



The regular meeting of the Charlottesville-Albemarle Joint Airport Commission was held Monday, December 7, 2009 at 4:00 p.m. in the 2nd floor conference room of the terminal building.

Members Present: Bill Schrader, Jeff Uphoff, Rit Venerus, James Van Liew

Members Absent: Will Dirickson, Greg Edwards, Kurt Goodwin

Others Present: Barbara Hutchinson, Executive Director; John Whitmer, Landmark Aviation; Colleen Hawkins, Landmark Aviation

Mr. Schrader called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.

1. Future Hangar Development Meeting

Mrs. Hutchinson reported the purpose of the meeting was to review alternative locations for general aviation development, with a goal of revising the Airport Layout Plan to list future development in order of priority with minimum development specifications. She stated the Airport Layout Plan does not identify an area for development of a second full service Fixed Based Operation (FBO), and that the FAA has concurred the west side is unsafe for use of a stub taxiway due to the number of potential aircraft operations. Mrs. Hutchinson noted that although CY 2010 aircraft operations would be down slightly from CY 2009, they would significantly exceed 2007 and 2008. She stated that aircraft operations neared or exceeded those of Richmond International Airport a number of months in the past 2 years.

She stated the Commission elected to focus on remaining development opportunities on the east side of the airfield as well as revisions to regulatory documents, including the Minimum Standards, Leasing Policy, Minimum Hangar Terms and Rules/Regulations. She remarked the Commission will be reviewing potential revisions to the minimum standards, rules and regulations, leasing policy and minimum hangar terms at a future meeting. She stated this does not preclude the Commission currently reviewing development priorities and developing a recommendation to forward to the Board on any proposed action, if any.

Mrs. Hutchinson presented a set of drawing of four potential sites to be considered for east side development for some type of general aviation facility. She stated the first drawing illustrates the limits of construction for future expansion of ramp, facilities and parking at the current Smith Vicars/Worrell leasehold. She noted the site is expandable to significantly enlarge the storage hangar, parking and ramp area. She commented the current lease may be allowed to expire and a request for proposal issued for a new land and facility lease; or, a request for proposal process could allow for a land lease and proposed redevelopment of the site. She noted that current lease expires

in April 2011; and, suggested any proposed redevelopment of the site could include a requirement to relocate and enlarge the airport fuel farm since the fueling rights expires with the current lease. In addition, she stated the Commission should consider the impact of an RFP process on existing tenants if redevelopment is selected since additional hangar spaces does not exist to accommodate the Smith Vicars/Worrell aircraft. She noted that Smith Vicars/Worrell did not seek a new long term lease, and that a short term lease may fit better while long term redevelopment is further considered via a Master Plan Update in order to fully analyze and review the impacts on overall airport operations. She recommended that if redevelopment is a preference, another request for proposal process be considered at the same time to provide adequate hangar space to accommodate the existing aircraft.

Mrs. Hutchinson stated redevelopment could include a number of operations allowed under the Minimum Standards. She noted consideration of impacts to terminal and parking operations would also have to be considered. She pointed out the ramp and facility expansion could preclude use of the existing overflow lot and prevent future airline/deicing ramp extensions. In addition, she concluded the last terminal expansion study included an option for future airline hold rooms to be “pods” extending from the terminal to the north to reduce the cost of construction and impacts on airline ramp operations. Mrs. Hutchinson concluded by reviewing stormwater management and utility impacts created by expanding the north general aviation facility to the limits of the leasehold.

Mrs. Hutchinson also stated UVA Pegasus is seeking larger space to accommodate the helicopter as well as one fixed wing aircraft. She noted Pegasus also desires larger living quarters for the 24 hour operation. Mr. Whitmer reported Pegasus is seeking a 10,000 square foot facility. In response to Mr. Venerus, Mr. Whitmer concluded the 8,000 s.f. Smith Vicars/Worrell hangar would most likely be sufficient for Pegasus.

Mrs. Hutchinson reviewed the second area proposed for general aviation development. She presented renderings of the space between Landmark Aviation and Pegasus, and stated that its highest and best use was for corporate aviation, noting the space could be configured for multiple hangars with support space, e.g. maintenance operation tool room, public lobby area, etc. In response to Mr. Venerus, Mr. Whitmer noted the timing for demolishing the old t-hangars is ideal because all current tenants are month-to-month and have been informed the t-hangars would likely be demolished during a five year time span. Mrs. Hutchinson reviewed the types of operations that would be ideal for the area, including aircraft maintenance, corporate hangar storage, and a future full service or specialized Fixed Base Operation (FBP). She noted the area is currently within Landmark’s leasehold which does not expire for 14 years. She stated the Authority’s legal counsel is reviewing if a request for proposal process is required to redevelop the area or if direct negotiations are required with Landmark due to the existing lease. Also in response to Mr. Venerus, Mrs. Hutchinson concurred that the 1954 Pegasus/maintenance hangar should be replaced, but noted options existed for constructing alternative hangars to maintain continuity of operations.

Mrs. Hutchinson reviewed the last rendering that illustrates adequate space for an additional 30,000 s.f. corporate hangar on the south end of the existing Landmark hangars. She noted the placement may impact ramp operations or expense of construction ramp to the meet the hangar, but stated little fill would be required to commence site work/construction. She concluded the proposed hangar is already on the Airport Layout Plan.

Mrs. Hutchinson reviewed minimum construction specifications and noted the development plan should include relocation and expansion of the fuel farm to serve as a consolidated facility in the event there is more than one full service FBO. She concluded a second fuel farm is not in the best interest of the Authority, and that the Authority may require that all full service FBOs utilize a consolidated facility, noting many airports already have such a requirement. She noted the existing above ground tank at the Smith Vicars/Worrell facility will be removed on lease expiration to comply with Minimum Standards, reminding the Commission it was permitted in a different era under much older Minimum Standards as part of a bankruptcy settlement. In response to Mr. Uphoff, Mrs. Hutchinson stated the Authority has no funds for any development at this time so fuel farm replacement would be at the expense of a successful proposer and perhaps Landmark Aviation.

In further conversation, Mr. Schrader had questions about space for additional commercial air service. Mrs. Hutchinson reviewed options depending on the need for full ticket counter and operations space, or if a prospective airline works out a deal for ground handling by an existing operator. Mrs. Hutchinson stated that staff desires to undertake an analysis of becoming the ground handler for airlines, a new revenue producing operation that many small airports are considering. She stated it is an attractive alternative for airlines who do not have to undertake setting up staff and have greater expenses than the airport. She noted the example of Charleston WV putting together ground operations for Air Tran which led to the new service. She concluded it also reduces the amount of space needed in the terminal building because of one common operator. She concluded by stating that the proposed revisions to the Airport Layout Plan are specific to general aviation, and are being proposed to the FAA due to the standing request from a private developer. She noted staff hopes the FAA will allow ALP changes without the typically required "master plan style" analysis which requires significant time and investment. She concluded an extensive update to the ALP would have to be postponed until funding became available, reminding the Commission FAA funding has been constrained since 2007 due to Congress' failure to pass a new four year Airport Improvement Program bill, and that CHO's state entitlement funding for the current fiscal year was reduced from \$1.6 million to \$395,000. She also stated several inquiries had been received regarding cargo operations and that space for a cargo facility would also need to be considered.

2. Adjourn

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:50 p.m.