

Aspen/Pitkin County Airport Advisory Board

Meeting Minutes May 19, 2022

I. Call Meeting to Order: 3:00PM

II. Roll Call:

In person: Meg Haynes, Valerie Braun, Howie Mallory, Rick Heede, Richard Burkley, Brad Jacobsen, Rich Englehart, and Dan Bartholomew

Virtual: Bruce Gordon, Auden Schendler, Mike Solondz, Clint Kinney, Sara Ott, and Catherine Christoff

Not in attendance: Jacque Francis

Gallery: Andrew Doremus, Bill Tomcich, Jonathan Jones, Ellen Anderson, and Langdon Dresser

III. Approval of Meeting Minutes: Minutes approved from 4/21

IV. Board Comments:

-Valerie asked if Dan has gotten the information about Aero. Dan replied not yet and he may not be able to get it.

-Bruce – why not. Dan answered the records might not be easy to get because the charters have different rules and records are not always accurate or discoverable.

-Bruce asked isn't that a big issue for the airport and Dan replied that it isn't because charters go through the FBO.

-Howie – we lease the FBO to Atlantic – isn't it in our agreement that they show how many people go through. Dan answered that it is not but we can possibly add that to the next lease.

-Bruce asked if charters impact Airport emissions. Dan said the number of operations does, not the number of passengers. He added that the number of operations is easy to track.

-Bruce stated that charter service has increased and Dan agreed.

-Howie would like this discussion to remain on the table.

-Meg – Regarding the letter from Amory Lovins, the AAB members were sent an email from Jacque outlining that staff is reviewing and will not be addressing it at this meeting. Once responses are complete it will be addressed and Dan will send them to Mr. Lovins. Meg added that many of the issues raised would be items on future agendas.

-Dan told the board that our emissions consultants are responding to some of Mr. Lovins questions and they will be here for the June meeting. Our noise consultants will also be scheduled sometime this summer.

-Howie asked if the emissions consultants will have data and Dan replied yes. Dan encouraged the board to ask questions while they are here. In addition, Mary Vigilante with Mead & Hunt will be here to walk through how they model emissions data.

-Valerie asked if the modeling is based off Aspen data and Dan replied yes – GA and commercial activity, vehicle activity, equipment, etc...

-Meg was tasked to remind the board that Public Comment is a time on the agenda to hear from the public and is limited to 3 minutes. There should not be a discussion at that time

but if the board decides a topic needs more attention they will schedule it on a future agenda.

-Valerie added regarding the Amory Lovins letter that she is not complaining that it has not been addressed yet but stressed that it should not be put off too long as it would lose emphasis. Valerie also stated that she does her own research and she encouraged the other board members to do their own as well.

-Valerie then added that she is still very curious about the changes the FAA made and noted that the board had not heard back on that. Dan responded that the FAA Advisory Circular that was updated went from approximately 350 pages to 500 pages and for him to compose what has changed will take a fair amount of time.

V. Public Comment:

-Bill Tomcich – One subject that repeatedly comes up in these meetings is reporting Part 135 scheduled charter operations. The detailed data that people are seeking just does not exist. They (Aero, Wildcat) are not required to report and it is the same at other airports. The level of sophistication on reporting numbers is nowhere near that of commercial services and it is not realistic to expect the same amount of data. This is a nationwide issue. Howie stated that if this data exists and they use our facility we should be able to require them to provide it.

-Ellen Anderson stated that she is very surprised that the AAB does not want to hear from Amory Lovins before the consultants, as he will bring up some very good points. In addition, on February 11 one of the County Commissioners posted a promotional piece for Signature Aviation on social media. Ellen has contacted the County Attorney but has not heard back and she is happy to share more information with anyone that wants it.

VI. Old Business:

a. Dan let the board know that the chat feature has been disabled to prevent behind the scenes conversations. This is a public meeting and all discussions need to be captured in the official meeting minutes.

VII. New Business:

a. Dan – We received a request from a board member for the number of gallons delivered into aircraft from Atlantic Aviation. 2018 - 2021 totals have been sent to each AAB Member.

-Valerie stated that these are from before and during COVID and the numbers have increased tremendously compared to pre COVID.

-Rick added that he was the board member that requested the information as part of his emissions calculations.

