



MEETING NOTES

DATE: February 21, 2008 – 5:00 – 7:00 PM

LOCATION: Port of Shelton Commission Chambers

ATTENDEES: See Attached List

MATERIALS PROVIDED: Agenda, Draft Chapter Four – Airport Facility Requirements, General Aviation Airport Security (handout attached), Facility Requirements General Overview (handout attached), and Instrument Approach Decision Heights (provided by ASP, attached)

MEETING AGENDA:

INTRODUCTIONS

PUBLIC COMMENT

SUMMARY OF AIRPORT FACILITY REQUIREMENTS CHAPTER CONTENTS

DISCUSSION OF KEY ISSUES

GENERAL COMMENTS/ CORRECTIONS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEE REVIEW

PUBLIC COMMENT

NEXT STEPS, NEXT MEETING DATE

1. INTRODUCTIONS –

Matt Rogers with Century West reviewed the Agenda for the meeting and provided an opportunity for all attendees to introduce themselves.

2. PUBLIC COMMENT –

Matt Rogers described the public comment period and opened the floor for comments. The topic of the residential housing development in the runway approach was brought up. There was concern that it was not adequately addressed in the chapter. The idea of extending the runway and relocating the threshold on the 23 end was also suggested as a possible approach to mitigate for noise over the residential area.



Sanderson Field
Airport Master Plan
PROJECT MEETING #3

Airport Facility Requirements Chapter
And Discussion of Future Development Issues

The Shelton Springs housing development was approved by the City prior to their adoption of the Airport Overlay Zones and is subsequently “grandfathered” in. However, prior to adoption the plat was reviewed by the Port, WSDOT Aviation & FAA and several changes and suggestions by these entities were incorporated into the final plat configuration and were made conditions of plat approval. For the purpose of planning the area will be viewed as an existing condition and reviewed for obstructions that penetrate the approach surface. To date, the housing has not been built or surveyed, but we will look at topo maps and estimate the elevations of the structures in the alternatives analysis. We know that we can’t change or influence what will be built on the ground, so we will look at airspace options as we develop alternatives.

3. SUMMARY OF AIRPORT FACILITY REQUIREMENTS CHAPTER CONTENTS

David Miller provided an overview of the Draft Facility Requirements Chapter. It is a dense technical chapter that serves as the foundation for planning and future development at the airport. The purposed of the Facility Requirements is to build on the information developed in the Inventory and Forecast chapters. The intent is to take the existing facilities and factor in the forecast airside and landside demands and through a methodical review of the information develop a quantifiable assessment of the needs at the airport.

The existing facilities on the airfield are reviewed for conformance with FAA standards. Figure 4-1 is a graphical depiction on non-conforming issues identified at Sanderson Field. Overall the facilities are in excellent condition and are generally overbuilt compared to the standards for the current use at the airport because it was originally constructed to Military standards.

Sanderson Field is designated by WSDOT as a Regional Airport which sets it apart from other General Aviation airports based on its size and the nature of the facilities. There are only 18 airports in Washington designated as Regional Service airports. The criteria are based on a higher level of service that can be provided. The criteria is a minimum runway length of 5,000 feet, must have a parallel taxiway, runway lighting (HIRL), precision approach or lower than $\frac{3}{4}$ mile visibility minimum, have a vertical glide slope indicator, weather reporting, sell 100LL and Jet A fuel, have maintenance service, and a full service FBO.



Sanderson Field
Airport Master Plan
PROJECT MEETING #3
Airport Facility Requirements Chapter
And Discussion of Future Development Issues

The selection of the appropriate design standards for airfield facilities is based primarily upon the characteristics of the aircraft that are expected to use the airport. The most critical characteristics are the approach speed and wingspan of the design aircraft anticipated for the airport. The design aircraft is defined as the most demanding aircraft type operating at the airport with a minimum of 500 annual itinerant operations, as described by the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) substantial use threshold. The combination of airplane design group and aircraft approach speed creates the Airport Reference Code (ARC), which is used to define applicable airfield design standards.

The 1997 ALP identified a Boeing 727 as the design aircraft although use numbers are much higher than can be explained. The FAA has tightened standards on demonstrated need and will require a justification of need to support any runway extension based on the design aircraft, if FAA funding is desired. Subsequently, through our review of actual use and number of operations at the airport the Design Aircraft has been changed. As indicated in the updated master plan forecasts, both the current and future design aircraft identified for Sanderson Field are included in Aircraft Approach Category B and Airplane Design Group II (Airport Reference Code: B-II). The current design aircraft is a business class turboprop, with the representative aircraft being a Beechcraft Super King Air 300. The future design aircraft is a small/medium business jet, with the representative aircraft being a Cessna Citation Bravo. Both design aircraft are classified as “large” general aviation airplanes based on the maximum takeoff weights above 12,500 pounds.

It was noted by an Advisory Committee member that Sanderson Field is listed as a Reconstitution Area for natural disasters and it plays an important role for emergency services. This could be used as an argument moving forward to justify keeping the runways and taxiways larger than required by the corresponding FAA design standards.

Based on the design aircraft, the runway length identified for planning purposes is 5300 feet. We have also identified a reserve up to 6800. The reserve will protect the land from other development and allow property acquisition to prepare for future runway lengthening. The 1997 Airspace Plan depicts “other-than-utility” with a precision instrument approach surface for Runway 23 and a nonprecision instrument approach surface for Runway 5. Based on the existing and planned runway utilization and instrument approach capabilities, these planning assumptions remain valid and should be applied to the updated Airport Layout Plan



Sanderson Field
Airport Master Plan
PROJECT MEETING #3
Airport Facility Requirements Chapter
And Discussion of Future Development Issues

drawings. However, the precise dimensions of the airspace defined by FAR Part 77 will be determined by the ultimate length of Runway 5/23 reflected in the preferred alternative and depicted on the updated Airport Layout Plan.

