

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA

DEPARTMENT OF AVIATION

5702 Gulfstream Road

Richmond, Virginia 23250-2400

Virginia Aviation Board Workshop Meeting

June 19, 2007, 6:30 PM

Wyndham Hotel Richmond

4700 S. Laburnum Avenue

Richmond, Virginia

CRANE-SNEAD & ASSOCIATES, INC.

4914 Fitzhugh Avenue, Suite 203

Richmond, Virginia 23230

Tel. No. (804) 355-4335

1 **VAB Attendees on June 19, 2007**

2 Roger L. Oberndorf, Chairman

3 Richard C. Franklin, Jr.

4 Bittle W. Porterfield, III

5 Larry T. Omph

6 Robert S. Dix

7 Dr. Alan W. Wagner

8 Maryann Radcliff

9

10 Other Attendees:

11 Randall Burdette, Director, Department of Aviation (DOAV)

12 Terry Page, FAA

13 Todd E. LePage, Senior Assistant Attorney General, Technology and  
14 Transportation, Office of the Attorney General, Counsel

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

1

2

3 Call to Order..... 4

4 Robert Oberndorf, Chairman

5 Virginia Aviation Board Review

6 a. Review of Funding Request..... 4

7 Report by Mike Swain, DOAV

8 b. Presentation on Tappahannock Project’s Status..... 25

9 Matt Kundrot, Delta Airport Consultant

10 Chairman’s Comments..... 27

11 Board Member Comments and Reports .....27

12 Public Comments.....27

13 Adjournment..... 29

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 MR. OBERNDORF: I'd like to call the Virginia  
2 Aviation Board to order. I'd like to welcome Todd LePage who is sitting in  
3 for John Beall, the Attorney General Representative . John is on vacation.  
4 Old business? All right. New business, and we'll start by reviewing the  
5 funding requests.

6 MR. MIKE SWAIN: Good evening everyone.  
7 You should have some colorful sheets in front of you. We've had a few  
8 changes and a few substitutions. All of these sheets pretty much are  
9 swapping out the existing sheets, etc., which I'll get to. Basically they're in  
10 the order as to how they should be replaced. The main reason for the  
11 changes is that we uncovered some significant funds since the Board  
12 package was put out. If you turn to the program section, we'll go over the  
13 funds that are available. The front page is entitled, Commonwealth Airport  
14 Fund. As of May 31, 2007, which is the last month that we closed out on the  
15 spreadsheet, the air carrier reliever discretionary fund has about \$55,394.90,  
16 and in the GA Discretionary Fund, we had \$29,866.21. Following that is a  
17 memorandum which you should have a green sheet which is the revised  
18 memorandum to Cliff Burnette and that shows those same figures.  
19 However, you'll see that Richmond returned \$300,000 which is part of the  
20 TA which at one point was \$1,000,000 that the Board allocated back in April  
21 for an access road, and it was determined that we wouldn't need all of those  
22 funds. We got a little check back from them. It would enable us to fund all  
23 of the projects that are in front of you tonight so you have a total on the air  
24 carrier reliever of \$355,394.90. Also, with the General Aviation, the change  
25 to that column was that Williamsburg returned the balance of a grant of

1 \$72,580.80. We have a new balance now in GA of \$111,474.04, which will  
2 also allow you to fund all of the GA projects that are ready to go forth.

3           If you'll turn to the first summary sheet, which would be a  
4 yellow goldenrod, Air Carrier/Reliever Airport-Discretionary Funds  
5 Recommended Projects. I would like to explain that typically the staff has  
6 not changed their recommendations from the time we posted the Board  
7 package unless it's an error. In this case, we had a couple of changes.  
8 You'll see that the funds available in the original amounts and not the new  
9 amounts, because if we put the new amounts in the program, it would have  
10 picked up some projects shown then to be funded. We didn't want to change  
11 the recommendations in case the Board had agreed not to fund something.  
12 We're still looking at mostly what was in there first except we've had a  
13 couple of priority numbers that have changed. As we go over the projects, I  
14 may state we recommend not funding because of sufficient funds, I'll let you  
15 know we now have the sufficient funds or if there's been another change.  
16 Not the recommendations that may affect your decision on these. So there's  
17 really no need to go over the summary sheet. We'll just start with Region I.  
18 Region I, there are no changes. The first funding request should be the  
19 Virginia Highlands Airport which is the white sheet. They are requesting  
20 money for an archeological study. Phase II, Supplemental Environmental  
21 Assessment in the amount of \$1,875.00. Also, easement acquisition for  
22 obstruction removal in the amount of \$4,029.00. The archeological study,  
23 the staff recommends funding this project and the Easement Acquisition  
24 staff also recommends funding for this project.