-Howie asked if there is sustainable fuel included and Dan replied yes, it is part of the mix. FAA regulations allow up to 30% of the jet fuel to be sustainable. He added that this fuel is very difficult to get.

b. ***Airfield Pavement Repairs and Condition Presentation*** - Dan

- Runway Pavement Conditions
 - ASE has been having on going issues with cracking, raveling, and spalling.
 - Most of our pavement is pushing its 20 year useful life – nearing the end
- Runway Pavement Conditions – Subsurface

- Core samples taken exposed subsurface failures that are causing the top pavement to fail due to age
 - See photos in presentation: 1st photo at southeast end, 2nd photo in the center, and 3rd photo at the northeast end
 - Dan added that where Owl Creek goes under the runway there might be some joint issues in the pipe, which is causing pumping of the water. This can get into the subsurface and cause damage. Dan said we are getting to a point where we will have to do a complete rehab of the runway and our engineers are predicting 2024.
- Runway Rehabilitation Efforts – May 2022 (See presentation aerial photo)
 - Green and Blue indicate mill and overlay. They dug out 3 inches of asphalt.
 - Yellow indicates mill, overlay, and crack seal
 - Dan added that we are having these issues on at least the northern 2/3rds of our runway in the keel section – which is the hardest hit pavement by aircraft landing.
- Airport Pavement Condition Index (See chart in presentation)
 - Dan said the pavement starts out good and as time passes we use preventative maintenance and minor patching. Once it reaches a certain age, it starts to get exponential in its deterioration. Aspen Airport has been diligent about doing mill and overlay projects but the deterioration continues. We do not do a Defer Action – we try to maintain. ASE is now right in the middle of the graph heading into reconstruction mode. This is why completing the ALP is so important.
- Correlation to ALP Project
 - Existing ALP shows runway shift (Current official ALP)
 - Need FAA concurrence of taxiway shift versus runway shift (CGR) via updated ALP (Current effort)
 - Without FAA concurrence:
 - Airport not eligible for AIP Funding for runway reconstruction (\$ Millions)
 - Runway reconstruction cannot take place. They will not give us funding to rehabilitate a runway they think might shift. ASE cannot afford to do it without funding.
 - ASE has only one runway. If the runway pavement “fails”, the runway closes.
 1. Need time to acquire FAA Funding
 2. Perform Environmental Evaluation Update
 3. Design/Engineer Reconstruction
 4. Construct
 - Dan stated that all of these things take time, which is why we need to move forward with the ALP Project
- Questions?
 - Meg asked how much time did we buy with what was done this May? Dan replied that last year we only closed for one week and did some critical work. This year it was 2 weeks since we did the entire keel section hoping that we will

not need to shut down next year. Our Engineers are going to do more ground penetrating studies and there may have to be some phasing involved but looking at a month or two closure in 2024.

-Valerie asked if there has been any feedback from the FAA about leaving the runway where it is. Dan responded that there has not been thus far but they will be working closely with the FAA and building a relationship. All of our initial conversations have been positive.

-Valerie questioned if this is going to push us towards having to make a final codification of a runway that is 150 feet wide. Dan answered that is a difficult question. There is a good possibility the FAA will let us just rehab the runway where it is and then at some point in time we would have to go to Group 3. Dan added that he does not think there is a need from the FAA to make us do this immediately however, it is still in the realm of possibility.

-Rich stated that would be our approach as well. The community has placed priority on the terminal, which will cost a lot of money so the farther we can push the runway out, the better.

-Mike was curious if the FAA is not up for funding smaller rehabs because we will need a full reconstruction in the near future, is the money coming out of the operating budget. Dan replied no, they are willing to pay for minor repairs using money we get on an annual basis – Entitlement Funds. For the project in 2024, we will have to go out for Discretionary Funds and we will have to compete for that funding.

