acre (RR5)</td>
<td>Provides a classification for lands already committed to residential development or for lands, which have been excepted from the statewide planning goals on agriculture and forest lands. The minimum lot size is five acres.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Commercial (FC) and Woodlot Resources (WR) - both referred to as “Forest Zones”</td>
<td>These designations are intended to implement the Goals and Policies of the Josephine County Comprehensive Plan by conserving and protecting lands for forest use. As mentioned previously, the County is currently proceeding with removing the WR designation and replacing it with RI. However, as the FC zoning will remain in the most northerly portion of airport property, it will be important for the Airport to be given the authority to protect the airspace from obstacles created by any tree growth. The purpose is to conserve agricultural land most appropriate for farm use and provide uses for lands not capable of farming without creating conflicts with suburban expansion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Resource (FR)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ownership/Control of Runway Protection Zones

Runway Protection Zones (RPZs) are designated areas off runway approaches that enhance the protection of people and property on the ground and are trapezoidal in shape. RPZ dimensions are determined by the aircraft approach speed and runway approach visibility minimums. The FAA strongly encourages airport sponsors to either own or exercise land use control within the RPZs. If an airport does not own the RPZs in fee, control of obstructions to airspace can be achieved through avigation easements. The County does not control the property within the Airport’s RPZs. Small portions of each RPZ are controlled by avigation easements; however, the majority of land has no easement.

ENVIRONMENTAL INVENTORY

The purpose of this section is to summarize the environmental setting of the Airport and identify any potential environmental constraints.

Environmental constraints for airports typically fall into two general categories: human environment and natural environment. Human factors that can constrain airports include existing settlements and incompatible noise, land use, social or socioeconomic conditions, historic and
cultural resources, recreational resources, light and glare, and the general controversial nature of airports. Natural environmental elements include various aspects of air quality, water resources, fish and wildlife, hazardous materials, energy and other resource issues. **Exhibit 1G** portrays the Airport’s environmental designations.

**Human Factors**

**Noise.** The Airport currently supports about 2,900 aircraft operations (2008 FAA Terminal Area Forecast), mostly single engine aircraft. The typical threshold of concern is when the 65 DNL contour extends over noise sensitive land uses. Another threshold of significance is 90,000 annual adjusted propeller operations. The current usage of the Airport is well below this. The Airport Director reported that about 10 years ago, there were a large number of complaints regarding noise caused by ultralights; however, as the use of these aircraft has declined, the complaints have diminished substantially.

**Land Use.** The majority of the area surrounding the Airport is rural industrial. Land along Highway 199 is zoned industrial, as is the land at the northern end of the Airport, including a County-owned industrial park. The south end of the Airport abuts the Rough and Ready Creek Botanical Wayside, managed by Oregon State Parks. The Airport and the land to the east, across the highway is zoned Rural Industrial. Land to the west of the Airport is Wooded Resource, which allows very low-density homes. North of the Airport, property is zoned Serpentine, which allows residences, with special provisions associated with the soil conditions. The land to the west of the Airport is owned and managed by the US Bureau of Land Management for the botanical resources on the land.

**Social Impact and Induced Socioeconomic Issues.** Social impacts are typically related to relocation of businesses, residences or the alteration of established patterns of life (e.g. roadway changes, new facilities that divide a community, et cetera.) Any property acquisition associated with the current master planning process is not likely to result in relocation of residences or businesses.

Socioeconomic issues include the potential for the Airport to provide an economic attraction to the community, including on-airport jobs, off-airport jobs that are supported by the Airport, or some attraction that provides incentive to use the Airport. In the past, there has been a restaurant located at the Airport. The County is seeking a new operator for the restaurant. The industrial park was developed to attract businesses and provide revenue to support the Airport. The County is hopeful that as economic conditions change, tenants will develop this property. The Airport also has existing and proposed hangar space that provides rental income to the County. There appears to be additional land along the highway and adjacent to the industrial park that could be developed as hangar space.

