



VISTA FIELD ADVISORY BOARD MEETING

PORT OF KENNEWICK

FEBRUARY 2, 2011 MINUTES

CALL TO ORDER

Board Chairman Skip Novakovich called the meeting to order at 3:37 p.m. in the Port of Kennewick Commission Chambers located at 350 Clover Island Drive, Suite 200, Kennewick, Washington 99336.

The following were present:

Board Members: Skip Novakovich, Port Commissioner, Chairman
Carl Adrian, Tri-City Development Council
Carl Cadwell, Airport User Representative
Kathy Blasdel, Kennewick Public Facilities District
Kris Watkins, Tri-Cities Visitor and Convention Bureau
Chuck Freeman, Kennewick Irrigation District (KID)
Don Britain, City of Kennewick Councilmember
Mark Kushner, Benton Franklin Council of Governments

Port Staff Members: Tim Arntzen, Executive Director
Larry Peterson, Director of Planning & Economic Development
Tammy Fine, Director of Finance/Auditor
Bridgette Scott, Secretary/Special Projects

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Don Britain led the Pledge of Allegiance.

PUBLIC COMMENT

No public comments were made.

APPROVAL OF OCTOBER 20, 2010 MINUTES

Mr. Novakovich asked the Vista Field Advisory Board (VFAB) for any revisions or corrections of the minutes.

Ms. Blasdel commented on page 4, second paragraph, the draft minutes should not include "and Public Facilities District". Ms. Blasdel wants to make certain the purpose for local funding options for public facilities districts, according to the RCW's, is understood. The RCW's states "Moneys received from any tax imposed under the authority of this section shall be used for the purpose of providing funds for the costs associated with the financing, design, acquisition, construction, equipping, operating, maintaining, remodeling, repairing, and reequipping of its public facilities."

Ms. Blasdel asked for clarification of Dr. Cadwell's investment plans at Vista Field. Dr. Cadwell stated he would make sure there is at least ten million dollars worth of development at Vista Field, including improvements made at Cadwell Laboratories. Dr. Cadwell stated all of the funds may not come from Cadwell Laboratories, as there are other people who want to develop at Vista Field. However, if necessary, he will do all the investing himself.

Mr. Novakovich commented that the public donations and investments will be tracked and reported to the Commission. The minutes were approved as corrected by consensus.



VISTA FIELD ADVISORY BOARD MEETING

PORT OF KENNEWICK

FEBRUARY 2, 2011 MINUTES

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Mr. Novakovich welcomed the public and the Board.

It was noted that the Tri-Cities Visitor Guide includes Vista Field on the map and in the guide.

Mr. Novakovich received an email from the FAA on February 1, 2011 stating that it does not look good for Vista Field to be included in NPIAS funding.

Mr. Novakovich stated the Design Standards have been revised using the concerns and recommendations from the VFAB.

Mr. Novakovich stated when the Port Commissioners made the commitment to keep the airport open; the comment was that the Port of Kennewick would invest \$1 million over a ten year period. The Financing section of the Master Plan now states, if the Plan is approved, that the Port will contribute \$1.7 million over the next 10 years. The Master Plan will be presented to the Port Commission on February 8, 2011 for a final decision.

Mr. Kushner asked if the NPIAS funding was denied due to the two other airports being within 30 miles. Mr. Novakovich confirmed and stated the FAA does not see a compelling Federal interest in the airport.

MASTER PLAN FINAL DRAFT REVIEW

Mr. Spencer Montgomery of JUB Engineers, Inc. stated the objective of the meeting is to review the draft Vista Field Master Plan, discuss any questions and prepare recommendations to be made to the Port Commission. Mr. Montgomery briefly reviewed Chapters 1-6.

Mr. Montgomery introduced Eric Johnson from Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT).

Chapter 7, Financial Plan

In the process of preparing the Financial Plan, JUB looked at the different funding sources and the different projects. JUB broke down the concepts the VFAB put together and identified which projects would be Port projects and which projects would be done by the private sector. The improvements needed to develop the Airport Layout Plan over the next 20 years have been determined.

Mr. Novakovich commented that one of the limitations of funding is the amount of money the Commissioners said they would spend at the airport. The construction of a FBO building does not fit into the Port's commitments.

Mr. Kushner asked about the feasibility of selling some of the land adjacent to the airport and using the funds for airport development. Mr. Novakovich replied the Commissioners would have to agree to sell the property.