c. Procurement Process – Rich

-There was an assumption that we were hiring the same firm we has used in the past. We want to be clear on how we go about selecting consultants. We have a Procurement Department that handles all of our RFPs and RFQs and it is a very strict legal process. The staff will develop a scope of work and we will reach out and ask for input from the AAB on the upcoming FBO RFP. By County code it has to be a competitive process - the RFP is put on BidNet which is nationwide and most contractors are familiar with this platform. The submittal process is very specific in what it requires and it spells it out – it has to be a certain font, a certain amount of words, etc... If the process is not followed they will be disqualified. Questions during the process are sent to the Procurement Department – staff does not address them. Procurement collects the questions and sends out an addendum for clarification – this can happen more than once. They must verify they have received those as part of their submittal. Staff will put together a team from either the County or people we have a contract with. We do not invite the general public into these because if the applicant does not get selected it can go through an appeals process. There is a scoring sheet based on percentages for different things. The team will score each without seeing each others scores and then they are compiled. If there is a clear winner, the process is over. Staff will do a notice of award and sit down to work on a contract. If terms cannot be reached, we go to the second choice, etc... or then re-advertise. It is a long process. Jacobsen/Daniels was one of the seven that started for the ALP process that was then narrowed down to four. They came in

to give a presentation with the scoring committee and Jacobsen/Daniels was selected. The assumption was that Kimley-Horn was going to do the work but that is not the case. From the standpoint of the FBO we have asked for input and we have received some, which we plan to put in the scope of services. We will share with the AAB the RFP before it goes out but it will be in confidence. If anyone has a conflict, you must let us know. We are forming a team right now – for ALP RFP Community Development, Public Works, and three from the airport were involved. For the FBO we are looking at perhaps the County Engineer, myself, Jacobsen/Daniels, Ricondo (Our financial consultant) as they come with the expertise we need. When/if we bring in some for presentations, we are checking with the County Attorney if we can have one or two of you sit in but not as a scoring person. There will be non-disclosures that will have to be signed.

-Bruce asked what is the role of the AAB in this – is there involvement in choosing the FBO firm/individual. Rich answered that they have been talking to John Ely about having 1 or 2 board members sit in on any presentations but we cannot have you be part of the scoring team. We need your help on the front end – who best meets our criteria. This helps in the evaluation because if there are points out there that need to make it into the RFP we want to know. This will go to an Executive Session and the BoCC is the ultimate decision makers.

-Meg asked if we have a timetable for the Executive Session. Rich replied not yet but we are hoping to get the RFP out by June or July so it will be within that period of time.

-Rick asked for clarification on which RFP the AAB is invited to participate in and Rich replied it will be the FBO. Rick added what about the Terminal Design. Rich said that is a whole different thing. The AAB will be heavily involved in that – it will be a larger public process. We will need an engineer and an architect and we will have to do a procurement process for both.

d. *Presentation by Jacobsen/Daniels*

-Brad – We are very excited to be here. I am one of the owners of Jacobsen/Daniels, I've been doing this for over 20 years and I just want to present our initial thinking on the scope. I want to hear from you and for this to be conversational. Please interject with any questions.

Project Objectives:

- Why? To achieve the community goals (CGR) and meet the FAA's mandate for safety
- How? Provide technical analysis/stakeholder coordination to translate/validate the CGRs
- What? Update ALP drawing and implement roadmap

Translate Settled Common Ground Recommendations:

(Meet FAA Specifications)

- Translate the CGR into a set of plans the FAA will accept
 - Orthorectified Mapping
 - AGIS Format
 - AC 150-5300-13B

- AC 150-5070-6B
- AC 150-5300-16B
- AC 150-5300-18B
- Validate the unsettled CGR – Add Technical Analysis Study
 - What is not sufficiently defined?
 - What does not yet meet FAA criteria?
 - What is not yet functionally viable?
- Areas for additional study/analysis
 - ATCT Relocation
 - Taxiway shift impacts
 - Fleet Mix forecast
 - Existing FBO Leasehold
 - Westside GA Development
 - Terminal Modernization

-Questions?

-Valerie stated that it will be a tight squeeze – she needs to be convinced there is actually enough room. Brad replied that they anticipate there will be multiple solutions.

-Valerie also asked if the development at the Lumberyard get encompassed in this and Brad answered that he will speak about situations like that later in the presentation but not specifically that situation.

-Howie asked if Brad had been involved in something of this scale before and at what scale. Brad answered the tight space is a very common problem – most of his previous clients have had the same issues. The bigger challenge that we will have here is not only defining what you do but when you do it – can you afford it and how do you prioritize.

