

**Notice of a Meeting of  
The Baraboo-Wisconsin Dells Airport Owners**

**Date and Time:** Thursday, September 15, 2016, 10:00 a.m.

**Location:** Baraboo City Hall, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor Council Chambers, 135 4<sup>th</sup> Street, Baraboo

**Owners Noticed:** WI Dells: Nancy Holzem, Baraboo: Michael Palm, Village of Lake Delton: John Webb, Town of Delton: Larry Volz

**Others Noticed:** Cheryl Giese, Edward Geick, Deborah Kowalke, Kay Mackesey, Media, Tom Diehl, Bill Murphy, MSA Professional Services, Bureau of Aeronautics

**CALL TO ORDER**

**INTRODUCTIONS**

**BUSINESS ITEMS**

1. Approve Agenda.
2. Approve previous minutes.
3. Review and consideration related to planning and design of runway reconstruction project including possible widening. Review, discussion and possible decision concerning option A: reconstruction of existing footprint and option B: widening to 100'.
4. Review, discussion and possible decision concerning funding options for the runway reconstruction project including possible widening.
5. Other Comments.
6. Next meeting date.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Michael Palm, Mayor of Baraboo

---

Posted on 9/7/2016

**PLEASE TAKE NOTICE** that any person who has a qualifying disability as defined by the Americans with Disabilities Act that requires the meeting or materials at the meeting to be in an accessible location or format, should contact the Municipal Clerk, 135 4th Street, or phone 355-2700, during regular business hours at least 48 hours before the meeting so that reasonable arrangements can be made to accommodate each request.

It is possible that members of, and possibly a quorum of members of, other governmental bodies of the City of Baraboo or other Towns and Villages who are not members of the above body may be in attendance at the above stated meeting to gather information. However, no formal action will be taken by any governmental body at the above stated meeting, **other than the body identified in the title of this notice.**

**FOR INFORMATION ONLY, AND NOT A NOTICE TO PUBLISH**

Present: Michael Palm (Baraboo), Larry Volz (Town of Delton), Nancy Holzem (City of Wisconsin Dells)

Absent: John Webb (Village of Lake Delton)

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

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

### Runway Reconstruction Project

Mark Graczykowski and Mike Hinz of MSA Professional Services presented three alternatives for reconstruction of the paved runway at the Baraboo Dells Airport. Alternate A is the reconstruction of the present footprint (75' wide by 5010') to B-II Aircraft standards, including adding more base, grading, strengthened pavement, replacement lighting, and restriping. No environmental study or change in the runway protection zone is required as there is no change in class of aircraft being served. The timetable is for design to occur over the winter months with bidding in August of 2017 and construction in 2018. The estimated project cost is \$2.9M with a 5% local share of \$145,000.

Alternate B is widening the present runway as designed for C-II Aircraft standards. The length remains the same but because of the upgrade in aircraft design standards, the owners will need justification of 500 operations per year to qualify for state and federal funding. The owners anticipated that this would be very difficult to obtain, even though present reports indicate roughly half of the required amount currently exists. Upgrading to C-II aircraft also requires a master plan to document the need for upgrading to service C aircraft as well as requiring an environmental study. The larger aircraft also increase the runway protection zone, so both North Reedsburg Road and Pitt Road fall within the RPZ limits. FAA regulations do not allow for roads within the RPZ areas. To avoid North Reedsburg Road, the runway can be shifted to the south by 825' requiring land acquisition and relocation of Pit Road or engineering a bump out around the RPZ. The owners learned that designing for C-II standards will add about 10 years to the project and feared that the present pavement condition would not survive the timeline. The estimated project cost is \$8.5M.

Alternate C is widening the runway for C-II standards and using B-II standards for all other features of the project. The 75' width is eligible for state and federal funding and the 25' widening would be funded as a local project. A small environmental study is required due to the widening, but no runway protection zone analysis is required since there is no change in class of aircraft being served. The timeline is the same as Alternate A and the estimated project cost adds \$800,000 as the local share for the widening portion.

With all options, the airport would be closed for the greater share of the construction season and the length remains the same at 5010'.

After hearing the explanation of the alternates, the owners questioned why widening would be necessary and who is asking for the extra width. Bill Murphy was contacted by telephone and he explained that safety reasons are a major contributing factor supporting the widening as 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. Bill also stated that he has been in contact with two individuals who may be willing to financially contribute toward the widening and he will meet with them to explain the project and report back to the Owners. The telephone conversation ended with Bill.

The Owners discussed Alternate B as being a future goal, but it is not feasible to delay the reconstruction for another decade due to the pavement and lighting condition. So they focused more on Alternates A and C, showing strong support for Alternate A, rebuilding the current footprint.