25

1           Region 2. You should have a goldenrod sheet as a replacement  
2 on Region 2 which shows two Shenandoah Valley projects, and it has a  
3 rating of 175 for the first one and 100 for the second one. The only thing  
4 that has changed here was the rating for the first one. We actually had bids  
5 in hand and could not support that as a phase project. It really didn't change  
6 any recommendation. So the first summary sheet for Region 2 should be a  
7 goldenrod sheet for the Shenandoah Valley and it shows the two projects, or  
8 actually, three projects. The first project is a request to construct the  
9 helicopter parking area and the request is for \$31,008.00 Then we have the  
10 obstruction study for \$22,681.60, and runway 5-23 remarking design  
11 construction for approximately \$43,532.00. On the first one, construct  
12 helicopter parking area construction , a recommendation was against funding  
13 this project because the bids had not been received. However, the bids have  
14 been received at this time and everything is in order for that one. We do  
15 have funds available. On the obstruction study, originally our  
16 recommendation was against funding this due to insufficient funds;  
17 however, there are sufficient funds available.

18                           DR. WAGNER: I have a question about the  
19 obstruction study. How is that done, the obstruction study?

20                           MR. SWAIN: Basically, because it's a study, all  
21 studies are kind of the same. If it's designed for obstruction removal of the  
22 obstruction removal process, you get a much higher score, but the way the  
23 priority system has it, all the studies are almost the same priority, regardless  
24 of what it's for. It's an aerial survey. Right now the airport is free and clear  
25 of obstructions. They want to be proactive and fly the property and see if

1 they're getting close to any of them so they can get on top of them before  
2 they can become a problem.

3 DR. WAGNER: Because we've had so many  
4 problems with obstructions, now it seems like the low priority compared to  
5 other funding of airports and the safety of the airport would be paramount.

6 MR. SWAIN: It's rare that someone breaks it out  
7 this way. Typically, the evaluation is part of the airport layout plan update  
8 and part of the design effort. The preliminary is the study portion and then  
9 they design it. In that case, it's a much higher priority. This case is simply a  
10 study and that's how that gets funded, but I understand what you are saying.  
11 As I said, the obstruction study, there are funds available if the Board wishes  
12 to fund that project. The runway 5-23 remarking design construction, the  
13 staff recommends funding this project. Any questions on that one?

14 MR. FRANKLIN: I'll just say that I shared Dr.  
15 Wagner's question. I understand what you're saying as far as the system,  
16 but maybe that needs to be looked at to see if that should be a higher priority  
17 on the obstruction funds, but that's the first step. We are proactive on  
18 obstructions, especially with the staff that we have now. They're very  
19 proactive.

20 MS. RADCLIFF: I think the problem that's  
21 happening is that we have to focus more, not less. It's something that we  
22 really haven't addressed as we should.

23 MR. SWAIN: It's rare that an airport will come to  
24 us and does not have an obstruction issue and looking to be proactive and to  
25 see where they are.

1 MS. RADCLIFF: More and not less, and I think  
2 that should be rated higher. Maybe we need to change the ranking of these  
3 guys.

4 MR. BURNETTE: Ms. Radcliff is correct. Since  
5 the last August meeting, the emphasis has been put on encouraging the  
6 sponsors to get ahead of the curve. Greg is here, but I believe we're at the  
7 head of the curve on this because the last time we had a part 139 inspection,  
8 the inspector was kind of saying, "Those trees are getting pretty close."  
9 Greg's out there and trying to get ahead of the curve in identifying and the  
10 best way to do it, to fly over, Mike says that the traditional studies, but if we  
11 can possibly go in there and tweak it so that anything that's an obstruction,  
12 we can push it up a little bit. The question is, how much. We'll look at it  
13 and come back to you with a recommendation.

14 MS. RADCLIFF: All right.

15 MR. FRANKLIN: The whole book this time, and  
16 I asked Mike about it before we started out, and that one just jumps out, why  
17 and what's involved. Why are we not doing the obstruction and that's the  
18 first step.

19 MR. BURNETTE: There are other elements that  
20 go into the scoring of the particular project with a follow-on project. You  
21 get bonus points or other points, but in this case, none of that is really  
22 germane. That's why the score is low. We'll look at it and come back to  
23 you with a recommendation.

24 MR. SWAIN: Next is Region 3. We've got a  
25 change from the first request, Luray Caverns. Their request is funding for

1 “Form C” for State Route 652 relocation requesting \$886.00. The second  
2 project is obstruction removal Phase I, land acquisition services. The  
3 request is for \$5,560.00. On “Form C”, the staff recommends funding this  
4 project and for the obstruction removal and land acquisition, the staff  
5 recommends funding this project.

6 MR. FRANKLIN: How many acres are involved?

7 MR. SWAIN: For the land acquisition services, 14  
8 acres. Pretty small. Next in Region 3, we have Orange County apron  
9 expansion, Phase I construction increase, a request for \$11,368.42. The  
10 increase is due to the bids coming in higher than engineering estimates. The  
11 staff recommends funding this project.