-Howie – Regarding the availability of funding, do you see any trends that you need to be mindful of? Brad replied that the bipartisan law identifies around 20 billion for airport development and it is broken into different categories. Aspen is a non-hub airport so we will be competing with all the other non-hub airports for that portion of the money over the next five years. The sooner you can be ready to be first or near first in line and the better plan you have, the higher your chances of getting that money.

-Brad – The last thing I wanted to touch on is the **Terminal Modernization**. That was the part that the community supported and wanted to get involved in. Also, the Fleet Mix Forecast really has been settled but you really want to keep looking at it because it will continue to change – you want to stay current.

- Incorporate other “Common Goal” Considerations
(Potential Near-Term Opportunities)
 - Land Swaps
 - Employee Housing
 - Geothermal
 - Solar Panels
 - Microgrid
- Implementation Roadmap
(Project Sequencing)
 - AIP Projects
 - ROM Cost Estimate

- Sources and use of Funds
 - FAA Grants
 - PFC/CFC
 - Rates and Charges
 - Revenue Bonds
- Phasing Sequence
 - Match need, funding, federal approvals

Environmental Processing:

- The FAA issued a FONSI/ROD in July 2018 for an EA of shifting Runway 15/33 to the southwest and a number of terminal area improvements
- CGR call for shifting Taxiway A (and relocating ATC Tower) instead of shifting Runway 15/33 to minimize impacts to the community
 - Step 1: Compare CGR to the previous EA project components
 - Step 2: Coordinate with FAA on desired approach
 - Step 3 Perform NEPA Analysis/Secure unconditional FAA approval

Environmental Processing:

(Time & Effort)

- If ALP components and related impacts are similar, FAA may determine they are adequately addressed under previous EA. (Least time & effort)
- If not FAA may require a written re-evaluation or a supplemental EA. (More time & effort)
- If not and ALP components vary substantially from the previous EA, the FAA will request an entirely new EA. (Most time & effort)

Environmental Processing:

(Initial Strategies)

- 1) "Separate" the CGR Terminal Improvements (same/similar as previous EA) to avoid additional NEPA Processing and enable terminal planning and design process to begin
- 2) "Disconnect" Taxiway A shift to avoid delaying the terminal work
- 3) Potential Supplemental for the Taxiway A shift (Faa coordination on ATCT relocation)
- 4) Section 163 determination for remaining ALP components (including "other considerations")

-Valerie – just so I am remembering correctly, the EA was about noise and emissions in the area, not an operational assessment of the airport – the construction of the original project. It is not significant because we are not moving the runway. Brad replied that it is not only the construction of the project but also the operations of the airport after it is constructed. It is the environmental impact of just this project.

-Howie – who actually reaches out to the FAA? Dan replied that it will be a combination of himself, Rich, and Jon Peacock. The BoCC signs the final EA in partnership with the FAA.

-Rich added that if there are big changes that come out of the meetings with the FAA, those will need to come back to this board.

-Rick – Do the CGR include widening the runway and what size aircraft would then be permitted? Dan answered that the FAA puts everything into boxes: Design Group 1 –

small GA planes, Design Group 2 – slightly larger planes, and then Design Group 3. The FAA does not like anything in between, which is where we are now. We have to move to Group 3 and an example of a Group 3 aircraft is an Airbus 220. We have a modification standard right now as we have exceeded Group 2. If we wanted to move back to Group 2 we would lose all of our airline service. This comes down to Fleet Mix. Examples of Group 3 aircraft is an Airbus 220 and also the 737. Dan added that he believes it is questionable at this point if the 737 can operate out of Aspen efficiently and economically. Rick also added that there is a nondiscrimination clause and Dan replied yes, it is a Federal Funding issue.

-Bruce – two questions– 1) Do we have any control over putting in gates and distances between gates to mitigate bringing in the 737s? Dan – no you cannot design a terminal to get around an aircraft that your runway can serve. 2) Why would a group two not work if the current mix is the way it is? Dan – the aircraft we have now are bigger than a Group 2 aircraft but not quite full Group 3. We have also received funding for the size runway we have – we would have to pay back millions to revert back to a lower class airport.

