



Department of Public Works

Blossom Scott-Heim, P.E.
Director

48 Yaney Avenue, Sonora
Mailing: 2 S. Green Street
Sonora, CA 95370
209.533.5601
www.tuolumnecounty.ca.gov

ADMINISTRATION

Assistant to the
Department Head
Emma Hawks
209.694.2718

AIRPORTS

Airport Manager
Tonya Scheftner, P.G.
209.533.5685

BUSINESS

Agency Fiscal Officer
Doreen Ellis
209.533.5972

ENGINEERING

Blossom Scott-Heim, P.E.
209.533.5904

FLEET SERVICES

Fleet Services Manager
Orlando Magdaleno
209.536.1622

GEOGRAPHIC INFORMATION SYSTEMS

GIS Coordinator
Madeline Amlin
209.533.6592

ROAD OPERATIONS

Superintendent of
Roads and Fleet
209.533.5609

SOLID WASTE

Solid Waste Director
Deborah Reagan
209.533.5588

SURVEYING

County Surveyor
Warren Smith, L.S.
209.533.5626

AGENDA TUOLUMNE COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS AIRPORTS ADVISORY COMMITTEE December 2, 2024, 1:00 p.m.

LOCATION:

Tuolumne County A.N. Francisco Bldg. 3rd Floor
Committees & Commissions Conference Room 3-D

1. INTRODUCTIONS

2. PUBLIC FORUM

The public may speak on any item, not on the printed agenda. No Action may be taken by the committee. The amount of time allocated for the public forum is limited to 15 minutes total.

3. COMMITTEE BUSINESS

- a. Consideration of approving the minutes of the meeting on November 12, 2024.

4. STAFF / COMMITTEE REPORTS

5. DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEMS

- a. Update on the 2024 Airport Feasibility and Viability Study.
- b. Presentation of the Airport Capital Improvement Plan (Columbia).

6. NEXT MEETING—TBD

7. ADJOURNMENT

The Airports Advisory Committee advises the Board of Supervisors on Tuolumne County Airport issues including development, operations, and use. The committee serves as a sounding board and catalyst for the development of recommendations to the Board of Supervisors.

LATE AGENDA MATERIAL CAN BE INSPECTED IN THE AIRPORT OFFICE AT 10723 AIRPORT RD, COLUMBIA, CALIFORNIA. In accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance (i.e. auxiliary aids or services) in order to participate in this public meeting, please contact the Airport Office, (209-533-6688). Notification 48 hours prior to the start of the meeting will enable the Clerk to make reasonable accommodations to ensure accessibility to this public meeting.

Introduction and Acknowledgement

Introduction:

The purpose of this addendum is to document observations, clarifications, and recommendations identified by the Airport Advisory Committee during its review of the Airport Feasibility and Viability Study (Study) for Pine Mountain Lake Airport and Columbia Airport prepared for the County of Tuolumne by Coffman Associates in association with Kimley Horn and Aviation Management Consulting Group (AMCG) (Project Team) dated September 2024.

The Study represents a significant effort to assess the current and future needs of the airports and provides valuable insights for guiding their development. The feedback provided in this addendum is offered in the spirit of collaboration and improvement, with the shared goal to ensure the Study reflects the highest standards of accuracy and relevance for the benefit of the airports and their stakeholders.

This addendum of observations and recommendations by the Airports Advisory Committee (AAC) serves as a supplementary resource and does not alter the core findings or recommendations of the original Study. Instead, it highlights areas where further clarification, context, or data refinement is requested to strengthen the document's utility for decision making. Responses highlighted in red within this document have been prepared by the Project Team after coordination with County staff. Appropriate revisions will be made to the Final Airport Feasibility and Viability Study Report based on coordination between the Project Team and County Staff.

