

**Steamboat Springs Steering Group  
Working Paper 4 Development Alternatives Meeting Summary  
June 13, 2007 4:00 PM Centennial Hall**

---

A Steering Group Meeting was held at Centennial Hall in Steamboat Springs to review and discuss the Development Alternatives Chapter and obtain feedback on recommendations for future development. Attendance at the meeting comprised of 12 individuals, including the Steering Group, the Director of Transportation for Steamboat Springs, Steamboat Springs Airport Manager, a representative from Federal Aviation Administration Denver ADO, a representative from the Colorado Department of Transportation Aeronautics Division and representatives from Armstrong Consultants, Inc.

The meeting agenda was discussed which included Working Paper #4 Development Alternatives along with the next steps for the airport master planning process. The next steps will include gathering the recommendations from the Steering Group and the public and providing the recommendations to the Steamboat Springs City Council to approve the recommended future development and complete the remainder of the airport master plan.

The future airport development was broken down into three fundamental development items which included the taxiway development alternatives, the runway development alternatives and the landside (hangar and apron) development alternatives. Each of the items were addressed separately allowing for input from the group.

The first item of future development discussed was the location of a future parallel taxiway including the offset from the runway. The offset of the taxiway centerline from the runway centerline is dependent upon the instrument approach minimums. The first option for the taxiway offset included placing the centerline of the taxiway 300 feet from the runway centerline, which, would meet the requirements for approach minimums of lower than  $\frac{3}{4}$ -mile (i.e.  $\frac{1}{2}$ -mile) visibility. The second option for the taxiway offset included placing the centerline of the taxiway 240 feet from the runway centerline, which would meet the requirements for approach minimums of as low as  $\frac{3}{4}$ -mile visibility. The consensus on the offset of the taxiway was to place the taxiway at 240 feet from the runway centerline, since the cost of development would be reduced due to lower earthwork requirements, less impact on adjacent land owners and the unrealistic expectations of having instrument approach procedures with lower than  $\frac{3}{4}$ -mile visibility due to existing terrain constraints. The taxiway offset of 240 feet also provides for the possibility of constructing a retaining wall to keep the future taxiway development on existing airport property. The determination to which end of the runway should have a partial parallel taxiway and which end(s) should have bypass taxiways was also discussed. Partial parallel taxiway to both ends of Runway 14 and 32 would require a significant amount of earthwork to meet the grades. Runway 32 has been recognized as the primary runway, therefore a partial parallel taxiway to Runway 32 and a bypass taxiway on the end of Runway 14 have been recommended. The taxiway development would enhance safety and increase the utility of the airport and is currently justified by existing operation numbers.

The second item of future development discussed was the runway length. Several lengths were identified, each accommodating a different percentage of the small aircraft

fleet. The advantages and disadvantages of each runway length were discussed allowing feedback from the group. The cost/benefit analysis was also covered for each runway length showing the estimated increase in revenue from fuel sales and the local development costs. The revenue or subsidy for each alternative was shown for both the City of Steamboat Springs providing fuel and a future private FBO providing fuel. The recommendations as a result of the meeting include showing a future 600 foot runway extension to the northwest to a length of 5,052 feet, and showing an ultimate 728 foot runway extension to the northwest to an ultimate length of 5,780 feet. This will allow the runway extensions to occur as demand justifies and phase the ultimate extension over time allowing for future funding from the FAA and State to potentially become available. Also, these runway lengths including the RPZ will remain on existing airport property. The other alternatives evaluated which included an ultimate length of 7,430 feet and 8,200 feet were determined to be unrealistic during the 20-year planning period and have therefore been eliminated from further discussion.

The third item of future development discussed was the landside development. The landside development includes hangar and apron development. Several areas were identified for future landside development including the conversion of a portion of the automobile parking lot into hangar development, hangar and apron development north of the existing apron, hangar and apron development southwest of the existing apron on the opposite side of Runway 14/32 and hangar and apron development southeast of the existing apron. The advantages and disadvantages were discussed for each location. It is recommended that the airport plan on the development of the parking lot area initially and the area north of the existing apron ultimately. All of the alternatives identified with the exception of the initial parking lot development area, would require significant earthwork to meet grading requirements. The potential development of a residential/airpark was also discussed, however, the FAA and State recommended that the future airpark development not be shown on the Airport Layout Plan, although it could be considered if a private entity approached the City for such a project. Landside cost/benefit analysis was presented for each of the different landside alternatives showing the revenue and expenditures associated with each.

The next step will include releasing the Revised Working Paper #4, the Development Alternatives Chapter. The next meetings include a public information meeting on the Development Alternatives and a City Council Meeting to present the Development Alternative recommendations to the City and to approve the decision on what alternatives will be shown on the Airport Layout Plan Drawing.