12 Region 4. You have a goldenrod sheet for Region 4 which has  
13 two Hanover projects on it. You should also have a goldenrod sheet for  
14 Hummel Field that’s correcting the priority for that project. The first request  
15 for Region 4 is for Hanover County. This is a “Missed Opportunity”  
16 request. They’re separated, but they are for the same project. Requesting  
17 funds for an environmental assessment obstruction removal, “Missed  
18 Opportunity,” that was taken to the Chairman and Ms. Radcliff for Region 4.  
19 The second is an environmental assessment of obstruction removal change  
20 in scope to the existing standard allocation. The same project. Referring to  
21 the bottom of the first EA obstruction removal change in scope “Missed  
22 Opportunity”. The staff recommends approval of the change in scope. The  
23 sponsor has an existing TA of \$52,000 for obstruction removal. They plan  
24 to pursue additional obstruction removal in accordance with the ALP. That  
25 requires additional environmental work to be completed before they can start

1 the obstruction removal. The request is the scope of work for that original  
2 TA be changed to fund the environmental assessment Phase I in that same  
3 amount, \$52,000. That's the first request. The second request is for the  
4 balance of that environmental assessment. It's a request for \$20,000 and the  
5 total state share for that environmental assessment is \$72,000, so they've  
6 submitted an additional request for \$20,000 on Phase II of that project.  
7 Initially, for the \$20,000, our recommendation was not to approve because  
8 of insufficient funds. However, there are adequate funds available at this  
9 time.

10           Next, we have Hummel Field. There are two requests. Access  
11 road and parking lot paving design construction asking for \$36,609.20. The  
12 fueling system modification design construction, \$7,082.30. Both of these  
13 projects are recommendations against funding the airport unmitigated state  
14 standard obstruction. However, the obstructions have since been mitigated  
15 and there are adequate general aviation discretionary funds for this project.

16           Next, we have Tappahannock Essex County and the request is  
17 for apron expansion runway end identifier lights and signage construction.  
18 The request is for \$12,727.00. The staff recommends funding this project.  
19 Chairman Matt Kundrot from Delta Airport Consultants and the office  
20 manager of the Richmond office, there's a presentation he'd like to give on  
21 that to present a status as of a few days ago of that project. Are these  
22 PowerPoints?

23   MR. KUNDROT: Yes.

24   MR. OBERNDORF: Well, let's finish this and  
25 come back.

1 MR. SWAIN: Any questions on Tappahannock?

2 Then we will come back to the presentation.

3 Region 5, we have no requests.

4 Region 6. Region 6 is Chesterfield County, and there are two  
5 requests. The first one is for runway 15-33 rehabilitation non-AIP-night  
6 work in the amount of \$240,000. The second is taxiway Charlie West  
7 rehabilitation non-AIP construction in the amount of \$10,000. On runway  
8 15-33 rehabilitation non-AIP-night work, the staff recommends against  
9 funding this project as it is a portion of an AIP project, the FAA considers  
10 ineligible. We believe the benefits do not outweigh the cost, considering the  
11 close proximity of Richmond and Hanover and Dinwiddie County airports.  
12 The County of Chesterfield does not want to shut the airport down during  
13 the day to perform the rehabilitation work. This recommendation is  
14 consistent with the Board's practice in the past of not funding night work  
15 such as the Hanover County Airport terminal building renovation last year.  
16 In addition, the runway at Leesburg Executive was rehabilitated last year  
17 without incurring additional costs of night work. They did it during the day.  
18 On taxiway Charlie West rehab project, the staff recommends funding this  
19 project. I'm sorry, originally we were against funding that project. The bids  
20 had not been received but they have been received now. There are adequate  
21 funds. The taxiway that leads to the industrial park on the West side of the  
22 runway and that is an eligible project under the Board's policy for one-third  
23 funding. Any questions?

24

25

1 MR. FRANKLIN: I'd like to go into this a little  
2 bit more and explain for the Board and me what the rationale is for this.  
3 Could you expound on that little bit?

4 MR. SWAIN: The rationale for it, I don't have a  
5 lot of information on that. They're not going to shut the airport down during  
6 the day. Chesterfield has a charter service running out of there and a flight  
7 school, and Chesterfield is a fairly busy airport, a reliever airport for  
8 Richmond. That's their concern, the possible loss of revenue, I guess, for  
9 the operations at the airport. The FAA says they're not going to fund it; they  
10 don't believe the benefits outweigh the cost. \$300,000 is the cost of doing  
11 this. We just don't believe it's justified.

12 MR. FRANKLIN: When would it be justified?

13 MR. SWAIN: We don't have a calculator that  
14 would calculate that. It's a tough call. The sponsor didn't provide us with  
15 any kind of breakout as to what damages they think that may be due for this  
16 runway being shutdown.

17 MR. PORTERFIELD: What is the difference  
18 between the cost of day and night work?

19 MR. SWAIN: The estimated cost for the night  
20 work is \$300,000 based on their request.

21 MR. BURNETTE: Harry, how did they handle  
22 Leesburg which is also a reliever with probably a few more operations and  
23 heavy equipment in Leesburg than Chesterfield?