Detailed Observations and Recommendations:

1. National Plan of Integrated Airport Systems (NPIAS)
 - a. Table 1D (page 1-4) makes it appear Pine Mountain Lake Airport has “lost” 111 aircraft in the past 15 years. The AAC acknowledges that the based aircraft numbers reported in the Study align with FAA data; however, according to the AAC, a more accurate assessment may reveal a higher number of based aircraft. This adjustment could better represent the airport's current activity levels such that Pine Mountain Lake Airport (PML) would become eligible for Airport Improvement Plan (AIP) development funds in the future.
 - i. In earlier versions of the FAA's National Plan of Integrated Airport Systems (NPIAS), the number of based aircraft being reported at PML included those aircraft on airport property as well as those aircraft located off-airport property that were provided through-the-fence (TTF) access. In more recent versions of the NPIAS (i.e., 2021 and 2023), it appears the number of based aircraft at PML are tied to what was being reported and validated in FAA's National Based Aircraft Inventory Program. This database accounts for aircraft that are located on airport property and specifically states that aircraft located off airport property, but afforded TTF access, shall not be included as based at the airport. Coffman

Associates will add a note to Table 1D and supporting text in the narrative to indicate that the number of based aircraft reported in the respective NPIAS Reports are based on FAA records and that PML still has a significant number of aircraft (both on-airport and off-airport) that utilize the airport; however, the more recent based aircraft numbers are what is included in the FAA's National Based Aircraft Inventory Program as being validated to PML and located on airport property. With the recent unveiling of the 2025-2029 NPIAS, an additional row will be added to the bottom of Table 1D that calls out PML being included in the "Unclassified" category with 7 based aircraft according in NPIAS year 2025.

- b. In addition, the AAC recognizes that residential-through-the-fence (RTTF) aircraft are not included in the official based aircraft count. However, the AAC requests that the Study include a mention of the numerous RTTF aircraft that regularly utilize the airport are not all represented in Table 1D (page 1-4). This acknowledgment would provide a more comprehensive perspective on the airport's high level of utilization, which extends beyond the reported based aircraft figures.
 - i. Coffman Associates will coordinate with County/Airport staff to add supporting text in the narrative that indicates the number of based aircraft reported in the more recent editions of the NPIAS Reports are based on FAA records and that PML still has a significant number of aircraft (both on-airport and off-airport) that utilize the airport on a regular basis.
2. Economic Impacts
- a. A request to consider any potential impact of revenue for transient occupancy tax from visitors, additional taxes for hangar tax and airplane taxes, etc. if possible, or to note there is additional revenue generated.
 - i. Response: The study scope does not include a tax revenue analysis. The Project Team can add a footnote in each of the Technical Reports where the total impacts are presented to indicate that aviation-related and visitor-related tax revenues were not accounted for in this analysis. As a note, any tax revenues generated from the airports would not directly go back to the airport. Taxes on aircraft registration, aircraft sales, or aviation fuel may be directed toward a state aviation tax fund and visitor-related taxes would go to the respective County or State.
 - b. A concern over using the 2019 Mono County, *Profile of Mono Visitors and Economic Impacts of Tourism* report for the tourist spending portion of the economic analysis. Recommend contacting Lisa Mayo with Visit Tuolumne County for potential modification if data appears relevant.

- i. Response: Kimley-Horn reached out to Lisa Mayo at Visit Tuolumne County to ask if they could provide similar data to what was presented in the 2019 Mono County, *Profile of Mono Visitors and Economic Impacts of Tourism* report. The Kimley-Horn team specifically needs a value for “amount spent per visitor per trip.” After some coordination with Jen Lopez at Visit Tuolumne County, they were able to provide Kimley-Horn with minimal information on “average spend per visitor per trip” but it is not representative of a valid sample size of visitors and would likely significantly and erroneously skew results. Kimley-Horn has requested additional detail in an effort to determine if any of the data from Visit Tuolumne County could be used, however without that additional detail on visitor spending, Kimley-Horn recommends keeping the study as-is using the Mono County data, which is a vetted and published data source.
 - ii. Response: Kimley-Horn expressed during the Airport Advisory Committee meeting that the impact of changing the “amount spent per visitor per trip” would result in minimal changes to the overall economic impact of each airport as the visitor spending component of the total impact is very small (6% for PML and 16% for O22) for the airports. The biggest source of economic impact for each airport is airport business tenant activity (92% for PML and 79% for O22).
- c. Concerns over airport tenant outreach was inadequate information resulting in data gaps.
 - i. Response: Kimley-Horn coordinated directly with County and airport staff at the time the data was collected. Airport staff provided a list of business tenants and indicated that they would be reaching out directly to the business tenants to collect the information requested from Kimley-Horn. All contact with business tenants was conducted via airport staff at the time due to their familiarity with the business tenant staff and existing relationships which often results in increased participation in the survey effort.
 - ii. Response: Several attempts, including emails and phone calls were made to collect data from tenants. When tenants were not responsive, the airport provided estimates of the number of employees at those business tenants to Kimley-Horn for use in the economic modeling.
 - iii. Response: Note that the definition of a business tenant is a tenant which employs staff, even if just one person. Although the project scope did not call for the surveying or inclusion of businesses that are operated out of hangar homes at PML, Kimley-Horn and the airport expanded the scope to include hangar home businesses with one or more employees. These businesses and their employment are included in the study. Similar to airport business tenants, airport staff at the time led the outreach to the