Mr. Arntzen commented that to this point, Port staff has tried not to influence the substance of the debate. We have been involved in the procedural issues. He thought he would be asked to review



VISTA FIELD ADVISORY BOARD MEETING

PORT OF KENNEWICK

FEBRUARY 2, 2011 MINUTES

the Capital Improvement Plan from the staff perspective of what could likely be funded. He has not taken a detailed look at how to fund the projects because we are still in flux.

Mr. Montgomery stated WSDOT grants could fund a maximum of \$250,000, with a 5% match from the local entity, to maintain pavement, safety improvements, maintenance and operations and planning.

Mr. Eric Johnson stated WSDOT grants are part of a competitive grant system. WSDOT is starting a State Capital Improvement Program (CIP) and will develop a 5 year CIP, which will provide predictability for the state's funding and the airport sponsors. They will combine and prioritize the CIP's from all airports and determine a list. At this time WSDOT cannot provide any predictability as to what will be funded. The CIP program is self-funded through aviation fees. WSDOT is considering raising aircraft registration fees which will provide additional funds.

Mr. Montgomery clarified that WSDOT will perform pavement evaluations for all airports so they will be aware of the pavement conditions. WSDOT's objective is to make sure airports are functional.

Mr. Johnson stated a consultant will be selected this summer and will have the results for the pavement study by January 2012.

Mr. Montgomery commented that WSDOT will help fund maintenance of 75' of runway. Vista Field is 150' wide. WSDOT will help maintain the part that is necessary, and the Port will be responsible for the rest.

After the decision was made on March 8, 2010 to keep the airport open, the Port prepared an interim action plan to provide guidance on how the airport was going to be treated and how projects would be funded. Some of the assumptions in the interim action plan were commitments for \$10 million from the private sector for improvements. It identifies the Port will apply for WSDOT grants to help maintain the pavement, \$50,000 for annual maintenance, and no less than \$1 million, no more than \$1.5 million over 10 years. It also identified the Port would strive for a net profit of \$50,000 per year. On November 23, 2010, the Port adopted Budget Goals to close the operating gap, fund projects with resources in-hand, pursue fewer projects and pursue projects with partners. The Port will also perform a Return on Investment (ROI) on some port properties.

Historically, it has cost more to operate the airport than the airport receives in revenues. If everything were leased, the airport could make \$90,000 in revenue. Ms. Fine commented the figure does not include staff time, indirect cost allocation to the airport, or depreciation expense. When the t-hangars are demolished it will bring down the revenue the Port receives. Chapter 7 also discusses interesting ways to increase revenues and decrease operating costs; such as perform a rate study, and land leases versus property sales. WSDOT made comments regarding through-the-fence policy, which will be similar to the FAA's policy. WSDOT requests all existing through-the-fence operations and Port policy on the pre-existing through-the-fence operations be included.

The status with the NPIAS system was that the FAA would not look favorably upon land sales and WSDOT may view this differently as it may ensure the long-term viability of the airport. The email



VISTA FIELD ADVISORY BOARD MEETING

PORT OF KENNEWICK

FEBRUARY 2, 2011 MINUTES

received from the FAA states the following: "At this time, based on the information available, there is not a compelling Federal Interest in Vista Field as a part in the national system." Mr. Novakovich feels this is no longer an option.

Mr. Don Clayhold, pilot and audience member, asked if FAA discourages through-the fence. His understanding is that they were discouraging residential. Commercial and industrial corporate hangars, which were recognized to be a typical airport use, were accepted.

Mr. Johnson stated the FAA first took issue with this a couple of years ago; they came out with a hard stance that they were not going to allow any through-the-fence. There was a lot of push back and it is now back in D.C.; a policy is being developed and reviewed; however, that has not come out publicly yet. At the state level, he thinks what it will end up as no residential, but the FAA will make sure that the revenues are in parity with what would be gained if it was on the airport. Mr. Johnson assumes WSDOT's policy will be similar to the FAA policy. Mr. Johnson commented WSDOT will examine what benefit existing through-the-fence is providing to the aviation system in their economic study, which will play a role in the WSDOT policy.