24 MR PAGE: In Leesburg relocate the threshold for  
25 a couple thousand feet on one end and turn it around and work a couple of

1 thousand feet on the other end, and then only close the airport when they're  
2 working in the middle, the runway was open at all times until they did the  
3 work in the middle. When you work day time, you have a much better  
4 project, better ride. Even though the standards are the same, requirements  
5 and specifications are the same, when you're working at night, just from  
6 experience, the ride is not as smooth and the runway. Working under the  
7 lights is one thing, but it's very hard to do that work. From our standpoint,  
8 it's not worth the extra cost of \$300,000. You might lose some business  
9 here and there, but there is also safety concerns working at night. There are  
10 a whole lot of factors that go into it as far as what's the best way to do this.  
11 Some of these one runway airports like Charlottesville or Lynchburg, we  
12 just wouldn't fund differentials like that.

13 MR. FRANKLIN: How did we do it before?

14 MR. SWAIN: Only if the FAA funded it. Has  
15 there been any in recent years?

16 DR. WAGNER: How long is this?

17 MR. SWAIN: 5,500.

18 MR. FRANKLIN: If you take 2,000 feet anytime,  
19 you eliminate all your corporate aircraft and all your air taxis and all that.  
20 That's a big concern. Obviously, the rest of us can live with it, but that's  
21 their concern. I met with the sponsor. I feel very strongly both ways.

22 MR. DIX: How long would the airport runway be  
23 closed?

24 MR. SWAIN: I'd have to defer to Matt on that, is  
25 it a 30-day project as far as just day work, or longer?

1 MR. KUNDROT: It's a difficult project, not just a  
2 simple overlay. If it was a simple overlay, we could probably get it done  
3 quicker. The project involves a significant amount of grave correction.  
4 That's part of the reason for the extended duration of work. Two phasing  
5 options that we've had. It wasn't so much, the alternate one had more night  
6 work involved and it provided for more usable runway length and less of the  
7 corporate jets to have to relocate during the project. We got a bid for that.  
8 The other alternative, we had to basically split the runway in half and  
9 basically limit it to about half of the usable length, approximately 2,500 feet.  
10 Like Mr. Franklin said, it means all of the corporate and alternative aircraft  
11 would have to relocate. The range is 60-90 days of operations when the  
12 project is ongoing. We'd like to accelerate it to about 70 days. Really,  
13 they're going to have to relocate their operations. Most of the base single  
14 engine and flight school will probably continue to operate under those  
15 conditions. They won't have to relocate. There are a number of corporate  
16 aircraft in charter business that's really affected.

17 MR. FRANKLIN: Seventy days if things hold to  
18 schedule probably means three months.

19 MR. KUNDROT: We're going to have to do a lot  
20 of motivations to get things done and the air show is coming up in October,  
21 and there are a lot of factors involved trying to move things along and keep  
22 going.

23 When you consider day work and night work, it really depends  
24 on other factors. We've had contractors, because of competition with  
25 highway work, refuse to pave at night because the plants are tied up in the

1 day time with road work. Really, sometimes it just depends on the situation.  
2 Up in DC contractors do most of their paving at night. It really depends  
3 more on how the project is to be broken up.

4 MR. DIX: What's the total scope of the project?

5 MR. KUNDROT: The bid for the project, the  
6 alternate two bids, I think was around \$6,500,000.

7 MR. DIX: Six and a half, 5 percent or something?

8 MR. KUNDROT: The difference in the bid  
9 between the two was actually 1.3. This is an estimate on the base price. The  
10 premium between the two alternates is actually over a million dollars.

11 MR. BURNETTE: The last time we overlaid the  
12 runway, it's been 20 years ago. What did we do then?

13 MR. KUNDROT: The runway when it was  
14 constructed with current configuration of 5,500 feet was constructed at that  
15 timeframe with different design standards.

16 MR. BURNETTE: We overlaid it all at the same  
17 time, didn't we?

18 MR. KUNDROT: I believe it was lengthened,  
19 widened, and overlaid.

20 MR. BURNETTE: That was a complex project.  
21 Didn't we redo that at one time?

22 MR. KUNDROT: The taxiway is not wide enough  
23 to be categorized as a temporary runway. It's not really recommended--

24 MR. BURNETTE: --It's not a yes or no but it's a  
25 judgmental thing.

1 MR. KUNDROT: Judgmental, there are no  
2 specifications for a temporary runway.

3 MR. PAGE: The minimum runway width is 60  
4 feet. When you consider small aircraft--

5 MR. KUNDROT: --Forty-five feet wide.

6 MR. PAGE: Minimum is 60 feet wide and that's  
7 day time, and you have to consider the type of aircraft and what activities,  
8 but considering VFR and students and that type of thing.