The runway configuration is similar to the 1997 ALP with the exception of the 23 end. The airspace assumed a precision approach on the 23 end and a non-precision approach on the 5 end and this is a reasonable approach moving forward. The FAA is no longer funding the installation of ILS's, so the precision approach would be either a WAAS or LAAS GPS approach (if funded by FAA) or an ILS solely at Port expense which is in the range of \$1M - \$2M.

In an e-mail follow up to the meeting John Dobbs expressed concerns that decision heights could be substantially higher for Satellite Navigation than for a conventional ground-based Instrument Landing System.

We are to a point in the planning process that the Port of Shelton (Port) could start the process to install a precision approach. The process is step by step starting with the precision approach being identified in the Master Plan. We have had sufficient coordination with the State and FAA to expect that this will be the case and the Port doesn't need to wait for the plan to be completed to get started on the next step. We discussed that if the Port wishes to pursue the WAAS system, the next step would be for the Port to send the FAA Flight Procedures Office a letter requesting a preliminary assessment of the general feasibility of a WAAS approach for Runway 5/23. The Port has subsequently initiated contact with FAA and the process will move forward to define next steps and near-term projects, such as conducting an updated airport obstruction survey. The FAA will review the feasibility based on the surveyed runway ends, known obstructions, and the topography around the airport. If it is deemed feasible the FAA will identify the need for an obstruction survey. When the survey is complete the FAA will design the approach and then it will be flight tested.

The Sanderson Field Facility Requirements General Overview handout provides a summary of the needs over the 20-year planning period and beyond. It identifies the net increase in based aircraft, the need for hangar spaces, and apron parking. In addition to the needs for the 20 year planning period, a 100% reserve is identified. The needs identified in the table will serve as the building blocks for the preliminary alternatives.



4. DISCUSSION OF KEY ISSUES (30 TO 60 MINUTES)

Types of facility requirements that may be accommodated through different facility development options:

- Runway-Taxiway System – Pavement maintenance represents the largest capital cost for airports. Many of the taxiways are wider than required per the design standards. When it comes time to overlay or reconstruct these facilities, the FAA will generally pay for the width required to meet the design standards; in some cases a cost-benefit analysis may be prepared to justify maintaining the current width compared to narrowing and relocating lighting, signs, etc. The FAA generally does not require airports to remove pavement. The airport pavements are overall in good shape.

The crosswind runway could be used for a future taxiway to support development adjacent to it. The wind coverage on the main runway was above 99% which means the FAA will not support rehabilitation for the crosswind as a runway.

- Aircraft Parking (*light aircraft tiedowns, business class aircraft parking, passenger loading & unloading area, helicopter parking*)

Figure 4-6 shows the apron layout in front of the FBO as it is today. We understand that some tenants are not happy with the current apron configuration (revised during the last project to rehabilitate the apron pavements). We will look at options in the preliminary alternatives to address concerns and optimize efficiency. One thing that is noticeably missing is drive through positions for corporate jets and larger aircraft. We also understand that there is a desire for tie-downs in front of the FBO.

- Aircraft Hangars (T-hangars, conventional hangars, commercial use hangars, etc.)

As previously discussed the existing T-hangars were built too close together to provide recommended separation per the FAA design standards. The taxilanes and gravel building pads that have been previously constructed could be modified to accommodate proper separation for new hangars. It appears that with a precision approach there may be room for 2 additional T-hangars between Hangar #87 and the runway-parallel taxiway system. We will review this and show where they could be constructed to meet standards in the alternatives evaluation. Any non-standard taxilane clearances will be noted on the Airport Layout Plan and listed in the “modification to FAA standards” table on the drawing. A modification to FAA standards requires FAA approval and is temporary (with ultimate disposition identified to eliminate the non-standard condition).

- Support Facilities (fixed base operator, fuel storage, aircraft wash rack, access roads, etc.)
- Aviation-related business and non-aviation development



Sanderson Field
Airport Master Plan
PROJECT MEETING #3
Airport Facility Requirements Chapter
And Discussion of Future Development Issues

Preliminary Discussion of Facility Development Options and Issues

Possible Sanderson Field Primary Development Areas (Landside Facilities):

- Existing Terminal Area (*area surrounding main apron and adjacent T-hangar development*) This area has been the location for the most recent hangar construction on the airport.
- Inactive Runway (*developable areas located along sides*)
- Central Airfield (*areas located along north side of Taxiway A, between inactive runway and Taxiway B*)
- West Airfield (*area located along north side of Taxiway A, adjacent to Runway 5 end, west of inactive runway*)
- Fairgrounds Complex (*south side of Runway 5/23*)

5. GENERAL COMMENTS/ CORRECTIONS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEE REVIEW

Process & timeline for review and comment on this material and upcoming sections. Due to length and technical content of the Facility Requirements Chapter, we would like to provide an additional 14 days for advisory committee review and comments. Please submit your comments **by March 7, 2008** to Patti and she will compile them and send them on to Century West.

6. PUBLIC COMMENT – No additional comments

7. NEXT STEPS - NEXT MEETING DATE SET FOR TUESDAY, MAY 13TH FROM 10:00 AM – 12:00 PM