

From: [D Inman](#)
To: [CityRecorder](#)
Subject: Landing Fees at the Salem Airport
Date: Monday, February 10, 2025 1:35:33 AM

Dear Council Members:

Your proposed landing fees do not sound like they will work.

I fly into KSLE frequently but am unaffected by your current proposal to the extent my airplane is under the weight threshold proposed. I am concerned, nonetheless, that your proposal will do more harm than good. I believe the plan you propose is going to push business away since there's very little in Salem that larger aircraft can't do elsewhere.

I once lived in Salem while attending Willamette University. Attending a recent meeting at the Capitol, I drove through many of the neighborhoods I remembered. I have to say that Salem is most certainly in poorer condition than it was in the 1980s. This focus on the airport looks more like trying to solve fiscal problems caused by years of mismanagement of the whole city.

If you want your airport to yield fruit, you need more commercial activity. To get commercial activity you've got to encourage it, not discourage it. For example, in the last few years the Oregon Department of Aviation Board was approached with an idea of an Uber-like service of small aircraft to supply air transport to rural areas. I thought it was a great idea. The Board, while financing the idea during "studies", took so long to decide whether or not to approve the plan the promoters of the idea abandoned it. I attended that meeting where the entrepreneurs gave up and was embarrassed just watching it. This would have helped Salem airport.

Okay, the state is not much help here, but that really doesn't free city managers from blame. You should also make sure all your hangars house active aircraft. You should ask aviation businesses what would bring them to the airport. Should they come, you charge rent, you sell more gas to their customers, people get jobs, and their families spend in the local economy. Have a plan of what could be developed on the airport. All of this boosts the value of the airport. My home base is a private strip and appears to have a comparable number of operations per day to Salem, yet it has no tower. It also makes a profit - every year - and is growing steadily. McMinnville also has more operations and no tower. If the tower is one of your expenses, you might start there. You don't need it unless you grow the number of aircraft operations.

If you grow the city and make it better than its current poor state, aircraft operations will grow. I am aware there's an attempt at airline service going now. Unless the city improves I give it no chance of success. Go to Coeur d'Alene, Idaho to Pappy Boyington Field (KCOE) - a field of similar size. It is surrounded by vibrant, tidy, industry. Businesses want to move there (if Oregon's policies aren't working, tell the people in the big marble building). The airport is, consequently, growing and looks like it's doing terrifically. Coeur d'Alene Airport supplied over 1,000 jobs in the community and reported an economic impact of over \$200 million. They have over 120,000 aircraft operations in 2021. If Salem had that kind of draw your landing fee proposal might appear useful. KCOE grew because the airport, city, and state attracted business. If they can do it, why can't you?

Sincerely,

David Inman

David M. Inman
9301 NE 83rd Ave.
Vancouver, WA 98662
Phone: (503) 764-7200
dinman2022@gmail.com

From: [Dave Wheeler](#)
To: [CityRecorder](#)
Cc: [Salem Airport](#)
Subject: Salem Airport Landing Fee Update
Date: Monday, February 10, 2025 6:24:17 AM

Ladies and Gentlemen,

It has been brought to my attention that your city council will be meeting tonight to consider and implement updates to the Salem Airport (KSLE) landing fee schedule to help return the airport to profitability.

I am very concerned about the precedent this sets once you start talking about changing the applicable gross weights to increase profit.

I am even more concerned that hiring an outside company to observe current procedures and airport traffic, then recommend further changes, will do the exact opposite of your intentions. Such a move will likely place your airport further in debt.

I would like you to consider the following proposals:

1. Landing fees only for aircraft that require a type rating, and aircraft operating on air carrier/cargo certificates. This will encompass all jet aircraft and still cover FedEx/AmFlight. I would propose exceptions for flight training and experimental/limited category aircraft.
2. Partnering with local businesses like the restaurant and B-17 Alliance for fuel specials, to bring in more business to the airport. Who doesn't like to fly for discounted fuel and lunch?
3. Doubling the current overnight fees with a negotiated fee for stays longer than a certain number of days, and waiving the fee with a minimum fuel purchase (10 gallons is industry standard for light aircraft) Put out a dropbox for payment, along with a QR code for after hours payment options. An example of a successful policy is that of the Arlington Municipal Airport (KGKY) in the Dallas area.
4. Have the FBO collect landing fees. Jet traffic generally is already using FBO services or incurring a call-out fee after hours. We already know how many times per day FedEx and AmFlight land for most of the year. If the airport is already operating at a deficit, there is no good reason to pay an outside company to come in and set up equipment, and take a cut of the fees.