hangar homeowners and provided Kimley-Horn with data that was submitted.

d. General concerns over economic model methodology.

- i. Response: The economic impact methodology employed follows industry standards in terms of study process and methods to collect and model economic data.
- ii. Response: All economic modeling was conducted in IMPLAN, an industry-leading and most frequently used input/output model. IMPLAN is backed by data from the Bureau of Economic Analysis, Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Census Bureau, and the U.S. Department of Commerce.

3. Additional Revenue and Value Considerations

- a. The Study does not appear to capture property tax revenues generated by aircraft and private property (such as office equipment and tools) that directly benefit the county. Additionally, the increased value of parcels adjacent to E45, driven by their proximity to the airport, represents a significant economic contribution that remains unquantified. While some residential properties at E45 may fall under Prop 13 with fixed assessments, it is important to note that many of these parcels are likely to be sold and reassessed in the near future as the current owners age and transition out of the area. This trend underscores the growing potential for higher property tax revenues in the years to come, further emphasizing the airport's role in driving economic value for the county.

- i. Response: The project scope did not include an analysis of tax revenues. Kimley-Horn could add anecdotal information referencing the general benefit of taxes generated by airport activity.

- b. While the Study provides valuable insights into many aspects of airport operations, it should be noted that it cannot fully capture the qualitative and quantitative value of the Columbia Air Attack base, which plays a pivotal role in protecting lives, property, and natural resources across the region.

- i. Response: The project scope did not include a separate quantitative or qualitative analysis for the Columbia Air Attack base; however, the CalFire base was included as a tenant at Columbia Airport and the associated employment and capital expenditures were accounted for in the assessment of the economic impact of O22. Kimley-Horn could add a callout box highlighting the qualitative value of CalFire but a separate qualitative analysis, including interviews, research, and additional documentation is not included in the project scope.

- c. The Study does not capture the non-tenants or vendors that rely on our airports, with local examples such as Sierra Pacific Industries, Diestel Family Ranch, and

Banks Glass, which are large county employers and rely on our airports to conduct business.

- i. Response: The project scope included the economic assessment of on-airport business tenants, but did not include an assessment (quantitative or qualitative) of off-airport businesses that may rely on the airport. Kimley-Horn could add a callout box noting that the study did not include the assessment of off-airport businesses that rely on the airport and mention these specific businesses as examples.

4. Rent Study Considerations

- a. Table 5 ‘Small T-Hangar Summary’ on page 5-14 reports Hangar Rows A-E as “Poor Condition”. The AAC states the ‘Poor Condition’ deducted 10 percent for the market value; the opinion of the AAC is the market value should be closer to 25 percent reduction and notes portions of these hangars are built on a historic landfill with sagging roofs, doors that often won’t slide, and asphalt floors that flood during rain events.
 - i. Response: As stated, Poor Condition noted in Table 5 (Page 5-14) resulted in a 10% adjustment for condition in Table 15 (Page 5-21). During the site visit, the functionality of the doors and flooding issues were not noted. While Poor Condition was identified, an additional adjustment is warranted given new information. However, AMCG does not agree a -25% adjustment for condition is appropriate. Based on AMCG’s experience inspecting T-Hangars at airports, an adjustment of -15% for condition will be incorporated into the revised document resulting in a Market Rent Opinion of \$235 per unit per month.
- b. Page 5-14, second bullet point, reports Hangars F-K has fire suppression and fluorescent lights which is inaccurate.
 - i. Response: Fire suppression for Hangars F-K was incorrectly noted by AMCG. As such, the second bullet point will be revised accordingly. Additionally, the note on fluorescent lighting will be expanded to identify “fluorescent or incandescent lighting”. These changes result in an amenities adjustment from “Good” to “Average” in Table 5 (Page 5-14) and subsequent change from +5% to 0% for Amenities in Table 15 (Page 5-21) resulting in a Market Rent Opinion of \$290 per unit per month (Row F and Row G) and \$302.50 per unit per month (Row J – K).
- c. Page 5-18, footer number 5, indicates “relevant and usable information from Calaveras County Airport (CPU), Castle Airport (MER), Chowchilla Airport (206), Franklin Field Airport (F72), Mariposa-Yosemite Airport (MPI) and Turlock Airport (O15)”. The AAC considers this a significant data gap.
 - i. Response: The airports noted (Calaveras County, Castle Airport, Chowchilla Airport, Franklin Field Airport, Mariposa-Yosemite Airport,