The Capital Improvement Plan includes projects for Short term (1-5 years), Intermediate term (5-10 years) and Long term (10-20 years). Table 7.1 Vista Field Capital Improvement Program was reviewed. (EXHIBIT 1) Timing for project placement was determined by available Port funding; time sensitive projects; pavement maintenance schedule, the VFAB recommendation to pursue FBO early on; and that the new hangars would precede removal of old ones and property acquisition. Mr. Montgomery reviewed the placement of projects for short and intermediate terms.

Mr. Arntzen commented there are two funding sources not included in the table: raising taxes and the Industrial Development District (IDD). The Port used the IDD levy to create funding for Clover Island. It is a possibility the Port could impose the IDD levy, which is a temporary tax for a specific project or area. Although this may be a possible source of funding, the Commissioner's may not want to propose the levy for political reasons.

Mr. Britain suggested Hanford Area Economic Investment Fund Committee (HAEFIC) loans and/or grants, Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funding and sponsorships may be possible sources of funding. Mr. Arntzen stated it would be difficult for the Port to commit \$2.9 million over ten years. Mr. Arntzen would be comfortable with \$1 million over ten years.

The Port of Kennewick has approximately 9 acres near the airport that could be sold. Mr. Arntzen feels if the property was sold for reasonable prices, and if we had the authority to put the funds back into the airport, it would create a fairly capable funding source for most of the things on the list. However, there are a couple assumptions. First, the Port Commission would agree to sell the land as opposed to ground leasing, and second, that the proceeds from the sale will go into the airport. Mr. Arntzen does not believe the Master Plan, in its current version, reflects that he could sell the land and put it back into the airport.

Mr. Montgomery stated the long-term projects are planned for 10+ years in the future.



VISTA FIELD ADVISORY BOARD MEETING

PORT OF KENNEWICK

FEBRUARY 2, 2011 MINUTES

Chapter 9, Airport Layout Plan Drawing Set

Mr. Montgomery stated WSDOT requires the following information to be included in every Master Plan:

- Airport Layout Plan (EXHIBIT 2)
- FAR Part 77 Airspace Plan
- Runway 2-20 Inner Approach Plan and Profile
- Airport Land Use Plan
- Airport Property Plan

Mr. Novakovich asked the VFAB what should be recommended to the Commission for funding based on the information provided. For instance, selling land adjacent to the airport, pursuing grants or other funding, the Industrial Development District, raising taxes, etc.

Mr. Kushner asked for clarification on the Port's financial commitment. Mr. Novakovich stated the Port initially made a commitment of \$1 million over ten years. Then it was changed to reflect a minimum of \$1 million but not to exceed \$1.5 million over ten years. Chapter 7 identifies \$1.7 million and an additional \$1.2 million from land sales, for a total of \$2.9 million.

Mr. Adrian feels the Port would need to fund the projects through year 5 in order to cause private development to occur. If the facility is not well maintained, there will not be interest from the private sector to invest. The sooner these projects are accomplished, the more likely we will reach the vision for Vista Field. Mr. Adrian feels the VFAB should recommend the Commissioners fund the projects through year 5, with the caveat of utilizing other funding opportunities; and use taxes as a last resort. Mr. Adrian believes there are many grant opportunities that can be pursued. Mr. Novakovich reiterated that the proposed recommendation is not to worry about future funding up to \$2.9 million; just worry about the \$750,000 right now and pursue other methods of funding. Mr. Adrian confirmed and feels the priority of getting the stuff done is to encourage the private sector to step up and invest.

Ms. Blasdel stated the way to get the private sector involved is to get the pilots and airplanes back at the airport, to get the business coming back into the airport.

Ms. Watkins suggested a visual plan be used to illustrate the plans for the airport to the private sector and give the private sector an idea of what they are buying into. Private sources need to know what the airport will look like in 5-10 years.

Mr. Adrian suggested some of the Port's expenses could be offset through land sales.

Mr. Montgomery stated when the interim action plan was put together, land sales were not considered. He stated if all the Port's facilities were leased, the revenues could contribute to the funding of the CIP.

Ms. Marjy Leggett, volunteer for Vista Field, commented the 2013 Air Race Classic will be hosted at Vista Field and 40-50 planes are expected. The planes will need tie-downs and according to the CIP, the tie-downs are listed in the intermediate term. Ms. Leggett stated at least temporary tie-downs will be necessary for the event.