Environmental Justice is a specific aspect of socioeconomic impact that addresses whether a facility places a disproportionate burden on a population that is otherwise subject to perceived discrimination or other burden, for example a low-income or ethnic minority community. There does not appear to be populations meeting the definition within the immediate airport vicinity.
Airport Operating Revenues & Expenses

Table 1B shows the Airport’s recent revenues and expenses. Operating expenses have consistently exceeded revenues. Discussions with the County have indicated that the Airport has never been financially self-sufficient without some form of subsidy (see interfund subsidy line item of operating revenues).

Table 1B. Airport Revenues and Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2005-06 (actual)</th>
<th>2006-07 (actual)</th>
<th>2007-08 (actual)</th>
<th>2008-09 * (actual)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operating Revenues</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants</td>
<td>$ 5,443</td>
<td>$ 68,350</td>
<td>$ 611</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charges for Services</td>
<td>$ 25,255</td>
<td>$ 22,395</td>
<td>$ 23,359</td>
<td>$ 7,912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interfund Subsidies</td>
<td>$ 37,000</td>
<td>$ 37,000</td>
<td>$ 37,000</td>
<td>$ -21,581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Earned</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity Transfer In</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>47,272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>$ (21)</td>
<td>$ 1,457</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Fund Balance</td>
<td>$ 35,225</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Operating Revenues</strong></td>
<td>$ 102,902</td>
<td>$ 129,202</td>
<td>$ 60,970</td>
<td>$ -80,760</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Operating Expenses** |                  |                  |                  |                     |
| Salaries and Wages     | $ (16,138)       | $ (16,590)       | $ (17,334)       | $ (12,443)          |
| Taxes and Benefits     | $ (7,154)        | $ (6,438)        | $ (5,853)        | $ (3,686)           |
| Materials and Services | $ (64,230)       | $ (18,856)       | $ (18,480)       | $ (22,291)          |
| Interfund Charges and Transfer | $ -       | -                | -                | 48,887              |
| Capital Outlay         | $ (441)          | $ (70,124)       | $ (1,422)        | $ (12,424)          |
| Contingency            | -                | -                | -                | $ -                 |
| **Total Operating Expenses** | $ (87,963)   | $ (112,008)      | $ (43,090)       | $ (99,731)          |

**Operating Income** | $ 14,939         | $ 17,194         | $ 17,880         | $ (18,971)          |

Source: Josephine County, February 2009.

* Partial data for 2008-09 (1/1/2008 through 3/31/2009)

Rates & Charges

The County has the authority to update the rates and fees annually, as outlined in the Josephine County Airports Rates and Charges Policy. The current rates, as of September 2007, are shown in Table 1C.
Chapter Two
AERONAUTICAL ACTIVITY FORECAST  Illinois Valley Airport

Aviation demand forecasts help to determine the size and timing of needed airport improvements. This chapter indicates the types and levels of aviation activity expected at the Illinois Valley Airport (Airport) during a 20-year forecast period. Projections of aviation activity for the Airport were prepared for the near-term (2014), mid-term (2019) and long-term (2029) timeframes. These projections are generally unconstrained and assume the Josephine County Department of Airports (County) will be able to develop the various facilities necessary to accommodate based aircraft and future operations. The methodology followed is from *Forecasting Aviation Activity by Airport* (GRA, Incorporated, 2001, July), which is the Federal Aviation Administration’s (FAA) recommended guidance for airport forecasting.

The primary objective of a forecasting effort is to define the magnitude of change in aviation activity that can be expected over time. Because of the cyclical nature of the economy, it is virtually impossible to predict with certainty year-to-year fluctuations in activity, especially when looking 20 years into the future. However, trends can be identified and used to study long-term growth potential. While a single line is often used to express the anticipated growth, it is important to remember that actual growth may fluctuate above and below this line. Forecasts serve only as guidelines and planning must remain flexible to respond to unforeseen aviation facility needs and the economic/external conditions giving rise to those needs.

The Airport will likely continue to serve the type of aircraft it has historically served—small (maximum gross takeoff weight of 12,500 pounds), single engine piston aircraft. The current Airport Reference Code for the Airport is B-I, as reported the from the last Airport Layout Plan
instrument approaches with visibility minimums lower than one mile.