and Turlock Airport) were identified as competitive airports based on a 60-mile radius from Columbia Airport. AMCG contacted each competitive (and comparable) airport at least twice in August 2023 to collect relevant and usable information for the Rent Study. Despite these efforts, information pertinent to the Rent Study was not provided from these airports.

- d. Clarification that conditions of hangars assessed does not account for any structural conditions, rather conditions such as the usability of the hangar was considered. The AAC request a definition to clarify.
 - i. Response: The opinion of condition and amenities is based on AMCG experience which includes inspecting general aviation land and improvements (including Executive Hangars and T-Hangars) at more than 50 airports within the last 5 years. While AMCG does not employ engineers and the inspection should not be considered an engineering inspection, AMCG inspected the hangars to determine an opinion of condition and amenities. The condition inspection includes identifying the presence of deterioration (interior structure and exterior), presence of cracking or deterioration of the concrete or asphalt flooring, usability of doors, and issues pertinent to flooding. The amenities inspection includes identifying electrical distribution (full, partial, none), lighting type and distribution (full, partial, none), T-hangar interior walls (fully subdivided, partially subdivided, or no subdivision), access to restrooms, exterior and interior materials (metal, steel, wood, etc.), flooring (full or partial concrete or asphalt, crushed stone/dirt), door type (sliding metal, bi-fold), and presence of insulation, heating, and/or cooling.

Tuolumne County Airports: Columbia Airport

*Airport Capital Improvement Plan
(ACIP)*

Federal Fiscal Year 2025-2030

Summary

Listed in the following table is a summary of Airport Capital Improvement projects:

PROJECT DESCRIPTION	FAA FY	Environmental Action
AWOS Replacement	2025	CAT EX
Airport Layout Plan Update with AGIS	2025	CAT EX
Pavement Management Plan	2026	CAT EX
No Projects Planned	2027	CAT EX
Design Phase: Runway 17/35 Rehab with Lighting/Wiring Rehab and Upgrade VASI to PAPI	2028	CAT EX
Construction Phase I: Runway 17/35 Rehab with Lighting/Wiring Rehab and Upgrade VASI to PAPI	2029	CAT EX
Construction Phase II: Runway 17/35 Rehab with Lighting/Wiring Rehab and Upgrade VASI to PAPI	2030	CAT EX

1.0 Entitlement & Airport Infrastructure Grants (AIG)Forecast Table

Funding Year	Project Description	Total Project Cost	Entitlement Accrual	Entitlement Amount Available	Entitlement Amount Utilized	AIG Accrual	AIG Amount Available	AIG Amount Utilized	BIL Amount Requested	Federal Share	Local Share
2025	AWOS	\$150,000	\$0.00	\$600,000	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$448,000	\$142,500	\$0.00	\$142,500	\$7,500
2025	ALP with AGIS	\$550,000	\$0.00	\$600,000	\$522,500	\$0.00	\$448,000	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$522,500	\$27,500
2026	Pavement Management Plan	\$90,000	\$150,000	\$227,000	\$85,500	\$144,000	\$449,500	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$85,500	\$4,500
2027	No Projects	\$0.00	\$150,000	\$292,000	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$449,500	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2028	Design Phase: Rehabilitate Runway 17/35 and Rehab lighting/wiring and upgrade VASI to PAPI	\$2,200,000	\$150,000	\$442,000	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$449,500	\$449,500	\$1,530,500	\$1,980,000	\$220,000
2029	Construction Phase I: Rehabilitate Runway 17/35 and Rehab lighting/wiring and upgrade VASI to PAPI	\$3,813,222	\$150,000	\$592,000	\$592,000	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$2,839,899	\$3,431,899	\$381,322
2030	Construction Phase II: Rehabilitate Runway 17/35 and Rehab lighting/wiring and upgrade VASI to PAPI	\$3,660,129	\$150,000	\$150,000	\$150,000	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$3,144,116	\$3,294,116	\$366,013