9 MR. BURNETTE: With night time traffic, you  
10 just have to make arrangements.

11 MR. KUNDROT: What we did 20 years ago, or  
12 15, or 10 years ago compared to today is one thing.

13 MR. PAGE: Things are different now from some  
14 time ago, parallel taxiways, even a temporary situation.

15 MR. KUNDROT: We discussed some options, the  
16 cost of widening the taxiway. All that has to be taken into consideration.

17 MR. DIX: The other project was widening, length,  
18 and overlay? What are you doing on this one on the same runway?

19 MR. KUNDROT: The major portion of the cost of  
20 this project, probably adding roughly a couple million dollars of premium.  
21 The cross section of the runway is crowned in the middle. Not all runways  
22 are constructed that way, but the Chesterfield runway, when it was  
23 constructed 20 years ago, has been widened, lengthened, and overlaid. I  
24 believe the original runway was 75 feet wide. When they widened it, they  
25 kind of left the crown where it was. If you look at the crown today on a 100

1 foot wide runway, the crown is 25, instead of being in the middle, 50 feet  
2 from either edge—25 from one edge and 75 from the other. Widened on one  
3 side and what they did was anticipate that the ultimate widening on the other  
4 side to a 150 foot width, which was the standard, C-3. At this time, it's not  
5 anticipated that the runway would go beyond 100 foot width. The decision  
6 was to bring it to standard which would be a crowned runway in the middle.  
7 By bringing that crown over, that required a significant reconstruction of one  
8 portion and you'd basically have a lot more outfall.

9 MR. DIX: Why are you wanting to change the  
10 crown at this time?

11 MR. KUNDROT: In review of the standards, you  
12 can look at it a couple of ways. The optimal standard is to have the crown in  
13 the center. The runway for all intensive purposes does meet the grade  
14 requirements of 1.5% which is what you'd like to see a runway at  
15 Chesterfield. The offset crown is a significant issue with me as an operator,  
16 I believe it's a significant issue. The desire from the FAA standpoint, if I  
17 put money into rehabilitation of a runway and try to bring things to standard,  
18 the interpretation and desires of the office of AEO, we'll put the money in to  
19 bring the runway to the book standard. That was the decision made in the  
20 pre-design. The FAA said, "We'll put the money in to bring the runway to  
21 the correct standard." It makes the project more extensive and requires more  
22 time to do it. That was the decision based on the prime funding agency  
23 which was the FAA.

24 MR. DIX: There is no thought of doing a re-  
25 centering or a re-crowning which would add something to the other side?

1 MR KUNDROT: Actually, the increased standard  
2 now is 100 feet, unless for some reason you go over 150,000 pounds of  
3 aircraft. That's not anticipated for Chesterfield. That's a 727 and beyond.  
4 It's anticipated that this time, ultimately, that 100 feet wide for Chesterfield  
5 will fill the ultimate need.

6 MR. SWAIN: You said the premium was \$1.3  
7 million based on the bids?

8 MR. KUNDROT: For around there, yes.

9 MR. SWAIN: How was the sponsor going to  
10 come up with the difference over this \$300,000 request in actual premium?

11 MR. KUNDROT: I think that was the estimated  
12 premium. The bids just came in last week. We tried to estimate what we  
13 thought the premium would be, but it ended up being quite a bit more than  
14 \$300,000. They ended up being quite a bit more. I believe the grant  
15 application was submitted. There is a strong desire based on the operational  
16 impact to address the base operator's concerns and also the base aircraft  
17 concerns. Relocation is a concern. There's a potential there, but I believe  
18 there was also some options that were discussed or what was available, like  
19 assistance from the state and local options available.

20 MR. OMPS: If you crown you had to shut down  
21 the runway, would it have to be shut down or relocate?

22 MR. KUNDROT: My professional opinion is that  
23 the extent of the project and cost of the project is significantly less.

24 MR. OMPS: That's not what I asked? Would you  
25 have to shut down and relocate?

1 MR. KUNDROT: There would probably be a  
2 shorter period of time of impact. There would be some period of time where  
3 I think you'd have to work toward the middle and difficult to tie in. If  
4 you're going to do the project at night, you're going to have to get out there  
5 and close the runway at some time, but it would be a temporary tie end in  
6 each case.

7 MR. OMPS: My feeling is that if they did it  
8 during the day and didn't have to reconstruct the entire runway, they'd still  
9 have to shut down?

10 MR. KUNDROT: We overlaid the runway at Hot  
11 Springs the same length, you can overlay the runway if it's not just the base  
12 aircraft in two weeks.

13 MR. OMPS: It sounds to me like if something is  
14 not broken, we're going to break it to fix.

15 MS. RADCLIFF: Mr. Franklin, seems like maybe  
16 we shouldn't change the scope of the project.

17 MR. FRANKLIN: No, we're just asking questions  
18 about the process and how the process works and how we got to a \$16  
19 million project.