Similar to runway width, taxiway width is determined by the ADG of the most demanding aircraft to use the taxiway. ADG I recommendation for taxiway width is 25 feet.

Runway centerline to parallel taxiway centerline separation distance is another important criterion to examine. The recommended distance is based on satisfying the requirement that no part of an aircraft on a taxiway or taxilane centerline is within the runway safety area or penetrates the runway OFZ. For the Airport, the recommended separations is 150 feet for ADG I visual runways and 200 feet for ADG I runways with lower than ¾ mile visibility minimums.

There are three connector taxiways between the runway and aircraft parking and storage. Connectors to the runway ends will be required if a parallel taxiway is built. More taxiway connectors may be required in the future to provide access to new hangar and apron development.

Airport Visual Aids

Airports commonly include a variety of visual aids, such as pavement markings and signage to assist pilots using the airport.

Pavement Markings. Runway markings are designed according to the type of instrument approach available on the runway. FAA Advisory Circular 150/5340-1J, Standards for Airport Markings, provides the guidance for airport markings. Basic (visual) markings are currently in place on Runway 18/36. If a nonprecision approach were to be implemented, the runway markings would need to be upgraded to nonprecision markings.

There are hold markings on all taxilanes adjoining the runway. The purpose of hold markings is to ensure that aircraft waiting for arriving or departing aircraft to clear the runway are not in the RSA. Existing hold lines at the Airport are adequate if the Airport only has a visual or nonprecision approach. If a precision approach were pursued, the separation would need to increase by 50 feet to 175 feet.

Airfield Signage. The Airport currently has hold signs on taxilanes adjoining the runway. The existing signage is adequate for the existing airfield layout. Future additional taxiways and aprons will require additional signs.

Airport Lighting

Beacon. The Airport’s rotating beacon is adequate for the planning period.

Visual Glide Slope Indicators. As discussed in Chapter One, the Airport has two-box VASIs on both runway ends. The VASI system for 18 out of service indefinitely, as they need to be relocated to meet FAA siting criteria. It is recommended that the County relocate the VASI system.
• Emergency Services
• Airport Maintenance
• Airport Fencing
• Utilities
• Storm Drainage
• Aviation Fueling Facilities

Emergency Services

There are no Aircraft Rescue and Firefighting (ARFF) facilities available at the Airport, nor does FAA require them. The Cave Junction Rural Fire Protection District provides emergency services. The Josephine County Sherriff’s department provides law enforcement services.

Airport Maintenance

Airport maintenance is adequately provided by the County with equipment stored off-airport. No changes are recommended.

Airport Fencing

The County is undertaking a fencing project in 2009 to complete the perimeter fence, with vehicle gates. This fencing should be adequate throughout the planning period.

Utilities

Utilities available at the Airport include electricity, water, telephone and septic. Extensions of electricity, water and telephone to future facilities will be required, as needed. New septic systems will be required for buildings with sanitary facilities.

Storm Drainage

The need for additional hangars and taxiways has been identified. These facilities will increase the Airport’s existing impervious surfaces. These additional surfaces must be evaluated to ensure that the requirements of the 1200-Z\textsuperscript{1} stormwater discharge permit are met. Because a specific layout for future development has not been defined yet, the exact amount of increased impervious surface is to be determined. The alternatives analysis will provide additional details regarding stormwater impacts of each alternative. The analysis will also include Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) requirements, water treatment and detention.

\textsuperscript{1} Water Act mandates jurisdictional control of the quality of stormwater runoff. This mandated in the Code of Federal Regulation part 122.26. The Airport may fall under the scope of these may need to apply for a National Pollution Discharge Elimination Permit (NPDES) for the discharge surface water system. In Oregon, this is typically referred to as a 1200-Z General Permit.
In general, this alternative appears to have few impacts, primarily associated with tree removal and new development near the Smokejumper Base (listed on the National Register of Historic Places). The alternative would not significantly change the existing noise footprint. It would allow the County to continue to market the industrial park area for non-airport uses, as well as those desiring an airport location. This alternative has the least environmental impact of the two build alternatives.