2.0 Breakdown of Project Expense Per Year

PROJECT	FUNDING SOURCE(S)			
	FAA FY	Full project	95% Federal	5% Local
Automated Weather Observation System (AWOS)	2025	\$550,000.00	\$522,500.00	\$27,500.00
Airport Layout Plan (ALP) Update with AGIS	2025	\$150,000.00	\$142,500.00	\$7,500.00
Pavement Management Plan	2026	\$90,000.00	\$85,500.00	\$4,500.00
	FAA FY	Full project	90% Federal	10% Local
No Capital Improvement Projects	2027	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Design Phase: Runway 17/35 Rehab/Rehab Lighting/VASI to PAPI	2028	\$2,200,000.00	\$1,980,000.00	\$220,000.00
Construction Phase I: Runway 17/35 Rehab/Rehab Lighting/VASI to PAPI	2029	\$3,813,222.00	\$3,431,899.00	\$381,322.00
Construction Phase II: Runway 17/35 Rehab/Rehab Lighting/VASI to PAPI	2030	\$3,660,129.00	\$3,294,116.00	\$366,013.00
Total		\$10,463,351.00	\$9,456,515.00	\$1,006,835.00

3.0 Proposed Future Improvements 2025-2030

Project Guide

Projects contained within this document illustrate the projects as well as give detailed information about the respective tasks. These projects are laid out sequentially in the order that they are expected to happen.

2025 – Development Grant – AWOS

The Need

The AWOS, while operational, has received an end-of-life notice by the manufacturer in October 2014. Parts are no longer made for the AWOS and are difficult to come by as repairs are necessitated. The replacement is essential in maintaining safety, regulatory compliance, and operational efficiency at our airport.

1. Safety Concerns

The AWOS provides real-time weather data essential for pilot decision making. Accurate and reliable information on windspeed, visibility, temperature, and barometric pressure significantly reduces the risk of weather-related accidents. Replacement of the AWOS is recommended.

2. Regulatory Compliance

The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) and other regulatory bodies require airports to maintain operational and accurate weather systems for both safety and compliance, particularly for airports that serve commercial operators.

3. Financial Considerations

Delaying the replacement increases long-term costs. Repairing an outdate AWOS system is expensive, and replacement parts are increasingly hard to source.

Environmental

CEQA: Cat/Ex

NEPA: Cat/Ex

Finance

The proposed project will be financed through 95% AIG funds as well as a 2.5% state and 2.5% local match. Current estimate for the project total is \$150,000.00.

Project Scope

The proposed project would install a new AWOS.

2025 – Development Grant – Airport Layout/Master Plan with Airport Geographic Information Systems GIS Update

The Need

An Airport Layout/Master Plan (ALP) Update with AGIS integration is required by the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) for grant funding and compliance. It provides a roadmap for infrastructure improvements, community engagement, and project alignment with FAA standards.

AGIS integration is a relatively recent FAA requirement, designed to ensure airports maintain accurate, digital geospatial data for improved safety, compliance, and planning. Incorporating AGIS into the ALP Update aligns the airport with modern standards, supports NextGen technology initiatives, and enhances access to federal funding opportunities by meeting this critical regulatory expectation.

Environmental

CEQA: Cat/Ex

NEPA: Cat/Ex

Finance

The proposed project will be financed through 95% AIP funds as well as a 2.5% state and 2.5% local match. Current estimate for the project total is \$550,000.00.

Project Scope

The proposed project would develop an updated Airport Layout/Master Plan with AGIS.

