

**Airport Master Plan
Planning Advisory Committee #2
Wednesday, June 12, 2019 | 1:00 P.M.
Port of Skagit Offices
15400 Airport Drive
Burlington, WA 98233**

Welcome

Heather Rogerson (Planning and Environmental Manager – Port of Skagit) welcomed the members of the planning advisory committee (PAC). Heather set the stage by reviewing what has been accomplished to date. Heather indicated that the FAA is still reviewing the forecasts. PAC members present introduced themselves.

Presentation

Patrick Taylor (Project Manager – Coffman Associates) began by reviewing the master plan process. This meeting is the third of four planned meetings. Items to be covered today are the Facility Requirements and the Alternatives draft chapters. A review of the public involvement plan was presented with a reminder that the second public information workshop will be from 4:30-6:30 this evening (6.12.19).

Inventory and Forecast Review

Patrick Taylor briefly reviewed the inventory and forecasts presented at the last PAC meeting. The FAA is still reviewing the critical aircraft component of the forecasts and has asked for additional documentation of the C-II and larger aircraft using the airport. Patrick indicated that the Port may need to produce the photographic evidence of jet activity at the airport as collected during the Aircraft Operations Study (2013-2016).

Facility Requirements

Patrick Taylor presented highlights from the draft Facility Requirements chapter, examining airside (runways and taxiways) and landside (hangars, ramps, and support facilities) facility needs.

Runway design standards were presented. The design standards for each runway is a function of the critical aircraft using the runway. As presented in the Forecasts chapter, Runway 11-29 should be designed to C-II standards, while Runway 4-22 should be designed to A/B-I standards. The following are the non-standard geometries that currently exist:

- Angled threshold taxiways (A and C) to Runway 11;
- RSA windsock penetration near Runway 11 end;
- ROFA penetration by windsock, segmented circle, vault at midfield;
- ROFA penetration by windsock near Runway 29 end;
- Lead-in taxiway to Runway 4; and
- Several taxilane OFA areas do not meet standard.

There was some discussion about the separation distance between Runway 4-22 and Taxiway B. Patrick noted that, according to FAA guidance, the A/B-I are the minimum design standards for Runway 4-22 because the crosswind coverage for Runway 11-29 determines the design standards for Runway 4-22. Since Runway 11-29 provides greater than 95 percent crosswind coverage at 10.5 knots, Runway 4-22 only needs to meet A/B-I standards. The A/B-I separation standard is 150 feet, which exists today. The previous master plan and airport layout plan considered B-II standards for Runway 4-22 (240' runway/taxiway separation standard). It is the option of an airport sponsor to exceed design standards; however, exceeding design standards adds additional maintenance and rehabilitation costs that are a local responsibility (assumes FAA eligibility of the runway).

Runway eligibility was presented. It was noted that Runway 11-29 exceeds the minimum wind coverage threshold, thus making Runway 4-22 ineligible for FAA maintenance and rehabilitation funding. This has been a known situation for several years, thus any maintenance and upkeep for Runway 4-22 is a local financial responsibility. A PAC member asked if Runway 4-22 could be eligible. Patrick indicated that it could if the FAA were to make a specific determination that the runway is eligible as a secondary runway. Factors that could be considered by the FAA include:

- Runway 4-22's proximity to most of the general aviation development that would be able to use the runway.
- The fact that Runway 4-22 accounts for 17 percent of total operations, or approximately 5,000 annually.
- The fact that small general aviation aircraft do benefit from the presence of the runway when there is a crosswind to the primary runway (however, it was noted that this factor is a matter of convenience to pilots and is not supported by the wind data or the technical analysis which follows FAA guidance).
- Back-up runway capability for times Runway 11-29 is having maintenance. (Note that this reason is not supported by FAA guidelines).

A PAC member who is a Port Commissioner suggested that staff consider requesting an official determination by the FAA of the eligibility of Runway 4-22. Patrick indicated that the first step is to write a letter to the FAA ADO asking for Runway 4-22 to be declared eligible and listing the reasons why.

Runway length was the next topic presented. Following FAA guidelines in FAA AC 150/5325-4B, *Runway Length Requirements for Airport Design*, it was determined that the optimal length for Runway 4-22 is 2,900 feet. At 3,000 feet, this runway meets the recommended length requirements. The optimal length for Runway 11-29 is 5,500 feet based on the current fleet mix operating at the airport (100% of business jets at 60% useful load). At 5,478 feet in length, the runway nearly meets this recommended length.

The future critical aircraft is the Gulfstream IV (one of which is currently based at the airport), which has a runway length requirement of 6,300 feet. One hundred percent (100%) of business jets at 90% useful load require a runway length of 7,600 feet. Finally, the flight planning manuals for several business jet types that currently operate at the airport were consulted and a runway length of approximately 7,000

feet would accommodate these aircraft. Any of these runway lengths will require documentation of 500 annual operations by aircraft that need the length.

On the landside, calculations indicate an immediate need for an additional 100,000 square feet of new hangar space and a long-term need for a total of 350,000 square feet of hangar space (which is double what is available today). Additional aircraft parking apron is needed. Additional Jet A fuel capacity is also needed.

Alternatives

Patrick Taylor presented the development alternatives. The alternatives are broad concepts for airside and landside development over the next 20 years. Various segments of the airport were examined individually and then two overall airport development concepts were presented. Patrick noted that in the next phase, a single recommended concept would be put forth and it will likely include elements from each of the alternatives presented.

Airside concepts presented included the following:

- Surface road access to the “triangle area” between the runways, which would require crossing and closing a portion of Taxiway C.
- Extension of Runway 11-29 to 7,000’ and 7,600’, with the understanding that any extension would have to be justified by 500 annual operations.
- Examination of the runway protection zone impacts when extending the runway. 7,000 feet is much more feasible than 7,600 feet, which would require relocating Farm-to-Market and Josh Wilson roads.
- Examination of the feasibility of extending the Runway 29 end, which is not feasible because the airport entrance road would have to be re-routed or tunneled at great expense.
- Consideration of reconstructing Taxiway A at the standard separation distance of 400 feet or maintaining it at 500 feet.
- Consideration of a parallel taxiway on the west side of Runway 11-29.
- Maintaining or phasing-out Runway 4-22.

Landside concepts include:

- Build-out of property adjacent to Runway 4-22 (whether the runway remains operational or is phased-out).
- Build-out of Lot 72 (south of Corporate Jet Center) using preliminary concepts from possible developer.
- Redevelopment of Hangars A-E, which were damaged in a wind event and are at the end of their useful life.
- Maintaining or redeveloping existing Runway 11-29 flight line facilities around the administration building.
- Extending Runway 11-29 flight line development to the north into undeveloped and forested areas to maximize development of the flight line.
- Initial conventional hangar and apron development in the “triangle area.”
- Possible development along Taxiway C.

Wrap Up

Discussion on various alternatives ensued during the presentation. Most initial comments and suggestions from the PAC were considered then. Patrick wrapped up the meeting by reminding everyone of the public information workshop that evening. Patrick indicated that in 3-4 months, the team would be back for a final meeting to present the recommended concept and the capital improvement program.