Development Alternative 2

This alternative places the helicopter area at the mid-north end of the airport. T-hangar and conventional hangar reserves, and future FBO space are located near the County’s industrial park area. Future conventional hangar reserve and airport-related business areas are on both sides of the runway, at the northern end of the airport.

This alternative also includes obtaining easements or ownership of the Runway Protection Zone (RPZ) on both runway ends. The southeast end is in Oregon State Parks and US Bureau of Land Management ownership, which could require additional consultation under Section 4(f). There is no feasible and prudent alternative for the location of the RPZ and the need for the airport to control the RPZ.

This alternative has more area designated for reserve use than in Alternative 1. Ultimate development of the reserve lands could increase impervious surface significantly, and therefore increase stormwater runoff and risk for water quality issues.

This alternative would likely have less impact on the Smokejumper Base Historic District, as only tree removal would occur.

This build alternative is slightly greater in terms of overall environmental impact of the two alternatives.

MASTER PLAN CONCEPT (PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE)

The two development alternatives and No-Build were presented to the County, Planning Advisory Committee (PAC), and members of the public on January 25, 2010. Based on comments made at that meeting, the County selected a Preferred Alternative (see Exhibit 4D). The Preferred Alternative, or Master Plan Concept, is based on various components of each of the alternatives presented in this chapter, as well as a few additional components not previously depicted. The Preferred Alternative is the basis for the Airport Layout Plan in Chapter 5. The proposed Preferred Alternative is summarized below.

Airfield. **Swit ton PHASES I+II FULL WESTSIDE, PHASE III EAST STUB**

- Phased development of an eastern partial-parallel taxiway stub (Phase I) and a full-parallel taxiway west of the runway (Phases II and III).
- The helicopter operations area remains in its current location.
- Control and protection of runway protection zone by acquisition or easement.
Landside.

- New access from Highway 199.
- Increased vehicle parking for airport users and tourists, with access to the airport re-routed to avoid conflicts between airport and non-airport users.
- Grass tiedown area south of the aircraft parking apron.
- FBO location on the east side of the Airport for immediate development, if demand increases an FBO reserve west of the runway has been identified.
- Reserves for T-hangars, conventional hangars, and aviation-related businesses.
- Self-service card-lock fueling system, with interim and ultimate locations identified.
- Reserves on the western portion of the Airport for future airport and commercial/industrial development.
- Pedestrian path on the east side for people to access the Botanical Wayside.

The above-described Preferred Alternative mirrors the PAC’s unanimous recommendations. The intent of the layout is to allow phases of development to occur, as demand dictates. Initial growth would be on the east side of the Airport, as utilities and access is readily available. Development west of the runway would occur in the long-term, with the taxiways phased in appropriately.
## Buildings and Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Type of Facility</th>
<th>Estimated Top Elevation (feet-AGL)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>T-Hangar</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>T-Hangar (ultimate)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Conventional Hangar (ultimate)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Conventional Hangar</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Airport Building</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Airport Building</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Conventional Hangar</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Pump House</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Smokejumper Building</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Smokejumper Building</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Smokejumper Building</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Smokejumper Building</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td><strong>REMOVE, NO BUILDING</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Smokejumper Building</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Smokejumper Building</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Airport Building</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td><strong>AIRPORT BUILDING REMOVED</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Conventional Hangar</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Conventional Hangar</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>**REMOVE &amp; REPLACE W/ 214-22</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Conventional Hangar</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Conventional Hangar</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Source: WHPacific, Inc

### NOTES:

1. SISKIYOU SMOKE LISTING ON THE PLACES.

### APPROVAL

**JOSEPHINE COUNTY**

Signature
Title FEDERAL AVIATION
Signature
Title Approval letter
Chapter Six
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

Through the evaluation of the facility requirements, identification of the Airport Layout Plan Concept, and the development of the Airport Layout Plan, the improvements needed at the Illinois Valley Airport over the next 20-year period have been determined. The Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) provides the basis for planning the funding of these improvements.

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS

The CIP develops both the timeline for airport improvements and estimated costs for those improvements. The plan is divided into three phases: Phase I (2011-2016), Phase II (2017-2021), and Phase III (2022-2031).