VISTA FIELD ADVISORY BOARD MEETING

PORT OF KENNEWICK

FEBRUARY 2, 2011 MINUTES

Dr. Cadwell stated the CIP lists \$721,000 from Port Property Taxes for the first five years. He suggests removing the \$150,000 for designing the FBO, as most likely the private party building the FBO will take it on. This would bring the number down to \$571,000. Dr. Cadwell suggests taking the \$571,000 to the Commission for approval.

Mr. Arntzen feels the \$571,000 figure is more feasible for the Port.

Mr. Freeman agrees with the dialog, keep with the 5 year CIP and remove the land sales until you reach an agreement whether they will be sold or not, agrees with removing the \$150,000 for FBO design and bring the plan back to update in the future based on what happens over the first 5 years. He suggested it may be good to move the marketing plan up to the FBO line.

Mr. Johnson stated Master Plans are meant to be updated and the state considers seven years out-of-date. This provides an opportunity to focus on the early years and then re-evaluate the priorities. Mr. Johnson suggested a budget line item for updating the Master Plan.

Mr. Adrian stated if a scale model was available, TRIDEC and TCVCB would allow the model to be displayed in their buildings.

Ms. Blasdel suggested if exclusivity were offered to the FBO operator, there could be potential to make income from fuel sales and plane repairs. She stated there can be a variance of \$2 to \$3 per gallon on fuel. Ms. Blasdel feels there are opportunities for an FBO to be profitable under the right circumstances.

Mr. Montgomery reiterated the following changes to the CIP table:

- ✓ Move \$150,000 for FBO design to the private or unfunded partners columns
- ✓ Disregard land sales
- ✓ Include a lump sum for marketing in the first year

Mr. Peterson commented that when eliminating the land sales column, those projects would go to the unfunded category, rather than the projects being eliminated.

The Port's commitment will be approximately \$570,000, plus marketing costs, over five years. Mr. Arntzen stated if there is another way to leverage the private investment, the Port will incentivize as much as possible. This is where partnerships can be utilized.

Mr. Johnson stated WSDOT operates on a biennium budget and funds are not allocated until the budget is complete. WSDOT definitely supports Vista Field and will do what they can to help fund pavement maintenance.

Mr. Novakovich stated the recommendation will go before the Port Commission on the February 8 and February 22, 2011. Public Comments will be received at each meeting.



VISTA FIELD ADVISORY BOARD MEETING

PORT OF KENNEWICK

FEBRUARY 2, 2011 MINUTES

Chapter 8: Design Standards

Mr. Novakovich introduced Chris Herath, of Herath and Associates. Mr. Herath designed the Port building, Clover Island Professional building and the lighthouse. Mr. Arntzen contacted Mr. Herath and asked him to review the design standards and use comments made by the VFAB and the public to create a conceptual design for t-hangars at Vista Field.

Mr. Arntzen commented that Cliff Berkey contacted him a couple months ago about building t-hangars or box hangars. Mr. Arntzen requested Mr. Herath to work with Mr. Berkey to design nice looking hangars according to the design standards that could be built by the private sector. Mr. Herath designed two sets of design standards – basic and enhanced. The different designs can be used based upon how close the hangars are to the road. The Port's intent is for the standards that people can build to and still find it profitable.

Mr. Herath commented his efforts focused on trying to streamline the guidelines. First, he identified two broad categories for design and development: everything that can be accessed by the public or is viewed by the street; and second, everything else that is not within public access or view. In addition, an overall principal that anything visible at the airport, would be held to a slightly higher standard.

Mr. Herath feels the broad guidelines used are: consistent design appearance; airport architecture; and the cost of enhancements. Design colors can be used to create nice detail without a significant cost. Mr. Herath proposes the use of metal buildings with 20% of the metal a different color. In terms of cost savings solutions, wood frame construction can be used. Mr. Herath reduced construction costs by reducing the amount of character enhancements, such as masonry and glazing. This reduced the price of enhancements from 25% to 5% for buildings without public access, and the character enhancements for public access buildings were reduced from 40% to 25%. Mr. Herath suggests a design review committee be formed to review proposed plans.

Mr. Arntzen stated the Port Planner, Larry Peterson, handles all the plans for the Spaulding Business Park, which is owned by the Port. The developer submits the plans, elevations, design and materials to the design review committee. Mr. Peterson works with the developers. The buildings all look different, but have high design standards. This process allows staff to review and finalize the plans before they are presented to the Commission.

