



September 16, 2021 Meeting Minutes

Call to Order: Chair Overcash called the meeting to order at 3:35 pm

Roll Call: Chair Overcash, Vice-Chair Fleming, Commissioners Adams, Arndt, Burgener, DiMartino, and Stooksbury were present.

Public Comments: None

Consent Agenda

Vice-Chair Fleming moved to approve the Consent Agenda. The motion, seconded by Commissioner Arndt carried with all the Commissioners present voting in favor thereof.

Pulled Items None

Consent Follow up None

Public Comments: None

Regular Agenda

4. TERMINAL 30% DESIGN PRESENTATION

In November of 2020, the Airport with assistance from the Cities went began a qualification based federal procurement process to select a team of professionals to begin design for the future airport terminal building. As a result, the Airport contracted with the most qualified team that consisted of Denver based engineering firm Dibble Engineering and Fort Collins based VFLA Architects to begin work on the 30% design of the Airport Terminal project. Since this time the project team have conducted four Charrette exercises obtaining feedback from airport stakeholders at every critical design step, with the goal of creating a sustainable iconic new facility that will serve as a new gateway to Northern Colorado air travelers.

During the fourth Charrette the Airport Commission reviewed 15% design schematics and provided direction to staff and the design team to move forward with the original phased design. The building at 30% design is 26,600 square feet, and includes high quality architectural themes and finishes. This item will share the new information about the terminal design to include the next steps in the process. At the October meeting the Airport Commission will be asked to provide the approval to move ahead with the next phase of design. This will include the recommendation to utilize a Construction Manager at Risk or CMaR delivery method which is a qualifications-based selection process



and a negotiated guaranteed maximum price. Staff and the design team will be working this month through next to create the request for statements of qualifications so that this can be solicited for proposals upon approval from the Commission to continue to move forward with completing the design.

Below is a chart that was shared as part of an updated meeting slide summarizing the 30% design cost estimates compared to the 15% design cost estimates.

Project Phase	15% Conceptual Design	30% Schematic Design	Cost Delta
Building	\$11,859,294	\$11,467,390	-\$391,904
FF&E	\$300,000	\$250,000	-\$50,000
Landscape and Patios	\$749,513	\$894,966	\$145,453
Net Construction Cost	\$12,908,807	\$12,612,356	-\$296,451
General Conditions - 6%	\$774,529	\$756,742	-\$17,787
Insurance Bonds - 2%	\$273,667	\$267,382	-\$6,285
Overhead and Profit - 3%	\$418,711	\$409,095	-\$9,616
Estimating Contingency - 5%	\$718,786	\$421,368	-\$297,418
Construction Contingency - 3%	\$452,835	\$434,009	-\$18,826
Cost Escalation (Q1 2023) - 7%	\$1,088,314	\$894,058	-\$194,256
On Costs	\$3,726,842	\$3,182,654	-\$544,188
Total	\$16,635,649	\$15,795,010	-\$840,639

Information above is from cost estimates provided by RLB Cost Estimators

Public Comments: None

5. STRATOP VISION & MISSION STATEMENT ADOPTION

This item is seeking the approval of the drafted Vision & Mission statements as created by Chair Overcash, PDSC member Diane Jones, and Stacy Pearson from Spinnaker Strategies. The statements were reviewed again and a recommendation was provided for this item to help expedite the approval process. The mission statement was adjusted slightly by the Commission to remove a redundancy in the message. The recommended statements for the Vision is item A: “Northern Colorado Regional Airport...sparking innovative transportation and leading edge economic development, training, research and education throughout the region.” and the Mission is also item A: “Serving the region, we are a catalyst for innovation in all modes of transportation, a driving force for innovation in business and training, and a global gateway to a magnificent Colorado.”

Commissioner Arndt moved to approve the new statements as recommended with the deletion of the word “innovation” prior to business in the Mission statement. The motion, seconded by



Commissioner DiMartino passed carried with all the Commissioners present voting in favor thereof.