We all want to see your airport succeed. I do worry both about the precedent your proposed solution sets at the airport and how it will affect the airport's reputation long term.

Thank you, and Best Regards,

Dave Wheeler
Commercial GA Pilot

From: [Gus Ali](#)
To: [CityRecorder](#)
Cc: [Salem Airport](#)
Subject: Salem Airport KSLE landing fees
Date: Sunday, February 9, 2025 8:36:54 PM

Hello, I am writing here adding my agreement for the proposed new landing fees in KSLE, however, I am also opposed expanding these fees to the experimental aircrafts that are under volunteer programs, donations, or historical restorations as it will impact the progress of such programs which all are mainly funded by donations.

The landing fees might be applied on the commercial/airliner or some FBO aircrafts where it will not affect their operations as much as the volunteer programs.

Best regards.

Gus Ali.
Based in KUAO

From: [Jim and Janice Shelton](#)
To: [CityRecorder](#)
Subject: Airport Fees
Date: Monday, February 10, 2025 1:05:50 PM

It's a common misperception that people that fly and have aircraft have a lot of excess money. Although the perception of this is not true it appears that the city looking to help fund the airport is under the same misperception. The solution is to be pro business and attract corporate aviation companies to increase the value of the airport. Please consider other options to landing fees which will merely drive users to land at an alternative airport.

Thanks

Jim Shelton

Sent from my iPhone

From: [JP McLaughlin](#)
To: [CityRecorder](#)
Subject: McNary Field landing fees
Date: Monday, February 10, 2025 2:37:14 PM

To whom it may concern.

I own 2 airplanes and a hangar at McNary field and fly for a corporate flight department based here,

so I do know a little bit about aviation.

Landing fees at Salem will do very little to assuage the deficit that the airport is running up and will

drive business away.

The number of eligible aircraft that land every year at Salem is easily calculated, and will put a very small dent in the \$660,000+ shortfall. The airport has, in the past, been close to self-supporting.

Will Avelo be subject to these fees?

The real question, of course, should be "How did the city increase the cost of operation at the airport

so much this year without any reckoning as regards financial resources to meet that cost?"

As a 'victim' of Vector Airport Systems' ADS-B-based billing, I can tell you that their data is subject

to quite a few different types of error, and it is not uncommon for our organization to get spurious

bills from them.

The geniuses who pushed for airline traffic into Salem regardless of cost should be taken to task for incurring large

increases in operating costs for the airport without a plan to provide the required revenue.

They were at best, ignorant, at worst, dishonest in their assessment of the situation.

Were they hoping, as people have hoped (fruitlessly) for decades that Salem will become a huge airline hub with multiple flights every day?

What income has Avelo produced to balance the half-million dollar increase in spending that their flights brought?

"If you build it they will come, bringing money with them."??? Yeah... Right...

J.P. McLaughlin
Chief Pilot
Colson & Colson Construction
Aircraft and hangar owner at McNary Field

From: [Kelly McDonald](#)
To: [CityRecorder](#)
Subject: airport fees
Date: Monday, February 10, 2025 2:41:45 PM

I am in opposition to the currently proposed landing fee schedule being considered for the Salem Airport.

I would be in favor of a fee schedule as follows:

1. Landing fees only for aircraft that require a type rating, and aircraft operating on air carrier/cargo certificates. This will encompass all jet aircraft and still cover FedEx/AmFlight. I will also propose exceptions for flight training (allowing our type training, for example, to continue) and experimental/limited category aircraft.
2. Partnering with local businesses like the restaurant and B-17 Alliance for fuel specials, to bring in more business to the airport. Who doesn't like to fly for discounted fuel and lunch?
3. Doubling the current overnight fees (for the Stinson, this would go from \$5 to \$10) with a negotiated fee for stays longer than a certain number of days, and waiving the fee with a minimum fuel purchase (10 gallons is industry standard for light aircraft) Put out a dropbox for payment, along with a QR code for after hours payment options.
4. Have the FBO collect landing fees. Jet traffic generally is already using FBO services or incurring a call-out fee after hours. We already know how many times per day FedEx and AmFlight land for most of the year. If the airport is already operating at a deficit, there is no good reason to pay an outside company to come in and set up equipment, and take a cut of the fees.