The Owners discussed paying for the 25' width as a local project, recognizing that the preliminary plans are being introduced today and several expressed the financial difficulty of coming up with the needed local share. It was noted that a final decision on what the scope of project will be needs to be decided by August so that the Engineers can complete their work according to the original timeline. MSA offered to create an electronic presentation explaining the project which could be circulated among the communities and airport users.

The Owners discussed the estimated financial obligations of this project:

Estimated Project Costs and Cost Sharing	Fed/State	Local
a. Reconstruct runway and lights	\$2,900,000	\$145,000
b. Widening	0	800,000

The Owners decided to empower Bill Murphy to discuss the project with airport users, hoping to generate interest and support among them. The owners will meet again in August to review local support for the project.

Possible funding sources to be explored 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.

Next Meeting – The group agreed to meet again in late July to finalize design parameters.

Cheryl Giese  
City Clerk-Finance Director  
Airport Manager  
City of Baraboo

**BARABOO – WISCONSIN DELLS AIRPORT**  
Runway 1/19 Reconstruction Alternatives Matrix

Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>75' wide runway</li> <li>B-II design standards</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>100' wide runway</li> <li>C-II design standards</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>100' wide runway = C-II design standards</li> <li>B-II design standards for other features</li> <li>Hybrid mix of design standards</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Length remains same @ 5,010'</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Length remains same @ 5,010'</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Length remains same @ 5,010'</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Eligible for state and federal funding as B-II</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Need justification to meet eligibility for state and federal funding as C-II</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>75' of pavement would be eligible for state and federal funding as B-II</li> <li>25' of pavement would be locally funded</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>User study and projections needed to justify 500 annual operations by "C" aircraft</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Master Plan generally required by FAA to document need for upgrading to serve "C" aircraft</li> <li>Change in the class of aircraft being served is a triggering event that requires Master Plan</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No Environmental Study required as the construction footprint for the project is not changing from existing conditions.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Environmental Study after Master Plan</li> <li>Change in the class of aircraft being served is a triggering event that requires Environmental Study</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Small Environmental Study required because construction footprint is slightly wider than existing conditions</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No Runway Protection Zone (RPZ) Analysis required. No change in class of aircraft being served</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Runway Protection Zone (RPZ) Analysis. Change in the class of aircraft being served is a triggering event that requires RPZ Analysis or RPZ must be owned in fee by Airport and be free of objects and incompatible land uses</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No Runway Protection Zone (RPZ) Analysis required. FAA funding only "B" class of aircraft and therefore no change in class of aircraft being served</li> </ul>

Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See sketch to show relationship to the Airport environs</li> <li>• There are no direct impacts or consequences anticipated with the reconstruction.               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ The RPZ for Runway 19 approach contains North Reedsburg Road. A reconstruction project with the same footprint does not trigger the requirement for the RPZ to be a completely free of objects and incompatible land uses</li> <li>✓ The Airport should upgrade the Clear Zone Easement (CZE) in the approach to Runway 1 to eliminate the irrigation equipment in the RPZ and CZE</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See sketch to show relationship to the Airport environs</li> <li>• Anticipated Impact and consequences of change to "C" aircraft standards. Dimensional standards for "C" aircraft are generally wider and longer than "B" aircraft. Runway is currently built to "B" standards.               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Runway Protection Zone (RPZ) size increases and North Reedsburg Road is located in the RPZ of Runway 19. North Reedsburg Road would have to be closed or relocated outside the RPZ or the runway would have to be shifted south to remove the road from the RPZ. There are no plans to close or relocate the Road, therefore the graphics show the runway shifted south.</li> <li>✓ Shifting the RPZ south requires the end of the runway to be shifted south approximately 825'</li> <li>✓ Shifting the runway south requires approximately 825' of new runway and taxiway pavement and removal of the old pavements.</li> <li>✓ Runway Safety Area (RSA) size increases which will require additional grading of a much larger area to FAA standards both off the runway ends and along the runway.</li> <li>✓ Shifting the runway south would require additional land acquisition.</li> <li>✓ Shifting the runway south moves the Runway 1 RPZ south, bringing Pit Road into the RPZ. Pit Road would need to be relocated outside the RPZ</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See sketch to show relationship to the Airport environs</li> <li>• There are no direct impacts or consequences anticipated with the reconstruction.               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ The RPZ for Runway 19 approach contains North Reedsburg Road. A reconstruction project with the same footprint does not trigger the requirement for the RPZ to be a completely free of objects and incompatible land uses</li> <li>✓ The Airport should upgrade the Clear Zone Easement (CZE) in the approach to Runway 1 to eliminate the irrigation equipment in the RPZ and CZE</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C
<p>Timetable- years are cumulative</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ <del>Justification to meet funding eligibility</del></li> <li>✓ <del>Airport Master Plan</del></li> <li>✓ <del>Environmental Study</del></li> <li>✓ <del>RPZ Analysis</del></li> <li>✓ <del>ALP Update</del></li> <li>✓ <del>Land Acquisition</del></li> <li>✓ <b>Design 1 year</b></li> <li>✓ <del>New approaches</del></li> <li>✓ <b>Construction +1 year</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Shifting the runway south may require additional obstruction removal</li> <li>✓ The localizer for the Runway 1 approach may need to be relocated or a new unit installed because the runway is shifted south approximately 825'</li> <li>✓ New approaches to both runway ends would be required. This effort would require following FAA AGIS process.</li> </ul>	<p>Timetable- years are cumulative</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ <del>Justification to meet funding eligibility</del></li> <li>✓ <del>Airport Master Plan</del></li> <li>✓ <del>Environmental Study</del></li> <li>✓ <del>RPZ Analysis</del></li> <li>✓ <del>ALP Update</del></li> <li>✓ <del>Land Acquisition</del></li> <li>✓ <b>Design 1 year</b></li> <li>✓ <del>New approaches</del></li> <li>✓ <b>Construction +1 year</b></li> </ul>
<p>Timetable - years are cumulative</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Justification to meet funding eligibility</li> <li>✓ Airport Master Plan ≥ 2 years</li> <li>✓ ALP Update w/ Master Plan</li> <li>✓ Environmental Study ≥ 2 years</li> <li>✓ RPZ Analysis at same time as Environmental</li> <li>✓ Land Acquisition ≥ 1 year after approved Environmental document</li> <li>✓ Design +1 year after approved Environmental document</li> <li>✓ New approaches to Runway 2 years, occurs concurrently with design &amp; construction</li> <li>✓ Construction +1 year</li> </ul>	<p>Runway 1/19 is in poor condition and needs to be reconstructed in the near future, and the lighting system is very old and needs replacement. Alternative B which requires the funding justification process, a Master Plan, ALP, RPZ analysis, environmental documents, and land acquisition) could take up to 10 years, a time frame that the existing pavement and lighting system may not survive.</p>	<p>Timetable- years are cumulative</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ <del>Justification to meet funding eligibility</del></li> <li>✓ <del>Airport Master Plan</del></li> <li>✓ <del>Environmental Study</del></li> <li>✓ <del>RPZ Analysis</del></li> <li>✓ <del>ALP Update</del></li> <li>✓ <del>Land Acquisition</del></li> <li>✓ <b>Design 1 year</b></li> <li>✓ <del>New approaches</del></li> <li>✓ <b>Construction +1 year</b></li> </ul>

Baraboo-Wisconsin Dells Airport  
Runway Reconstruction/Widening Project  
Potential Funding Sources

August, 2016

Alternative A = Reconstruction of existing footprint at B-II standards

Alternative C = Reconstruction and widening from 75' to 100' Hybrid of C-II standards for 100' runway, but B-II standards for other features

Local Funding Requirement of options:

Option	Cost Estimate	Local Share	Each Owner	Completion
A	\$2.9M	145,000	36,250	2018
C	\$3.7M	945,000	236,250	2018

1. Is there local funding available for widening as detailed in Alternative C and where will this funding come from?

Local Funding options to be considered:

	Option	Explanation
1	Payment up front by Owners	Owners each contribute equally ¼ of the local share upfront.
2	Installment payments to Third Party	Project costs are paid by third party and owners make annual installment payments in equal shares. (Qualifies as GO debt and can be included in the levy limit.)
3	Installment payments to Investment Authority	One owner community with sufficient cash reserves lends funds for project to the 4 owners who make annual installment payments back to Investment Authority. (For the lending community, this is treated as an investment and the borrowing communities treat it as GO debt which can be included in their levy limits.)
4	Installment payments to Borrowing Authority	One owner borrows all project costs and the other owners issue a note payable to the Borrowing Authority. Other owners make annual installments to the Borrowing Authority and budget for their share of debt service. (Qualifies as GO debt and can be included in the levy limit.)
5	General Obligation Debt as Individual Owners	Each community borrows the needed funds as a general obligation debt and budgets in subsequent years for the debt service. (Qualifies as GO debt and can be included in

		the levy limit.)
6	General Obligation Debt as Airport Commission	Cannot be accomplished since the Commission does not have direct taxing authority.
7	Contributions from Airport Patrons (private funds)	Communities accept donations from outside sources towards the runway improvements.
8	Capital Contribution Identified in Intergovernmental Agreement (Current Agreement expires in 2023—would need to extend agreement to cover term of debt)	Owners amend the Intergovernmental Agreement, agreeing to an increase in the annual capital contribution to cover future debt service payments.
9	Tourism Tax	Revenue stream available to 2 of 4 owners
10	Other Ideas?	