Public Comments: None

6. REVIEW RFP FOR HANGAR REDEVELOPMENT

At the June 17th Airport Commission meeting, a proposal from Fort Collins-Loveland jetCenter involving redevelopment of the Airport-owned T-hangars was presented. Airport stakeholders expressed concern with the proposal, resulting in the item being tabled. The Commission directed Airport staff and the Planning & Development Subcommittee (PDSC) to provide more opportunity for feedback and to examine potential options and solutions.

At the July 15th Commission, the item was considered for a second time. Stakeholder feedback gathered by email and from the PDSC meeting, considerations, and options were presented to the Commission. Airport Staff and the PDSC were instructed to create a request for proposals (RFP) for redevelopment of the Airport-owned T-hangars and development of new hangars in the area east of Lear Drive.

Airport Staff and the PDSC met on three occasions and feedback has been provided to create a draft RFP. Based on feedback from those meetings and the August 19th Airport Commission meeting, a third site has been added to the RFP. The site, which is located north of runway 6/24 and west of the Centre Point Business Park, has been identified as a suitable location for T-hangars or small box hangars, but lacks infrastructure.

Proposed Evaluation Committee (PDSC except for Airport Commission members)

- Diane Jones – PDSC Citizen Member
- Troy Bliss – Senior Planner, Loveland Development Services
- James Hays – FNL Pilots Association President
- Josh Birks - Fort Collins Economic Health Director
- Jason Licon – Airport Director
- Aaron Ehle - Airport Planning & Business Development Specialist

Proposed Advertising and Selection Process Timeline

- September 16 – Airport Commission approval of RFP
- September 23 – Publish RFP (six-week advertisement)
- November 4 – Close RFP and record submittals



- November 5-19 – Evaluate and score proposals
- November 29-December 3 – Interviews/presentations with top scoring proposers
- December 6-10 – Evaluation Committee prepare final recommendation
- December 16 – Evaluation Committee recommendation to Airport Commission

Commissioner Arndt moved to approve the proposed RFP. The motion, seconded by Commissioner Adams did not pass due to the item being tabled for the discussion at the next meeting.

Public Comments:

Adam Woodward: Site B has been on the table for several months. Site C being a recent opening may also be of interest to the group of pilots I represent but just taking a look right now as pilots that want hangars we have some significant roadblocks to the development of site B that are very expensive as far as mitigating those right now. So just real quick looking at how the FAA designates the KFNL airport it is a non-primary commercial classification that is used by general aviation aircraft that have facilities capable of accommodating commercial services. Master Plan comment real quick moving on to the CARES Act funding we can see that the CARES Act funding \$16.8 million dollars has been designated for commercial 0% percent has been designated for general aviation and I just bring that up real quick, thank you for the time, but to list out some of the development expenses on site B. So site B we have the removal of Lear Drive there is also another Lear Drive from the 1950's parallel to it, there's two roads that would need to be disposed of one curb and gutter one just or two being asphalt the other one would be the traffic study if necessary and the extension of Cessna Drive to Lindbergh Drive um that cost of that Cessna road construction would be quite significant to anyone that wanted to use this site as development knowing that for example business on the north side was just going to do a turn lane was going to be a quarter million dollars so the extension of Cessna Drive to Lear Drive we expect to be somewhere in that same ballpark so that would be placed on the developer right now in the RFP there's no provision for any kind of concessions on development so that's one of the things we think is maybe not leading to site B being shovel ready current lease rate of \$0.31 a square foot that would be more of a shovel ready development right now the site has been reduced 100,000 square feet down to 60 I do think that is more in line with the first row of hangar development each hangar building being ten long is usually 12.3 thousand square feet so you put two together with some square footage with some apron and you pretty much get to 50 60 thousand foot for a row so in a row would be 20. Each row that we've gone through at the cheapest rate without any profit is about \$1.1 million dollars per building so equating to \$2.2 million dollars per row and of course \$4.4 million dollars for the original 100,000 square foot that was originally proposed. That is significant when you look at the we do have to have bonding and a bond to sustain that 100% of the investment. Site B also has excessive distance from the current hangar locations there is a fence that has to be removed there's drainage concern and the very south east corner of the old hangars is an unsatisfactory taxiway we'd have to do drainage conduit underneath the asphalt and then a development of the asphalt out to the east so again just another fee that adds to the expense of the development of site B. The other one is that the RFP