Thank you,

Kelly McDonald

From: [Mike Rhodes](#)
To: [CityRecorder](#); [Salem Airport](#)
Cc: [Hannah McLaughlin](#); [Lee Nielson](#)
Subject: Salem Airport Landing Fee
Date: Monday, February 10, 2025 6:44:52 AM

City of Salem,

You are facing significant financial blowback from the General Aviation community by taking this approach. GA is all you have here to pay the bills. I strongly recommend you proceed with great caution.

Using ADS/B data to issue local bills VIOLATES the FAA's purpose of advancing safety with this mandated technology. If you use it for billing purposes, SHAME ON YOU! I hope someone sues the City if you do.

Hannah McLaughlin makes excellent recommendations regarding your insistence on landing fees at KSLE with these 4 points. I completely agree with Hannah and I strongly advise you heed her wisdom.

Mike Rhodes
Pilot / aircraft owner / local resident

1. Landing fees only for aircraft that require a type rating, and aircraft operating on air carrier/cargo certificates. This will encompass all jet aircraft and still cover FedEx/AmFlight. I will also propose exceptions for flight training (allowing our type training, for example, to continue) and experimental/limited category aircraft.
2. Partnering with local businesses like the restaurant and B-17 Alliance for fuel specials, to bring in more business to the airport. Who doesn't like to fly for discounted fuel and lunch?
3. Doubling the current overnight fees (for the Stinson, this would go from \$5 to \$10) with a negotiated fee for stays longer than a certain number of days, and waiving the fee with a minimum fuel purchase (10 gallons is industry standard for light aircraft) Put out a dropbox for payment, along with a QR code for after hours payment options.
4. Have the FBO collect landing fees. Jet traffic generally is already using FBO services or incurring a call-out fee after hours. We already know how many times per day FedEx and AmFlight land for most of the year. If the airport is already operating at a deficit, there is no good reason to pay an outside company to come in and set up equipment, and take a cut of the fees.

From: [ROBB LOOP](#)
To: [CityRecorder](#)
Cc: [Salem Airport](#)
Subject: Opposing proposed landing fees and absolutely opposing use of ADS-B to collect
Date: Sunday, February 9, 2025 9:00:19 PM

Unfortunately I am traveling out of town and wish I could be present at tomorrow's council meeting to voice opposition. I trust my voice will be heard through this email.

As a pilot operating out of KSLE I am in opposition to the proposed landing fees at KSLE and vehemently opposed to using ADS-B data to aid in collection of the fees.

ADS-B was developed and implemented as a safety measure for aiding pilots to see the position of other operating aircraft. While ADS-B is not required in class Delta airspace (KSLE) it is used by nearly every aircraft flying in and out of the airport and is an important tool for pilots to see and avoid other aircraft. Using ADS-B as a tool to collect fees will absolutely encourage pilots to operate "in the dark" with ADS-B shut off simply to avoid the fees. If it happens once..... it's too much. This represents a significant safety concern for local and transiting aircraft, including Avelo airlines.

Please do not impose landing fees and if you must...I plead with you not to use ADS-B data to impose the fees! Do not put pilot's and passengers operating out of KSLE at risk.

Robb Loop
Salem, Oregon Pilot

From: [Ron Sterba](#)
To: [CityRecorder](#)
Cc: [Sterba, Ron](#)
Subject: Salem Airport Landing FEES
Date: Monday, February 10, 2025 9:15:44 AM

I'm opposed of AIRPORT LANDING FEES at Salem Willamette Valley airport.

Ronald Sterba
500. 20th st ne
Salem Oregon
Sent from my iPhone

From: [Vance](#)
To: [CityRecorder](#)
Subject: Landing fees
Date: Monday, February 10, 2025 1:14:11 PM

This is to voice objection to the proposed landing fees at the Salem airport. The proposed \$3/1000lb fee for aircraft over 7000lb gross weight is onerous enough without lowering that to 5000lb. The obvious consequence of charging people to land is that many will choose not to land. There are obviously some people with an inflated estimation of KSLE's attraction as a destination. I am a pilot based at Salem. (South hangars, N75047) I am not affected by the proposal, but as a pilot I can tell you that when you can land anywhere you want, fees are a factor in choosing.

