

Present: Michael Palm (Baraboo), Larry Volz (Town of Delton), John Webb (Village of Lake Delton)

Absent: rep from Wisconsin Dells

Also Present: Cheryl Giese, Ed Geick (Baraboo), Kim Kaarto (Bureau of Aeronautics), Mark Graczykowski (MSA)

The owner representatives met at the City of Baraboo City Hall.

Summary of Activities -- Cheryl Giese provided a summary of activities since the City of Baraboo began duties as managing owner in 2008, highlighting 2014 and 2015 activities. Focus has been on pavement maintenance and airspace obstruction removal. The Coolidge property is being acquired using state and federal funding.

2015 and future proposed activities include runway design in 2015 with construction in 2017 and continued emphasis on obstruction removal.

Runway Reconstruction Project

The Owners heard reports of the present pavement condition and the deterioration identified between the 2008 and 2012 inspection reports. The last work done to the runway was annual crackfilling and the sealcoating applied in 2011 which extended the proposed pavement lifetime to 2018. However, due to increased jet traffic and heavier aircraft, the pavement has been deteriorating at an escalated pace.

The scope of the runway project for consideration is the reconstruction of the present footprint (75' wide by 5010') including adding more base, grading, strengthened pavement, replacement lighting, restriping and a limited environmental study. Original reports indicated concerns that the FAA may require adjustment of the runway because North Reedsburg Road lies within the Runway Protection Zone. However, Kim Kaarto advised that reconstructing the present footprint will not trigger shifting the runway to the south since it is an existing condition to a present facility. However, changes or upgrades to the facility may be viewed differently by the Airport District Office in Chicago.

The owners discussed lengthening the runway as an option to the project. It was noted that the additional earth moving may require studies such as expanded environmental, wildlife, archeological and master plan. Additional land will need to be acquired and the potential lengthening may also require relocation of Pit Road or engineering a bump out around the RPZ. To qualify for federal aid, proof of 500 operations per year by aircraft requiring the new length is needed. The owners learned that lengthening the runway will add several years to the project and feared that the present pavement condition would not warrant several more years. Kim Kaarto advised that the runway could be lengthened in the future much easier than widening, because the threshold could be displaced while a segment is added to one end. Whereas widening would require another airport closure to lay an additional 25' strip along one edge of the pavement all along the runway. With this information, the Owners decided not to proceed with lengthening the runway at this time.

The Owners considered the option of widening and questioned why it would be necessary. Bill Murphy discussed safety reasons advising that several aircraft have veered off of the runway in bad weather or windy conditions. Several aircraft already using the airport have a wing span that nearly reaches the 75' so the extra 25' width is extremely important. To qualify for federal aid, proof of 500 operations per year by aircraft requiring the extra width is needed. Bill Murphy advised that one operator currently has about 300 operations per year and we would need about 200 more. He feels that there are sufficient operations to qualify for the aid. Kim Kaarto stated that some businesses desire their information to be private and may not want to disclose in writing what they feel are business activities. She also emphasized that it can be a combination of current and future operations by aircraft needing the additional width. Kim also advised that an environmental study and mini master plan will likely be needed but they won't add significant time to the project. The Owners discussed paying for the 25' width as a local project, attempting to avoid state wage rates and therefore reducing the cost of the construction.

The timeline for reconstructing the present footprint is:

a.	July, 2015	Engineering selection, petition for funding	
b.	Fall, 2015 to Spring, 2016	Define scope of project	
c.	2016	Performed required studies	
d.	September, 2016	Identify and secure funding sources, complete 60% plans	
e.	January, 2017	Final engineering plans	
f.	February, 2017	Bid Project	
g.	April, 2017	Commence construction	Airport Closed
h.	July 1, 2017	Substantial completion	(or Runway Closed?)
i.	????	Airport re-opens	

The estimated project costs and cost sharing are:

Estimated Project Costs and Cost Sharing	Fed/State	Local
a. Reconstruct runway and lights	\$2,350,000	\$117,500
b. Widening	0	850,000
c. Lengthening	0	?

Possible funding sources include cost sharing among communities, soliciting private funding from airport patrons, appropriations from tourism sales tax revenue, encouraging new tourism grant opportunities at the State level.

John Webb summarized that the widening is needed for safety reasons and makes sense to do at the time of reconstructing the present runway. He further speculated that funding sources will likely be a combination of sources. Larry Volz suggested that justification be obtained to prove the need for widening and/or lengthening. The City will obtain jet usage data from FlightAware.com for our airport. Volz further discussed that the Town would have difficulty providing their matching funds. John Webb offered to work with the Town concerning payment. It was noted that the communities have 2 years before their project payment is due.

The absence of a representative from the City of Wisconsin Dells was noted. John Webb offered to speak with Mayor Landers advising of this meeting's outcome and also Tom Diehl to discuss tourism grants and tourism tax appropriations.

Ho-Chunk Properties in Trust

The owners reviewed a notice from the Bureau of Indian Affairs that the Ho-Chunk have applied for their property to be accepted "in trust". A response from owners of the airport can be given by June 26th concerning:

1. The annual amount of property taxes currently levied on the subject property allocated to the airport. (Answer is none)
2. Any special assessments that are currently assessed against the property in support of the Airport. (Answer is none)
3. Any governmental services that are currently provided to the property by the Airport.
4. If subject to zoning, how the intended use is consistent or inconsistent with the zoning.

The owners reviewed the properties concerning the height restriction ordinance and the proposed zoning overlay ordinance. The Ho-Chunk application made reference to the properties affected by the height restriction ordinance and it appeared that their proposed property uses voluntarily complied with the height limitation ordinance.

A map of the draft land use zoning overlay was reviewed and compared to the Ho-Chunk properties. It appeared that their proposed property uses voluntarily complied with the intent of the land use zoning overlay to a great extent. The only question was for Parcel E, a portion of which is at the northern tip of

the runway protection zone. Ho-Chunk plans indicate a school complex on that parcel and the owners expressed concern since airplanes in distress are normally attempting to take off or land and can go down in or near the runway protection zone. It was hoped that Ho-Chunk could slightly revise their plans so as not to put their people in harm's way. Questions arose as to whether lands in trust are subject to compliance with zoning regulations of a neighboring community, township or airport. No one knew the answer but Mayor Palm presented research of Oneida Nation and Brown County Airport (Austin Straubel, Green Bay) where the Nation voluntarily complied with zoning ordinances and were not consulted when the zoning was enacted.

Webb and Volz requested a letter responding to the notice in opposition of granting Ho-Chunk's application.

Next Meeting – The group requested to be kept informed about the status of the runway project and agreed to meet again as needed.