doesn't have any consideration or additions for the perimeter fence so the perimeter fence being FAA standard to surround site B with gate changes and installation was not included also so if that were to be the responsibility of the developer also again a more significant investment for those taking that leased land. Uhhhh what was the last one? and but and then I know we talked about the water tap. Currently right now a one inch water tap is running around \$100,000 dollars so a one inch water tap into the facility which then would be every 500 feet there would have to be one restroom so the one inch water tap would be required for this development and there's no concessions in the RFP right now to assist with the sewer or the water up into that location and that's what I guess that's what I have here. Just making a note I guess that the \$0.31 per square foot in the RFP as I look around the front range Colorado Springs has \$0.21 per square foot for shovel ready development and Greeley has no lease terms so when you do do a development you get the ground for the entire time so uh we were looking to amend the RFP if possible to extend the lease term to 35 years plus the three five years so at least that way we can obtain financing as the financier requires a 30 year loan uh the 25 year lease rate prohibits financing on that property as is. **Ehle:** Two corrections, RFP draft two stated there was a minimum lease rate of \$0.31 per square foot which was removed from the final draft. The Final draft only references that is our base rate for unimproved land and \$0.44 per square foot for improved land that would be shovel ready but we didn't say any proposals must meet any of those numbers. We did word the RFP vaguely on who would be responsible for the infrastructure requirements to see what suggestions we would receive from the private sector. **Licon:** Once of the items has to do with the existing infrastructure and the infrastructure need to be able to serve the site that's certainly something we can include in the language of the RFP not necessarily requiring it as a development driven investment but it could be negotiated. I think having the flexibility of having a request for proposals the proposer could elect what they would want to do and base the negotiated rates on that. We've done that in the past. **Ben Gary, BA Group:** I just want to applaud the depth and breadth of that analysis he hit a homerun with that and also Commission Stooksbury the RFP might have optionality in there of sites B and C I think we have a compelling argument that there really isn't an apples to apples economic comparison to site A and site B. I would just want the Commission to recognize there really isn't an economic comparable for C either. So while we may be checking the box and saying there is optionality built in there really isn't due to economic drivers so the feasibility costs are through the roof as soon as you bring some of this infrastructure in. So to streamline what is already going to be a long process I would just push the Cities to maybe speak internally with the Airport and talk about what the two Cities are willing to contribute to these infrastructure costs just to get a more level field of RFP responses. **Jason Kopp, Blue Ocean Aviation:** Picking up from Commissioner Burgener's statement if there were any other sites that are possible not part of the subcommittee at this time, but the 20-year proposals if we're still looking at a parallel we still haven't extended off the main runway. Are there any sites that would be available off of Boyd that actually feed more of the smaller general aviation sector and drive some of that work down off of Boyd road and leave the other stuff for the bigger projects that will come within the next 20 years. I'm not familiar with the subcommittee's work on other site areas on the field. **Ehle:** We do have long term plans for a parallel runway to our main runway there is land available for aeronautical development out there. There's absolutely nothing out there right now, no roads, no infrastructure, no taxiways. **Licon:** Not really. One thing I do want to point out that we included site C but that was not a site we had received multiple interests in that was discussed previously. We also do include the entire airport development area within the RFP I believe. **Ehle:** Right. **Licon:** We have a reference that shows all the available property on the airport in the RFP as well if we have somebody that would like to develop on that west side that will hopefully be able to



capture some of that interest. **Ehle:** We would welcome any proposals on that side. We also have non-aeronautical opportunities out there. **Burgener:** is there access to the runway from the west side? Is that a big project? **Licon:** There is not. There is a parallel runway slated in that area but no infrastructure that exists.

Chair Overcash moved to approve table the item. The motion, seconded by Commissioner Stooksbury carried with all the Commissioners present voting in favor thereof.

9. Business for Members None

Adjournment: Meeting adjourned at 5:46 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,



Vice-Chair, Tom Fleming