Mr. Arntzen stated the Design Review Committee for the airport could consist of a Port Commissioner, City of Kennewick councilperson and an architect. Mr. Arntzen stated the committee can make reasonable minor variations from the standards; however, the Port Commission retains ultimate control.

Dr. Cadwell has the following concerns:

1. Roof designs
 - a. Roof Pitch – why is 3:12 not permitted?
 - b. Hips and valleys are not permitted – a grand entrance cannot be constructed

Mr. Herath stated he tried to find a way from a design perspective to dictate certain roof forms and save money. He did not include hips and valley because they do not lend themselves to an



VISTA FIELD ADVISORY BOARD MEETING

PORT OF KENNEWICK

FEBRUARY 2, 2011 MINUTES

aeronautical look and they are more expensive. He feels valleys and hips tend to look residential.

2. Building materials - Why is concrete the only substance that can be used? Why not stone, stucco, brick or CMU?

Mr. Herath received a directive to create a design concept for the airport as a whole that has a level of consistency and coherence. He feels the use of different materials will take away from the coherence. If the goal is to develop a coherent design, then the use of some of the materials are restricted to provide consistency.

3. Glass in hangar doors. Dr. Cadwell feels the large doors are too big for windows. He is concerned that the windows will crack and break.

Mr. Herath included windows to provide light into the hangar. He stated the hydro swing door handles glass well and feels there may be flexibility.

Mr. Arntzen suggested Dr. Cadwell meet with Mr. Herath to discuss any remaining issues. He stated the Port does not want to create standards that make it too expensive to build hangars. He commented that the public does not want pole buildings at the airport.

Mr. Arntzen inquired if the VFAB would accept anything that meets the City of Kennewick's code? If so, pole buildings would be allowed. If the VFAB does not want that, please make that known. The public gave the Port Commission the task of building a first-rate airport.

Mr. Britain believes what the public sees at the airport needs to be aesthetically pleasing. We need to be careful about what is built there. In a multi-million dollar area and next to the Three Rivers campus, the airport needs to fit in to the area.

Mr. Arntzen stated that some airport users do see him as being supportive of their position. But this overall debate may not be over; it may come back in a year or two. The debate is easier to win, as far as if the airport should stay there, if there are quality buildings at the airport. If we build the lowest cost buildings, it will be easier for this debate to come up again. It could be viewed that building to higher standards could be better for the airport long-term.

Mr. Clayhold does not think the pilots disagree with what the Port and the architect are trying to accomplish. Mr. Clayhold mentioned that he is president of a 503(c) organization called "Friends of Vista Field." He feels the VFAB is doing a great job and compliments the VFAB for the input given. He feels it is a good quality product. With respect to the design standards, he does not disagree with anything said on the west side of the Entertainment District area, nor on the southeast side. However, there is an area where a compromise could be made; the area adjacent to the light industrial on Okanogan. He feels box hangars that are already in the fence and screened already by the light industrial, may be listed under a separate design standard. He's also concerned someone may break into the hangars if they have glass windows.

Mr. Herath commented the categories apply to the light industrial area as well. Those facades are not in public sight lines and they could be built to lesser standards; however, he suggests always



VISTA FIELD ADVISORY BOARD MEETING

PORT OF KENNEWICK

FEBRUARY 2, 2011 MINUTES

using two colors for the building. The Design Review Committee could decide the building could be metal because it is not in public sight lines.

Ms. Blasdel stated that if the building is on the street front, the VFAB wants it to have a different look than what is behind the scenes. She feels the colors should be consistent with the rest of the buildings.

Mr. Novakovich suggested a third category be created eliminating the 5% enhancements for buildings that are not in public sight lines. The VFAB is in consensus as long as the colors are consistent with the rest of the buildings.

Mr. Novakovich stated the Port offered to provide a lease discount of 5-10% of the land lease to offset building to the enhanced standards in the Airport Design Standards. He commented there are some considerations and concessions the Port is willing to make to have these types of standards at Vista Field.

MOTION: Mr. Adrian motioned to recommend the standards as presented with two exceptions: Dr. Cadwell and the architect may discuss hangar door windows and roof pitch; and the idea to evaluate a third, lesser design standard, would be acceptable in areas that are not in public view.

Ms. Watkins seconded the motion.