20 MR. PAGE: Mr. Chairman, the airport today, the  
21 center line of the runway is or the fact that the crown of the runway is higher  
22 than the, but if we don't fix it now, we're never going to fix it. Our decision  
23 was to go ahead and fund it and let's do it right and fix it. If we've got the  
24 money in place, we might not have it next year. I'm sure there is a good  
25 argument there to live with it for 20 years or if we have lived with it for 20

1 years, the crown over there up the center of the runway probably wouldn't  
2 make any difference as long as it's not icy conditions or other weather  
3 conditions, and the fact it slopes maybe to one side might not make a  
4 difference. If the decision is made and the federal money is there, just a  
5 matter of whether someone has got to relocate. If you repave the runway  
6 where it is, a few people have to relocate or not operate for a couple of  
7 weeks. So somebody has to relocate for two or three weeks, or two months  
8 – you're still moving.

9 MS. RADCLIFF: It seems like to me that with a  
10 price tag, and it's a steep price tag, we don't know that it's going to cover  
11 the difference, but it seems to me that there is a reason not to do it. I just  
12 don't see why we should do it.

13 MR. FRANKLIN: Mr. Chairman, I understand it,  
14 and I did meet with the sponsor and their engineers about the project at our  
15 last meeting, as a matter of fact. I wasn't just joking when I said I feel  
16 strongly both ways. I can understand the need for the sponsor because I  
17 know any airport that loses a big chunk of their business, particularly if it's  
18 two and a half months. At the same time, I certainly can understand. We've  
19 done similar airports of similar size without doing this. I just wanted it to be  
20 discussed by the Board and I've heard some of the discussions around here.  
21 Maybe the sponsor wants to consider some amount to appropriate from local  
22 funds. How much money are we talking about now? We've heard \$300,000  
23 on paper and \$1.3 million.

24 MR. BURNETTE: \$1.3 million.

25

1 MR. KUNDROT: For the low bidder, it's  
2 approximately \$1.3 million.

3 MR. FRANKLIN: It costs \$1.3 million more to do  
4 it at night?

5 MR. BURNETTE: Let me ask you this. Do you  
6 recall whether or not they funded this project in the August Board request?

7 MR. KUNDROT: I believe they did, yes.

8 MR. BURNETTE: I would suggest, that's a big  
9 amount, \$1.3 million.

10 MR. FRANKLIN: Mr. Chairman, I thank the  
11 Board for its indulgence in discussing this but I just felt like it was  
12 incumbent to bring it up on behalf of the sponsor. Thank you very much.

13 MR. SWAIN: All right, Region 6. Let's go to  
14 Region 7. Hampton Roads Executive, two requests. The first one is a  
15 replacement runway design for \$28,410. The second one is Wetlands  
16 Mitigation Phase I replacement runway. The request is for \$189,000. For  
17 the replacement runway design, the staff has recommended against funding  
18 that project until the environmental assessment is accepted. Also, for  
19 Wetlands Mitigation, the same recommendation against funding the project  
20 until the DA is accepted. Next is the Williamsburg-Jamestown.

21 MR. PAGE: I'd say it's close to 20% of the time  
22 down to maybe already drafting the documents, have it in hand and submit  
23 it. We're working out with our attorneys on finalizing the language. They  
24 want some numbers as how much is in Wetlands versus non. We'll have to  
25 go back to the airport and figure out and draw a sketch to include that

1 information. Any time it is drafted, we should be in a position to find the  
2 final environmental documents. I thought it should have been done weeks  
3 ago, but we're still struggling with it. We have to satisfy the people that  
4 have to sign off on the documents.

5 DR. WAGNER: That's all the federal funding?

6 MR. PAGE: The federal fiscal year, before  
7 August--

8 DR. WAGNER: --Where does that leave us as far  
9 as, would that be known in August, the schedule of our resources because of  
10 the size of the federal grant or--

11 MR. PAGE: --August will be the big meeting.

12 DR. WAGNER: Where will we be priority-wise  
13 by the August meeting as far as being able to make this go?

14 MR. SWAIN: 150 is a pretty high score. We  
15 don't have an estimate yet on the total Commonwealth Airport funds  
16 available. I can't imagine an air carrier reliever which does not have that  
17 much demand, but you never know.

18 MR. BURNETTE: We do have the money. Terry,  
19 has the sponsor signed the federal grant assurances?

20 MR. PAGE: Not yet.

21 MR. BURNETTE: Can you elaborate on what that  
22 means?

23 MR. PAGE: That means all of the conditions have  
24 been met. There are other clarifications that have to be made. Normally,  
25 they wouldn't commit to all of those things until they've got a promise of

1 money from us. The money is programmed to our system until there is  
2 actually an offer in the grant. The contactor, when they sign to get access to  
3 the money and they wouldn't sign it until then. It's got to be tied into a  
4 grant, in the actual grant contract itself. We don't require them to sign those  
5 until they actually get the grant in their hand. The federal funds are  
6 programmed. It's not a firm promise until the grant is in writing.