-Rick – There has been concern about the E175. Why are we allowing that to fly in? Dan – we can't make that call – if it meets requirements we have to accommodate.

-Rick – Are we required to strengthen our runway to allow for larger Group 3 aircraft? Dan – yes, all must meet Group 3 standards – we can try to negotiate but we do not have the final say.

-Rick asked Brad if widening and strengthening the runway to allow for Group 3 would trigger a new EA. Brad replied, not necessarily, as that was the plan before.

-Howie asked if SkyWest had started operating the E175 and Dan replied yes – Sun Valley, Eagle...

-Valerie asked Dan if many other airports have modified standards and he replied yes. She then made the statement – do we want bigger private jets coming in? Strengthening and widening will allow for significantly larger jets, which will mean less parking. Valerie added that the community is very concerned if we become a Group 3 airport we will have no choice but to allow bigger GA planes. She added that she believes a vote to the people would go against this.

-Mike stated the he and Bill Tomcich had served on the Technical Working Group and researched that there are very few planes that cannot already fly into Aspen.

-Valerie insisted that the board needs to be very sensitive to the fact that people do not want to have so many operations at the airport because there will not be anywhere to park.

-Rick – this community has a sensitivity to the 737 and Dan added that getting one in would be doable but getting one out would be difficult.

-Mike added that everyone is interested in getting the safest most practical layout for the runway and taxiway. He asked Brad if the best solution goes against the CGR would he bring it to the table. Brad replied that as consultants they will always bring what we think is the best solution but I don't believe our role is to evaluate the runway. Our role is to translate the CGR and put them into a document that is acceptable to the FAA. Dan added that the ASE Vision CGR is the Masterplan of this project. If the FAA came back and said no you can't move that taxiway we would have to look at other alternatives.

-Howie – The guardrails are the CGR and that may not match up with the best solutions but the public has to get behind that – not what the consultants say to do. Brad responded with yes, that is correct. My role is to facilitate the CGR.

Project Schedule:

(Briefing Schedule and Input)

- AGIS Delivery – 6 months
- Planning Support and ALP Delivery – 12 months
- Environmental Processing – 18 months
- Community & Coordination – 18 months

-Brad said they plan to touch base with the AAB every couple of months

-Valerie said that may not be enough once it gets started

-Meg – the more the better

-Mike agreed – work group sessions may be needed. Rich added that the bylaws are set up to allow that.

-Meg asked how we negotiate with the FAA to move up the terminal timeline sequencing issue. Brad replied that we can't really ask for money until they have approved the project. The goal is to break that out as a separate project, get it approved, even though we have not completed the rest of the ALP. The FAA can and will often do this for specific projects.

-Howie – since the FAA will not give money until everything is approved is the ALP funding coming out of County funds or enterprise funds? Dan replied that it is not – we have grants that will pay for Jacobsen/Daniels.

-Valerie – didn't a grant fund the Visioning Process? Dan answered no, that was all County money.

-Rick asked where Brad is based and he replied Detroit.

-Rick then asked if Brad will do a carbon inventory of all his travels back and forth and Brad said that he would.

-Howie – Brad, have you ever done a project comparable to this – one runway and a lot of competing GA and commercial. Brad replied he had not worked with a one runway airport but he had worked with other resort towns. Others on his team (they are 5 total) have worked with similar airports in Colorado.

-Meg asked if Brad would be here often and he answered, every month but he is not relocating

-Dan added one follow up to Valerie's earlier statement: It is not parking or anything else that controls our operations – it is airspace.

-Valerie agreed but added that we do have to acknowledge that we have very little ground space and if larger planes come in they will be the ones to park here. She also added that transportation is another issue the community is very concerned about.

-Bruce noted that often planes are forced to circle above during busy times, waiting for a plane to take off, as there is nowhere to park.

-Jonathan asked if he could make a clarification. The 30% is the sustainable fuel mix.

-Sara asked if managing traffic would be in the scope of the AAB. Rich replied that we probably will have to get into these types of discussions (engineering impacts) but that is quite a ways down the road. Dan added that the FAA does not weigh in on those types

of issues. As part of their scope, Jacobsen/Daniels will be looking at parking alternatives and traffic impacts.

VIII. Next Meeting: June 16, 2022. Meeting Adjourned 4:57PM