Ms. Blasdel requested an amendment that would maintain the standards in public view, especially from Grandridge. (Hangar doors without windows will not be on the street front, or visible from the street.)

The motion passed unanimously.

PUBLIC COMMENT

No comments were made.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Novakovich thanked the Board and the audience for their involvement. He commented many interests were represented and that everyone was able to agree and that a recommendation was presented.

With no further business to bring before the Board; the meeting was adjourned at 5:53 p.m.

APPROVED:

VISTA FIELD ADVISORY BOARD


Skip Novakovich, Chairman



VISTA FIELD ADVISORY BOARD MEETING

PORT OF KENNEWICK

EXHIBIT 1

FEBRUARY 2, 2011 MINUTES

Table 7.1 Vista Field Capital Improvement Program

Priority	Map Key	Project Description	Estimated Cost	Inc. Inflation Factor Estimated Cost	WSDOT	Unfunded or Partners	Port of Kennewick Property Taxes	Land Sales
Short-Term 2011 - 2015								
Year 1								
1		Master Plan preparation	\$ 7,500	\$ 7,500	\$ -		\$ 7,500	
2		Seal Coat Taxiways/Aprons, Crack Seal Pvmts	\$ 158,000	\$ 158,000	\$ 140,500		\$ 17,500	
3	FBO -1	Rehab existing FBO building	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000			\$ 20,000	
4	LS-1	Outside the fence Improvements along Kellogg	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000			\$ 50,000	
5		Relocate Fencing	\$ 35,000	\$ 35,000			\$ 35,000	
6		Marketing Parcels	\$ 5,000	\$ 5,000			\$ 5,000	
7		Comprehensive Utility Plan	\$ 35,000	\$ 35,000			\$ 35,000	\$ -
8	H-1	Infrastructure for hangar development	\$ 165,000	\$ 165,000			\$ 165,000	\$ -
9	H-1	Hangar development (6 at 6,912 sf)	\$ 1,192,320	\$ 1,192,320		\$ 1,192,320	\$ -	
10	H-1	Taxilane development	\$ 200,000	\$ 200,000		\$ 200,000	\$ -	
11	PS-1/H-2	Infrastructure related to potential land sales	\$ 200,000	\$ 200,000			\$ -	\$ 200,000
Year 1 Total			\$ 2,067,820	\$ 2,067,820	\$ 140,500	\$ 1,392,320	\$ 335,000	\$ 200,000
Year 2								
12	FBO -1	Additional Rehab of existing FBO building	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000			\$ 50,000	
13		Weather/Security Cameras	\$ 8,000	\$ 8,000	\$ 5,000		\$ 3,000	
14		AWOS Weather Station	\$ 85,000	\$ 85,000			\$ 85,000	
Year 2 Total			\$ 143,000	\$ 143,000	\$ 5,000	\$ -	\$ 138,000	\$ -
Year 1 - 2 Cumulative Total			\$ 2,210,820	\$ 2,210,820	\$ 145,500	\$ 1,392,320	\$ 473,000	\$ 200,000
Year 3 - 5								
15		Seal Coat/Crack Seal Runway	\$ 170,000	\$ 170,000	\$ 150,000		\$ 20,000	
16	FBO-2	Design New FBO	\$ 150,000	\$ 150,000		\$ -	\$ 150,000	
17	L-1	Land Acquisition	\$ 38,469	\$ 38,469			\$ 38,469	
18	TD-1	Rehabilitate Aprons and North Taxiway	\$ 175,000	\$ 175,000	\$ 150,000		\$ 25,000	
19		Crack Seal South Taxiway	\$ 15,000	\$ 15,000			\$ 15,000	
Year 3 - 5 Total			\$ 548,469	\$ 548,469	\$ 300,000	\$ -	\$ 248,469	\$ -
Year 1 - 5 Cumulative Total			\$ 2,759,289	\$ 2,759,289	\$ 445,500	\$ 1,392,320	\$ 721,469	\$ 200,000