Paying a company to set up cameras and ADS-B monitoring while the airport is operating at a deficit is unlikely to pan out fiscally if no one has accurate numbers as to traffic that falls in the range of aircraft covered by this proposal. Also, the ADS-B data is going to be challenged, as it is specifically barred from surveillance uses by the FAA.

Thank you,
Vance Dunlop

From: [Virgil Royer](#)
To: [CityRecorder](#); [Salem Airport](#)
Subject: Salem Airport landing fee opposition
Date: Monday, February 10, 2025 11:23:51 AM
Attachments: [letter to city of Salem council 2-10-25.pdf](#)

Dear City Council,

Please see attached: letter.

Sincerely,

Virgil Royer

February 10, 2025

City of Salem Council
cityrecorder@cityofsalem.net
salemairport@cityofsalem.net

Re: Salem Airport landing fee opposition

To Whom it May Concern:

Upon reviewing the email sent by Ms. Hannah McLaughlin, enclosed with this letter, I adopt and agree with her positions, suggestions and proposals in their entirety. The proposal for these landing fees is shortsighted and will do more harm than good in the long run. Please note my positions and opposition to the Salem Airport landing fee proposal to the official record along with a copy of Ms. McLaughlin's email.

Additionally, it seems odd to my self, and many others, that the City of Salem is not actively and vigorously encouraging Chemeketa Community College to offer an aviation degree program and flight school at Salem Airport. If the City would like the airport to be more profitable and beneficial to the community, having a program through Chemeketa would accomplish both. There are currently five community colleges in Oregon with aviation degree programs and why Chemeketa is not among them is perplexing.

Sincerely,

Virgil Royer

(503) 990-7672

From: Hannah McLaughlin <hannahmclaughlin13@yahoo.com>

To: cityrecorder@cityofsalem.net <cityrecorder@cityofsalem.net>; SalemAirport@cityofsalem.net <salemairport@cityofsalem.net>

Sent: Monday 27 January 2025 at 10:19:41 GMT-8

Subject: Salem Airport Landing Fee Opposition

Good afternoon,

My name is Hannah McLaughlin. I am a tenant at the Salem Airport, and am also employed by Aerometal International, Inc., a company up in Aurora that would be negatively impacted by the proposed fees.

At the special AAC meeting to propose fees back in December, it was noted that the airport operates at about a \$600,000 deficit per year. It was pointed out that federally funded airports have a requirement to be as profitable as possible, and the following proposals were discussed:

- Landing fees
- Overnight fees
- Non-aeronautical use

I will first address the landing fees. The proposed fees would be \$3/1000lb of gross weight for any aircraft over 7000lb (an increase from the proposed 5000lb) The implementation of landing fees concerns me for a number of reasons. I find it concerning that the City would pay a yet unknown amount of money to bring in a company to set up cameras and ADS-B monitoring to collect these fees, when the airport is already operating at a deficit. It also concerns me that the City would consider using ADS-B data when 1. not all aircraft are legally required to have ADS-B installed and 2. This was never the intent of the ADS-B mandate. Many pilots were opposed to the ADS-B mandate initially due to the potential of that data being used for landing fees. I would encourage the City to look at the backlash that implementing ADS-B based fees has incurred at airports like Oak Harbor and Kissimmee. The AOPA wrote a letter dated September 12, 2024 opposing the use of ADS-B data for fees, and is actively advocating for legislation prohibiting such a use.

I work on large vintage aircraft, the Douglas DC-3, and we often provide flight training and crew currency in our aircraft. Salem is a favorite airport of our instructors because of the instrument approaches, it being less busy than other local airports, and the restaurant. They also buy fuel from the FBO. The DC-3 can be operated at several different gross weights, but for simplicity's sake, let's say we are operating at 26,900lb (rounded up to 27000.) That is an additional \$81/landing. If we are doing a currency flight, we are likely doing 5-6 landings, which is \$400-500 on an airplane that already costs \$1900/hr to operate, with a bill we would not get until weeks later. We cannot justify this cost increase to our students or the owners of the aircraft we manage.