The anticipated plan for the Airport follows. As many of these projects are demand-based (i.e., hangar construction) the actual timing of construction is estimated. Funding for these projects has not yet been committed and the actual costs may vary depending upon final construction costs. The date of implementation may also vary due to funding availability.

Phase I (2011-2015)

Since Phase I represents the near-term future, which is more certain than the long-term future, Phase I development projects are identified by individual year, rather than a multi-year period. Projects in this phase include:
2011 - Perimeter Fence Project Completed
- Pavement Maintenance Program (PMP)
- Install of Medium Intensity Runway Lights (MIRLs), Runway End Identifier Lights (REILs) and Precision Approach Path Indicators (PAPIs), and relocate Rotating Beacon
- Installation of a temporary (interim) self-service card-lock fueling system

2012
- Tiedown apron reconstruction
- Construction of two conventional hangars and associated taxilanes

2013
- Overlay Runway 18/36

2014
- PMP
- Construct partial-parallel taxiway (Phase I)

2015
- Acquisition of the Runway 18 Runway Protection Zone (RPZ)
- Acquire avigation easement for the Runway 36 RPZ
- Construction of one row (six units) of T-hangars and associated taxilanes

Phase II (2016-2020)

Phase II projects include:
- Construct partial-parallel taxiway (Phase II)
- Develop grass tiedown area
- Install nonprecision circling approach with minimums not lower than 1 mile
- Expansion of the vehicle parking area and access road realignment
- PMP (2017 and 2020)

Phase III (2021-2030)

Phase III is the last ten years of the planning period. Projects falling within this timeframe include:
- Update Airport Layout Plan
- Install self-service card-lock fueling system at ultimate location
- PMP (2023, 2026, and 2029)

PROJECT COSTS

A list of improvements and costs over the next 20 years are included in Table 6A. All costs are estimated in 2009 dollars. Total project costs include construction, temporary flagging and
signing, construction staking, testing, engineering, administration, and contingency, as applicable. Power utilities are included in all new hangar projects. No water service cost was added for the hangar developments. For hangar development, site preparation and taxilane access is assumed to be funded by the County, while private individuals would fund actual hangar construction. Private development costs, such as the costs associated with aviation-related business and aviation compatible commercial/industrial development, were not prepared as they can vary greatly and do not have a financial impact to the County.

FUNDING SOURCES

The Airport is part of the National Plan of Integrated Airport Systems (NPIAS), and is eligible to receive federal Airport Improvement Program (AIP) funding. Currently, small general aviation airports, like Illinois Valley, receive $150,000 in annual entitlements from the AIP and are eligible for discretionary AIP funding and state apportionment grants. Therefore, the majority of funding for airport improvement projects is likely to come from the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA). For projects eligible for FAA AIP funding, the FAA may fund up to 95% of the total project cost. The airport owner must contribute the remaining amount. AIP funding is available for most capital projects, but at this time it is difficult to receive funding for revenue-producing items such as hangars, since airside needs must be met first.

The Airport is designated as a Category IV airport by the State of Oregon. As such, the Airport is eligible for the State-sponsored Financial Aid to Municipalities (FAM) discretionary grant and Pavement Maintenance Program (PMP). Under current legislation, FAM Grants are to be awarded annually for an amount not-to-exceed $25,000 for projects including planning, development and capital improvement. However, the grant program is on hold until a time when the State can reinstitute the program. The PMP consists of annual funds of up to $1,000,000 dedicated to preserving and maintaining pavements at eligible Oregon airports.

The State of Oregon currently has a grant program, ConnectOregon, which is on its third year of funding. The ConnectOregon initiative was developed to fund non-highway multi-modal transportation projects. If the ConnectOregon program continues, certain airport-related projects may be eligible for application. Currently, there are two grant types available: one that matches up to 80% of a project and another that matches the 5% local amount needed for FAA AIP projects.