7 MR. BURNETTE: If the EA is approved and in  
8 hand next week, how soon would you make the grant offer?

9 MR. PAGE: I'd still have to get the funds released  
10 to me; the Office of the Secretary of Transportation releases the process  
11 where the funds can go to the project. It takes at least 30 days, and even  
12 then, there are some issues that have to be worked out concerning the  
13 sponsor. If the sponsor has mortgages on the airport property and  
14 incumbencies, we have to look at the level of that to make sure that we feel  
15 comfortable in investing in the long-term project. If you are talking like \$20  
16 million of federal funds and to make sure the sponsor meets all of the  
17 conditions and is in good financial condition, our federal investment there  
18 will be protected. It's a comfortable factor. Not like a public sponsor where  
19 they've got a public agency behind them, financial risk is always something  
20 to consider.

21 MR. SWAIN: Williamsburg-Jamestown  
22 requesting funds for an obstruction study/aerial survey. The airport does  
23 have unmitigated obstructions at this time. The obstruction study is one of  
24 the few projects that's eligible to get them started to evaluate the  
25 obstructions. The amount requested is \$13,600. The staff recommended

1 against funding this project originally because the approved scope of work  
2 had not been received; however, since then, we have received the scope of  
3 work. It's adequate and there are funds available. That's all of the requests,  
4 Mr. Chairman.

5 MR. DIX: I'd like to ask a question back on the  
6 Chesterfield project. Do I understand the bid request is \$1.3 million and  
7 they are asking for \$300,000?

8 MR. KUNDROT: All I can say is that that request  
9 was put in prior to the deadline well ahead of when the bids were taken. The  
10 bids were just opened last week.

11 MR. DIX: The \$300,000 was put in before the bid  
12 of \$1.3 million.

13 MR. KUNDROT: Before the full difference was  
14 realized in the bid. The bid project was actually bid and then re-bid.

15 MR. DIX: The \$1.3 million difference is to do  
16 night work?

17 MR. KUNDROT: Not straight night work, there is  
18 a difference in phasing. Phasing is to accommodate the maximum amount  
19 of base users versus the phasing to accommodate only the piston single  
20 engine. The difference in having 4,200 feet of runway, the maximum length  
21 of time, and having roughly 2,500 feet available for full project time.

22 MR. DIX: If we approve something like this, are  
23 we opening ourselves up to get another request for another million dollars at  
24 some point in the future?

25

1 MR. BURNETTE: It'll probably come back with  
2 80% of that work might be ineligible, 80% of 1.3 million.

3 DR. WAGNER: So they could request anything.

4 MR. DIX: I just wanted to get some clarification.

5 MR. BURNETTE: Mr. Chairman, I think we have  
6 a presentation on Tappahannock.

7 MR. KUNDROT: I'll take a couple minutes to  
8 give you an update. John Longmaker took these pictures earlier this week,  
9 on Friday. As you can see, we had the fly over. You can see where the area  
10 is graded and the terminal building and what's been done as of late last  
11 week. The apron that's down now or the paving down right now, there is a  
12 final surface that will be underway this week. This is a terminal apron. It's  
13 my understanding they desire to have a complete full featured airport. The  
14 goal right now is to open in July. I'll try to get that date for you by  
15 tomorrow morning. They're working for July.

16 MR. FRANKLIN: What is that?

17 MR. KUNDROT: The electrical supply. You also  
18 can see that red roof really stands out when you fly over. The interior is  
19 coming together nicely and they are finishing out. It really looks good. This  
20 is the electrical, that comes on automatically.

21 MR. OMPS: Is this the Radcliff Memorial  
22 Airport?

23 MR. KUNDROT: This is the wide open, center  
24 line runway airport with no water towers. 4,200 runway to start with. It  
25 could go to 5. There's room to go to 5 if traffic will come.

1 MR. PAGE: The original plan to build it was, I  
2 think, 3,800 or 42, and then extend it to 42, I guess, and then extend it to 5.  
3 We got as much money as we could get when we could to get to 5.

4 DR. WAGNER: Was there some kind of grading  
5 issue where you wouldn't have to take a hard right or a hard left to get to the  
6 runway?

7 MR. KUNDROT: What you can see is ultimately,  
8 they are both parallel taxiways, 400 feet, so the airport can be upgraded.  
9 What we're doing now is just waiting for traffic to justify any other costs  
10 and the apron expanded where the hangers will go in this area. Right now,  
11 you have to turn around here and there are some stipulations as far as  
12 minimums. As the traffic builds, you'll see the airport expand this way.  
13 Then we can upgrade the airport in the future as the traffic increases. You'll  
14 see a lot of aircraft in this area.