At the special AAC meeting, the members felt that they would not be losing any operators with this fee structure. I am telling you, as an employee of Aerometal, that we will not be able to bring our students to the Salem Airport if this fee structure is introduced without exceptions for things like flight training or fuel purchase. When the DC-3s purchase fuel at Salem it is usually hundreds or thousands of dollars worth of 100LL. I got my job at Aerometal based on networking I was doing when the DC-3s came in for training, which will not be a possibility for other young mechanics if the DC-3s no longer come to Salem. It saddens me that if these fees are implemented, when I go to get type rated in the DC-3, I won't be able to do training at my home airport, that I am a tenant at, as I will not be able to afford the additional cost per hour that this fee schedule would introduce.

The airport manager has also stated that for aircraft that can operate at multiple gross weights (like the DC-3) that they will initially be charged at the highest gross weight, and that the burden is on the owner to prove the aircraft is operating at a lower gross weight. While the DC-3s in Aerometal's care have letters of explanation on board for whatever gross weight they are operating at, many operators of other aircraft do not have this.

I am also concerned about the precedent this sets. When the weight increase to 7000lb was proposed, Councilor Nishioka stated that if the Council felt that 7000lb was not bringing in enough revenue, that they

would again lower the weight to 5000lb. What happens when these fees push operators out? What is stopping the City from implementing fees for lower gross weight aircraft to make up for this? How long until everyone is paying a fee, and as a result, nobody is flying to Salem? It is a slippery slope, and will be damaging to the airport long term.

It was pointed out that if there is a negative impact, that the fees can change. Respectfully, this is not how the aviation industry works. Once an airport has a reputation, it takes a long time for that reputation to change. I have spoken with several local area pilots who, if any fees are implemented, will avoid the airport on principle. The owners of our DC-3s often have other, smaller aircraft in their collections, and they too will no longer visit Salem in their other aircraft. Another sticking point is the way fees are being implemented. Aviation runs on an honor system. If I were flying my aircraft, paid the FBO fee, and then weeks later got a bill in the mail for landing fees, that would be a great way to insure that I did not land at that airport again.

I would propose the following for landing fees at the Salem Airport, if they need to be implemented:

- Any aircraft requiring a type rating. This would include all turbo-jet powered aircraft, capturing the lighter weight jets that the City is worried about missing with a higher weight limit. This would also include any aircraft with a gross weight of over 12500lb.
- Any aircraft operating as an air carrier - this would capture UPS and FedEx, as previously mentioned at the special AAC meeting.

I would propose the following exceptions:

- Flight training - this would allow companies like Aerometal to continue to bring business to the airport.
- Experimental/Limited category aircraft. This would be a very small number of aircraft, and I would propose that this exemption be considered regardless of what (if any) weight of aircraft is chosen, as operators of aircraft in these categories cannot, unless operating on a waiver, recoup any costs.

I would also propose that the City allow the FBO to collect landing fees, as opposed to bringing in an outside company. Jet aircraft are generally landing during operating hours of the FBO or are generating a Call-out for services.

Overnight fees are another thing. The City could double the current overnight fees and still be within average. I would propose that for after-hours General Aviation arrivals, a dropbox be put out for pilots to pay cash, in addition to an option to pay at the FBO. I have been to a number of airports that have honor system overnight fees, and pilots are more than happy to pay. Again, look at Oak Harbor and the backlash they're facing for how they implemented fees. Just last week, I was on field after hours and someone came up to me and asked where the dropbox for the overnight fee was, as the FBO was closed and they were leaving early the next morning. We don't have a drop box, so they weren't able to pay. Here is the perfect example of someone trying to do the right thing.

I would propose that the City double their current overnight fees, set out a dropbox for overnight payments, and waive these fees with a minimum fuel purchase - 10 gallons is industry standard for light aircraft. I would also propose that if an aircraft is staying for more than 3 nights, a long term fee structure be introduced providing a slight discount.