Other funding may come directly from the County or other sources, such as economic development agencies or private entities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
<th>Airport Owner (5%)</th>
<th>FAA* (95%)</th>
<th>ODA* (95%)</th>
<th>Private</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase I (2011-2016)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavement Maintenance Program (PMP)</td>
<td>124,000</td>
<td>6,200</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>117,800</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Install MIWL, REIL, PAPI &amp; Relocate Rotating Beacon</td>
<td>550,000</td>
<td>27,500</td>
<td>522,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-service card-lock fueling system (interim)</td>
<td>39,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>39,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiedown Apron Reconstruction</td>
<td>644,000</td>
<td>32,200</td>
<td>611,800</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conventional hangars &amp; associated taxilanes (two)</td>
<td>345,440</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>345,440</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runway 18/36 Overlay</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>1,900,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMP</td>
<td>124,000</td>
<td>6,200</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>117,800</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct partial-parallel taxiway (Phase I)</td>
<td>1,007,000</td>
<td>50,350</td>
<td>956,650</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition of R18 RPZ</td>
<td>174,000</td>
<td>8,700</td>
<td>165,300</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aviation Easement for R36 RPZ</td>
<td>39,000</td>
<td>1,950</td>
<td>37,050</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-hangars &amp; associated taxilanes (one row, six units)</td>
<td>352,000</td>
<td>100,400</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>251,600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Phase I</strong></td>
<td>$ 5,398,440</td>
<td>$ 333,500</td>
<td>$ 4,193,300</td>
<td>$ 235,600</td>
<td>$ 636,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase II (2016-2020)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct partial-parallel taxiway (Phase II)</td>
<td>1,007,000</td>
<td>50,350</td>
<td>956,650</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grass tiedown area</td>
<td>41,000</td>
<td>2,050</td>
<td>38,950</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrument Approach Survey</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>47,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Parking Expansion &amp; Access Road Realign.</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>190,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMP (2017)</td>
<td>124,000</td>
<td>6,200</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>117,800</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMP (2020)</td>
<td>238,000</td>
<td>11,900</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>226,100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Phase II</strong></td>
<td>$ 1,660,000</td>
<td>$ 83,000</td>
<td>$ 1,233,100</td>
<td>$ 343,900</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase III (2021-2030)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update Airport Layout Plan</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>142,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-service card-lock fueling system (ultimate)</td>
<td>476,000</td>
<td>476,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMP (2023)</td>
<td>124,000</td>
<td>6,200</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>117,800</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMP (2026)</td>
<td>124,000</td>
<td>6,200</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>117,800</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMP (2029)</td>
<td>238,000</td>
<td>11,900</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>226,100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Phase III</strong></td>
<td>$ 1,112,000</td>
<td>$ 507,800</td>
<td>$ 142,500</td>
<td>$ 461,700</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cumulative Total</strong></td>
<td>$ 8,170,440</td>
<td>$ 924,300</td>
<td>$ 5,568,900</td>
<td>$ 1,041,200</td>
<td>$ 636,040</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Eligibility for FAA or ODA funding does not insure that funds will be available or granted for the project.*
Have copied Keith for his inputs / approval as well.
Alex, Thanks for your working with the AAB and county citizens whom have been giving inputs on the ALP, and once these inputs are incorporated in the final ALP for BCC and FAA submittal, it will become as per Roger's Brandt's quote in an IV News article recently, as the best ALP with the most community input, or words to that effect....
Thanks & Regards, Gary

From: jocoair@vsisp.net
To: gary_moseley@hotmail.com
Subject: IV Board Recommendations
Date: Tue, 7 Dec 2010 14:52:33 -0800

Hi Gary,

Sorry I was unable to attend the AAB meeting on Nov. 29th, I didn’t want to get everyone sick.

If you would be so kind as to send me the Boards recommended changes or corrections for the last two chapters of the ALP. I am hoping to get all the corrections to the BCC this week for their input, and then on to the engineers.

Thank you,

Alex Grossi,
Airports Director
Josephine County Dept. of Airports
1441 Brookside Blvd.
Grants Pass, OR 97526
Phone: 541-955-4535
Fax: 541-479-8894
jocoair@vsisp.net

12/13/2010