Intermediate Term 2016 - 2020								
20		Crack seal all pavements (every two yrs)	\$ 31,600	\$ 34,760			\$ 34,760	
21	A-1	Utilities to Apron/FBO-2/H-2/H-5	\$ 200,000	\$ 220,000		\$ -	\$ -	\$ 220,000
22	A-1	Apron/Tie Down area	\$ 916,935	\$ 1,008,628	\$ 150,000		\$ 158,628	\$ 700,000
23	TD-2	Remove large tie-downs, install small	\$ 7,900	\$ 8,690			\$ 8,690	
24	TD-1	Remove Tie-downs	\$ 3,081	\$ 3,389			\$ 3,389	
25	FBO-2	Construct New FBO	\$ 1,575,000	\$ 1,732,500		\$ 1,732,500	\$ -	
26	H-3	Maintenance Hangar - Phase I: 7,500 sf	\$ 432,000	\$ 475,200		\$ 475,200	\$ -	
27		Relocate/Replace Fueling to new FBO	\$ 241,500	\$ 265,650	\$ 150,000		\$ 115,650	
28		Relocate Fencing	\$ 35,000	\$ 38,500			\$ 38,500	
29		Electronic Gates	\$ 14,220	\$ 15,642			\$ 15,642	
30	A-2	Apron/Tie Down area	\$ 483,686	\$ 532,054	\$ 150,000		\$ 382,054	
31	H-4	Remove hangars	\$ 138,484	\$ 152,332			\$ 152,332	
32		Crack seal all pavements (every two yrs)	\$ 31,600	\$ 34,760			\$ 34,760	
33	H-4	New Hangars (24 at 2,000 sf)	\$ 1,380,000	\$ 1,518,000		\$ 1,518,000	\$ -	\$ -
34	H-4	Taxilane development	\$ 662,986	\$ 729,285		\$ 729,285	\$ -	
35	H-5	Hangar development (5 at 6,400 sq ft)	\$ 920,000	\$ 1,012,000		\$ 1,012,000	\$ -	
36	H-5	Taxilane development	\$ 160,812	\$ 176,894		\$ 176,894	\$ -	
37	H-6	Hangar development (2 at 4,500 sf)	\$ 517,500	\$ 569,250		\$ 569,250	\$ -	
38	H-6	Taxilane development	\$ 196,743	\$ 216,417		\$ 216,417	\$ -	
39		Crack seal all pavements (every two yrs)	\$ 31,600	\$ 34,760			\$ 34,760	
Intermediate Term Total			\$ 7,980,647	\$ 8,778,712	\$ 450,000	\$ 6,429,546	\$ 979,166	\$ 920,000
Year 1 - 10 Cumulative Total			\$ 10,739,937	\$ 11,538,002	\$ 445,500	\$ 7,821,866	\$ 1,700,635	\$ 1,120,000
Long Term 2021 - 2030								
40		Seal Coat Runway/Crack Seal (Runway)	\$ 170,000	\$ 204,000	\$ 150,000		\$ 54,000	
41	H-7	Maintenance Hangar - Phase 2: 7,500 sf	\$ 432,000	\$ 518,400		\$ 518,400	\$ -	
42	A-3	Apron Expansion	\$ 430,548	\$ 516,658			\$ 516,658	
43	A-4	Apron Expansion	\$ 156,976	\$ 188,371		\$ 188,371	\$ -	
44	H-2	Hangar development (multiple sizes)	\$ 4,089,124	\$ 4,906,949		\$ 4,906,949	\$ -	
45	H-2	Taxilane development	\$ 963,284	\$ 1,155,941		\$ 1,155,941	\$ -	
46	T-1	East side taxilane realignment***	\$ 187,736	\$ 225,283	\$ 150,000		\$ 75,283	
47	H-8	Taxilane development to service property sales	\$ 208,983	\$ 250,779		\$ 250,779	\$ -	
48	H-9	Hangar development (8 at 2,000 sf)	\$ 460,000	\$ 552,000		\$ 552,000	\$ -	
49	H-9	Taxilane development	\$ 37,162	\$ 44,594		\$ 44,594	\$ -	
50		Crack seal all pavements (every two yrs)	\$ 31,600	\$ 37,920			\$ 37,920	
Long Term Total			\$ 7,167,413	\$ 8,600,896	\$ 300,000	\$ 7,617,035	\$ 683,861	\$ -
GRAND TOTAL			\$ 17,907,350	\$ 20,138,897	\$ 1,195,500	\$ 15,438,901	\$ 2,384,496	\$ 1,120,000

Notes:

- 1) WSDOT funding participation is assumed in all cases.
- 2) Property acquisition assumes \$3.25/sq ft + appraisal.

Engineers Suppliers Martens
KENNEWICK, WASHINGTON