15 DR. WAGNER: Does the airport own the right of  
16 way on this area?

17 MR. KUNDROT: I believe they own all the  
18 property they need to expand.

19 DR. WAGNER: You own all that property?

20 MR. KUNDROT: This can all be expanded into  
21 here, yes.

22 MR. DIX: Does the airport own this, over there,  
23 on the ground? Can you add to that?

24 MR. BURNETTE: Yes, they own all from that  
25 point where he's pointing to that point.

1 MR. DIX: All on one end?

2 MR. KUNDROT: Yes.

3 MR. BURNETTE: The beauty of it, this airport is  
4 actually built on a little peninsula and the highest point of ground drops off  
5 of the sides of the runway and it has almost created an island where people  
6 can, it will keep people from building up to it. That's one of the attributes of  
7 that site. I must say this, that when we started this project, Ms. Radcliff was  
8 still in college. In the later years, she really fought hard, but I've been  
9 working on this almost 20 years. Maybe she was in high school.

10 MR. KUNDROT: It's designed for 5,000. This is  
11 looking West and this is 360 and Tappahannock is over here.

12 MR. DIX: How far is Richmond from there?

13 MR. KUNDROT: Maybe about 40 or 50 miles.

14 You'll notice the approach coming in. Its wide open. The instrument  
15 approaches will follow very shortly after, that's already funded shortly after  
16 the opening of the airport. This is going to be a tremendous asset.

17 MR. BURNETTE: Ms. Radcliff and the Board  
18 should be very proud of all the hard work they've done.

19 MS. RADCLIFF: A long time before any of us  
20 were here.

21 MR. OBERNDORF: Thank you very much and  
22 it's nice to see all this coming together. I really have no other comments.

23 Are there any public comments or questions? Hearing, none.

24 Any Board member comments?

25

1 MR. OMPS: Are we doing anything to support  
2 AOPA movement to fight the user fees? I'm talking about lobbying. Are  
3 we taking any action?

4 MR. OBERNDORF: I think the answer is yes,  
5 Randy?

6 MR. BURDETTE: Yes, we've made some  
7 presentations. We've attended hearings, and we've informed a lot of people  
8 about certain conditions, but there hasn't been a Commonwealth position  
9 except in one area. You may have seen a Senate provision and there are  
10 several provisions that violate the perimeter rules for National and trying to  
11 get additional positions, Jet Blue – 44 positions. The recent TAO report.  
12 "We have prepared a letter and the governor signed it to the Chairman.  
13 Please do not violate the perimeter rule because of the impact on the pilots  
14 with National and at Dulles. We're focusing our efforts to develop Dulles,  
15 the perimeter rules to protect National and to provide a good service without  
16 many delays. If the perimeter rules are violated, it opens up new  
17 negotiations. We expect concerns from the surrounding neighborhoods. It's  
18 clear we put forth an effort." The user fees? The Secretary of Education has  
19 been briefed and we're looking at how things develop, and there has been  
20 some communications but we don't have a formal signed letter or anything.

21 MR. OBERNDORF: Any other comments?

22 MR. OMPS: Would it be possible to get the staff  
23 to give us a list of airports that will be requiring or needing a terminal in the  
24 future? It would be good to know what we're looking at in the future or  
25 people asking for financial assistance.

1 DR. WAGNER: If we have some aging resources  
2 and you have a bunch of buildings, do we have any issues or plans or ideas  
3 regarding locating resources to go forward and what financial burdens  
4 throughout all the airports that we're facing?

5 MR. OMPS: I don't need the answer now.

6 MR. BURNETTE: The short answer is yes. We'll  
7 have it for you tomorrow.

8 MR. OBERNDORF: That's all I have.

9 MR. BURDETTE: Mr. Chairman, I talked to  
10 several Board members who have expressed an interest in going to Oshkosh  
11 and that would be Thursday night, July 26<sup>th</sup>, and Friday the 27<sup>th</sup>, and  
12 Saturday night, July 28<sup>th</sup>, and return on Sunday, the 29<sup>th</sup>. We've done some  
13 checking on hotel rooms. I'd like to find out how many Board members are  
14 interested in going so we need a count so we can start looking at  
15 accommodations.

16 MR. OBENDORF: I'll be in England that week.

17 MR. BURDETTE: Board members can contact  
18 me if you are interested.

19 MR. OBENDORF: All right. Comments from  
20 anyone else? Then the meeting is adjourned.

21

22 PROCEEDINGS CONCLUDED.

23

24

25

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

CERTIFICATE OF THE COURT REPORTER

I, Medford W. Howard, Registered Professional Reporter and Notary Public for the State of Virginia at Large, do hereby certify that I was the court reporter who took down and transcribed the proceedings of the **Virginia Aviation Board Meeting when held on June 19, 2007, at the Wyndham Hotel Richmond, 4700 S. Laburnum Avenue, Richmond, Virginia.**

I further certify this is a true and accurate transcript, to the best of my ability to hear and understand the proceedings.

Given under my hand this 29<sup>th</sup> day of June, 2007.

---

Medford W. Howard  
Registered Professional Reporter  
Notary Public for the State of Virginia at Large

My Commission Expires: October 31, 2010.

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25