2026 – Development Grant – Airport Pavement Management Plan (APMP)

The Need

An airport pavement management plan is essential for determining the best approach to rehabilitate or reconstruct critical infrastructure, such as Runway 17/35. By using Pavement Condition Index (PCI) surveys and structural evaluations, the APMP provides critical insights into current conditions, identifying issues such as cracking, rutting, or surface wear. This data allows us to determine whether rehabilitation, such as crack sealing or overlay is sufficient, or if a full reconstruction is necessary to address deeper structural deficiencies.

The APMP is a requirement of the FAA for eligibility to access runway rehabilitation/runway reconstruction grant funding. With accurate condition assessments, the APMP supports cost effective decision making, ensuring the runway rehabilitation or reconstruction meets both immediate operations needs and long-term performance goals.

Environmental

CEQA: Cat/Ex

NEPA: Cat/Ex

Finance

The proposed project will be financed through 95% AIP funds as well as a 2.5% state and 2.5% local match. Current estimate for the project total is \$90,000.00.

Project Scope

The proposed project consists of an Airport Pavement Management Plan which will create an updated inventory of all pavement surfaces, assessing their condition through methods like Pavement Condition Index (PCI) surveys, and identifying maintenance or reconstruction needs. The scope ensures compliance with FAA standards, integrates pavement management into the airport's Capital Improvement Plan (CIP), and provides a roadmap for ongoing inspections and maintenance.

2028 – Development Grant – Runway 17/35 Rehabilitation/Lighting Design Phase

The Need

The design phase for runway 17/35, which is the main runway for Columbia Airport, is critical to address its aging infrastructure. The project also includes replacing the outdated runway lighting and wiring systems to enhance operational safety and reduce maintenance costs.

Additionally, upgrading from the outdated (and inoperable) Visual Approach Slope Indicator (VASI) to the Precision Approach Path Indicator (PAPI) will provide more precise guidance for pilots, improving approach safety and aligning with FAA recommendations. Completing these upgrades together as a project will streamline the implementation, reduce financial impacts of the projects if they were completed separately, and was recommended by the FAA to combine.

Environmental

CEQA: Cat/Ex

NEPA: Cat/Ex

Finance

The proposed project will be financed through 90% AIG and BIL funds as well as a 5% state and 5% local match. Current estimate for the project total is \$2,000,000.00.

Project Scope

The proposed project consists of design for the reconstruction, rehabilitation, and resealing of Runway 17/35 as well as the design for the replacement of the outdated electrical and lighting for Runway 17/35. The project will additionally replace the VASI to a PAPI on both approach ends of Runway 17/35.

2029 – Development Grant – Runway 17/35 Rehabilitation/Lighting Construction Phase I

The Need

The first phase of construction will address the core structural needs of Runway 17/35. This includes either rehabilitation or full reconstruction of the runway surface, depending on the findings from the Pavement Management Plan and the Design Phase. Concurrently, outdated runway lighting and wiring in the areas under construction will be replaced with modern, energy-efficient systems. This phased approach was recommended by the FAA.

Environmental

CEQA: Cat/Ex

NEPA: Cat/Ex

Finance

The proposed project will be financed through 90% AIP funds as well as a 5% state and 5% local match. Current estimate for the project total is \$3,813,000.00.

Project Scope

Phase I will focus on the rehabilitation or reconstruction of Runway 17/35 to address structural needs and restore surface integrity. This phase will also include replacing outdated runway edge lighting and wiring in the areas under construction to enhance safety and reliability.

2030 – Development Grant – Runway 17/35 Rehabilitation/Lighting Construction Phase II

The Need

The second phase will complete the runway lighting replacement and wiring updates across the remaining sections. This phase will also include the installation of the Precision Approach Path Indicator (PAPI) system, replacing the outdated VASI. By addressing lighting and navigation aids separately, this phase minimizes the impact on flight operations and ensures that the new systems integrate seamlessly with the rehabilitated runway.

Environmental

CEQA: Cat/Ex

NEPA: Cat/Ex

Finance

The proposed project will be financed through 90% AIP funds as well as a 5% state and 5% local match. Current estimate for the project total is \$3,660,129.00.

Project Scope

Phase II will complete the remaining runway lighting and wiring upgrades and replace the outdated VASI system with a modern PAPI system, providing enhanced visual guidance and aligning with FAA safety standards.