I believe it was Councilor Nishioka who brought up fuel flowage fees, and asked why the airport does not generate more revenue there. The answer is simple: cost. Self-serve 100LL is \$6.60/gallon at Salem. it's \$7.15 for full service. Comparatively, Twin Oaks, a short, 20 minute flight away, is \$5.50/gallon, over a dollar cheaper. Albany is \$5.99, as is Lebanon. To the south, Medford, which is a busier commercial use airport, is \$5.41 for self serve. When I fill my airplane, I'm only putting 20-25 gallons in at a time (often less) and while an additional \$20/tank sucks, but is doable, and I like to support our local FBO. But there are many tenants on the airport who are retired and on a fixed income, or who are learning to fly and can't afford the additional cost, especially when that aircraft may hold 80+ gallons. When you have tenants on your airport who are flying to other airports for fuel because it makes more sense financially, then that is a problem. I would encourage the City to look at ways to lower fuel costs as much as possible - realizing, of course, that a profit does have to be made and that costs vary by fuel load.

I would propose the following: Once a month during flying season (lets say April-October) once a month, offer a fuel discount. Propose a partnership with the restaurant for a Pilot Special, or the B-17 Alliance when they host events. Pilots are always looking for an excuse to fly, and food and cheaper gas are reasons I myself have flown. Other airports have done this successfully. During the early months of COVID, when Chehalis had exceptionally cheap AvGas, pilots flew in from hundreds of miles around for lunch and cheap fuel.

The last point brought up was non-aeronautical use. Respectfully, I disagree that this is a necessity. There is a huge need nation-wide for hangar space. We have a waitlist for the Salem airport, and a number of hangars that are already non-aeronautical use against federal guidelines. Has the City looked into putting up city-owned portable hangars (like the green T-hangars on the south end?) Many people are hesitant to build on the Salem Airport because while you own the building, you lease the land, and that puts people off of investing in the airport. City-owned hangars, however, are common, and aircraft owners are more likely to accept this risk over the risk of losing their owner-built hangar or getting priced out at the end of their lease. If the City could offer competitive hangar rates, people would move from other airports to hangar at Salem. A T-hangar at Aurora State is upwards of \$5-600/month right now, and people are desperate for more reasonably priced hangar space in the area. The City could greatly benefit in this area if this was done correctly.

I would also be interested to see where it is that the airport is losing money every year. Tenants on the airport have historically felt unrepresented with the City Council, and we would all love to see where money is being spent (and lost) on the airport.

The airport receives federal funding every year, but has the City looked into state funding? Siletz Bay airport got just over a million dollars in 2023-24, and has much less to offer in terms of services than Salem does. Should the City be applying for more state funds?

I am not against airport fees, and believe they can be very beneficial to an airport. But the fees have to be implemented in a way that doesn't upset the already fragile airport ecosystem. Salem is not a busy airport. It is not Dallas Love. There is not enough traffic that fees on smaller aircraft are going to make a big difference, and certainly not \$600k worth. Pilots are happy to pay reasonable fees. But the proposed fee structure, paying for a company to come in and set up monitoring, with late billing, does not inspire any sort of confidence in the City by airport residents. Fees need to be published, need to be reasonable, and need to be charged at the time, not weeks later.

Salem is already struggling. If you want to bring in more air traffic, you have to make the airport more appealing, and making it more expensive to land here is not going to make it more appealing. I would strongly encourage the City Council to review the above proposals, and I am happy to speak with any Councilor about any questions or concerns that either the City or local pilots have.

Thank you,
Hannah
(971) 599-8896

From: [Sara Etherington](#)
To: [CityRecorder](#); [Salem Airport](#)
Subject: Salem Airport Fees
Date: Monday, February 10, 2025 3:27:59 PM

To whom it may concern,

My name is Sara Etherington. I will be moving to this airport sometime this spring. I am writing my opposition to the proposed landing fees as they are currently written.

I am not opposed to fees when they are implemented properly, but I am concerned with how the city is choosing to go about this. If the airport is operating at a supposed deficit of \$600,000 annually, why is the city willing to pay a company to come in and use ADS-B data and cameras to enforce these fees? Surely this company will charge a monthly fee and a percentage of the collected fees? Companies like Vector Plane Pass have a poor reputation among pilots for charging fees for overflight, low approaches, and applying fees to aircraft that are exempt, in addition to customer service that is a challenge to work with when trying to reverse these charges. I know that if I landed somewhere and got a bill in the mail weeks or months later, I would not want to land at that airport again.

The Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association (AOPA) has also put out a letter noting that ADS-B data was sold to pilots as a safety feature, and was never meant to be used to enforce fees. Pilots were sold on ADS-B as with promises it wouldn't be used for fees or enforcement action. AOPA is considering legislation to limit the use of ADS-B data to its original purpose.

The original weight proposal was \$3/1000lb for any aircraft that has a gross weight of 5000lb or more. This would include several types of flight training and vintage aircraft. That weight has since been increased to 7000lb, however, it is my understanding that at the special airport advisory committee meeting in December, Councilor Nishioka expressed interest in lowering the weight back to 5000lb.

The concern that many of us have is that this sets a dangerous precedent. How long until the city realizes that pilots are avoiding the airport because of fees, and lowers the weight even further? How long until everyone who flies in is paying \$5-10 a landing? This would destroy the airport's reputation and push pilots out.

I am familiar with Aerometal International up in Aurora and flown with them several times as part of the flight crew. I understand that they greatly enjoy using Salem as a stop during their type rating training for a number of reasons such as multiple runways, instrument approaches, the tower, and the restaurant. I know they also occasionally purchase several thousand dollars worth of AvGas when Salem is a fuel stop. The proposed fees would incur a charge of \$81/landing for our DC-3s. The majority of their flights into Salem are training flights, and I don't see how they can justify an additional \$400+ an hour to students to come do pattern work here. My roommate got her job at Aerometal through networking she did when those crew members were doing training flights into Salem. Future mechanics won't have that

opportunity if these fees are implemented as they stand.

Why is National Guard is exempt from any fees? Do they pay anything for land use? Under the FAA's grant assurance policy, the government is not to be charged for airport use unless there is substantial use. Per the Airport Sponsor Assurances document, this means 5 or more based aircraft, 300 or more movements per year, and certain weight considerations. Is this an option the city has explored? All aircraft currently based at the guard have a gross weight of 12500lb or more. See the FAA's [Airport Sponsor Assurances document, Part. 27](#).

I am told that at the special AAC meeting, fuel flowage fees were brought up. Self-serve avgas is a dollar more expensive than neighboring airports like Twin Oaks. There are tenants on the airport that go get fuel elsewhere due to the high cost.

I would encourage you to implement Hannah McLaughlin's suggestions below:

1. Changing the requirements for landing fees to include only aircraft that require a type rating and aircraft on an air carrier or cargo certificate. This encompasses all jet aircraft regardless of weight, as well as FedEx and AmFlight flights. I would propose the following exceptions, regardless of what the final weight ends up being:
 2.
 1. Known training providers, allowing companies like Aerometal to continue to provide type training and still bring business to the airport.
 2. Experimental and limited category aircraft, which cannot recoup costs. This would also mean that any large warbirds the B-17 alliance brings in for fly-ins would already be exempt, as most are operating on a limited category certificate.
 3. Partnering with local businesses like the Flight Deck or the B-17 alliance to host "pilot special" events with discounted fuel to bring more business into the airport. Pilots love to fly for lunch, fly-ins, and discounted fuel, myself included.
 4. Changing the current overnight fees. Current fees could be doubled and still be within industry standard. I would suggest a waiver for a minimum fuel purchase (industry standard is 10 gallons) and a long-term fee to be negotiated for longer stays, again, with a fuel purchase waiver. There is currently no way to pay overnight fees if arriving and departing after hours (something I personally have been approached about on evenings I am at the airport late) so I would propose putting out a dropbox for cash payments and QR codes to an online payment system.
 5. Have the FBO collect fees and post a similar dropbox/QR code at the gate. Most, if not all jet aircraft are either arriving during FBO hours or are getting a Call-Out. There is no reason for the city to pay to bring in another 3rd party company with a poor reputation to get these fees, especially when these companies have such poor reputations among pilots.

I would encourage the city to consider how they want the flying public to view the airport. I know that you have heard from operators who will not fly in anymore if these fees are published. I know you have also heard from a number of local pilots

who will not fly in here on principal if ADS-B data is used to collect fees. I know you have heard from tenants on your airport who are opposed to these fees for a number of reasons.

I know we all want the airport to succeed and see it bring in revenue, but implementing policies that will only serve to push traffic away from the airport is not the way to do this.

Thank you,

Sara Etherington