

HEBER CITY CORPORATION
75 North Main Street
Heber City, Utah
Airport Advisory Board Meeting
Wednesday, August 14, 2013

4:00 p.m.
Regular Meeting

Public notice is hereby given that the monthly meeting of the Heber City Airport Advisory Board will be in the Heber City Office Building, 75 North Main, South door, in the Conference Room upstairs. The following items will be discussed:

Agenda:

Approval of Minutes

June 12, 2013, Regular Minutes

- Item 1 Airport Manager Report
- Item 2 Kirk Nielsen, Aviation, Review of Draft Lease Rates and Policy Analysis Report
- Item 3 Discuss Use of Pilot's Lounge
- Item 4 Update on Hangar Sales – Discuss Future Hangar Development
- Item 5 Discuss Airport Board Goals/Projects
- Item 6 Discuss Airport Garbage

Other Items as Needed

Times are approximate and may vary if needed.

Those interested in the above items are encouraged to attend. Order of items may vary if needed. In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, those needing special accommodations during this meeting or who are non-English speaking should contact Karen Tozier or the Heber City Planning and Zoning Department (435-654-4830) at least eight hours prior to the meeting.

Posted on August 8, 2013 in the Wasatch County Community Development Building, Wasatch County Library, Heber City Hall, the Heber City Website at www.ci.heber.ut.us and on the Utah Public Notice Website at <http://pmn.utah.gov>. Notice provided to the Wasatch Wave on August 8, 2013.
Karen Tozier, Administrative Secretary

1 HEBER CITY CORPORATION
2 75 North Main Street
3 Heber City, Utah
4 Airport Advisory Board Meeting
5 Wednesday, June 12, 2013
6

7 4:00 p.m. - Regular Meeting
8

Members Present: Dave Hansen Airport Advisory Board
Kari McFee Airport Advisory Board
Mel McQuarrie Airport Advisory Board
Tom Melville Airport Advisory Board
Erik Rowland Airport Advisory Board
Alan Robertson Airport Advisory Board for Nadim
AbuHaidar

Absent: Nadim AbuHaidar Airport Advisory Board
Jeff Mabbutt Airport Advisory Board

Others: Mark Anderson City Manager
Terry Loboschefskey Airport Manager
Karen Tozier Airport Advisory Board Secretary

9
10 Others: Lew Lott of JUB Engineers, Paul Boyer, Mitch Iordaschescu, and Luke K. Waters,

11
12 Chairman Rowland convened the meeting at 4:00 p.m. with a quorum present. Boardmember
13 Melville was not present at this time.

14
15 **Approval of Minutes**

16
17 **March 13, 2013, Regular Minutes**

18 **May 8, 2013, Regular Minutes**

19
20 Alan Robertson moved that we pass the minutes of our meeting. (the meeting minutes for March
21 13, 2013, and May 8, 2013) Boardmember McFee seconded the motion. Boardmember
22 McQuarrie asked if they were approving both sets of minutes or just one of the meeting's
23 minutes. Alan Robertson stated that he was moving that we approve the minutes from the past
24 two meetings; both of them. Boardmember McFee's second still stood. Voting Aye:
25 Boardmembers Robertson, McQuarrie, Hansen, Rowland, and McFee. Voting Nay: none. The
26 motion passed.

27
28 **Item 1 Airport Manager Report**

29
30 Terry Loboschefskey presented information from his report. Discussion that the 2013 ADP
31 RW4/22 rehab may be delayed due to budgetary constraints; this would put the one month
32 closure of the Airport in either September or May of next year. Alan Robertson commented they
33 would obviously want to make it congruent with their sleepy period. Boardmember Melville

34 arrived to the meeting at 4:14 p.m. The CAF/Boy Scout camping proposal for Spring 2014 was
35 discussed briefly.

36
37 Lou Lott from JUB Engineers and Luke Waters were acknowledged.

38
39 **Item 2** **Review Proposed Scope of Work for Hangar Leasing Policies Project**

40
41 An updated scope of work and project budget estimate had been provided by Jviation for the
42 Board to review. The Board had been tasked with determining if the scope of work was
43 consistent with the City's goals and needs and to make recommendation for modifications they
44 deem necessary. Kirk Nielsen and Craig Sparks of Jviation were to be available by telephone if
45 the Board had any questions about the proposed scope of work. Alan Robertson spoke for
46 Boardmember AbuHaidar. Robertson indicated that Boardmember AbuHaidar is concerned with
47 4.0 Lease Rates and Charges Policy stressing that it be a robust document that will address
48 recurring issues associated with lease rates and charges and not ad hoc. He conferred that
49 AbuHaidar thought more comparable airports were necessary (in excess of 10) and that there was
50 a potential to rely too heavily on survey data that would not fit our circumstances here. These
51 airports do not have amount of fuel and number of operations. Discussion from Boardmembers
52 relating to which airports to add and whether airports that compete with our airport should be
53 added. Chairman Rowland indicated the Board could give Jviation this feedback. Boardmember
54 McQuarrie did not agree with the process that Boardmember AbuHaidar was advising for. It
55 was noted that Boardmember AbuHaidar had indicated he wanted to have the consultant
56 generate the document. Boardmember McQuarrie thought the consultant should bring the data
57 and the Airport Board should generate the document. How much time Jviation would be
58 dedicating to the lease and charges policy was discussed.

59
60 Chairman Rowland commented on the potential the lease rates and charges document might have
61 to influence the type of traffic we are bringing here. He then asked whether we (the Board)
62 should encourage Jviation to draft a complete rates and leases policy or is it realistic that they
63 can't be as comprehensive as we'd like them to be? McQuarrie explained what the data would
64 be that the City would need from Jviation. Further debate of this issue, the nature of this
65 document; should it be a complete document or is it just data.

66
67 Expanding the sample of comparison airports to survey was discussed. Boardmember
68 McQuarrie suggested Friedman Memorial Airport in Hailey, Idaho and Alan Robertson
69 referenced Santa Fe. Chairman Rowland asked the Boardmembers to email himself and Mark
70 Anderson with suggested airports. Alan Robertson suggested airports based on three criteria; the
71 number of annual operations, volume of fuel consumed and number of based aircraft. Chairman
72 Rowland commented about asking Jviation what the factors are that they use. He suggested
73 asking, what did you use to build your sample airports? What factors did you consider when you
74 were putting that together?

75
76 The second question was relating to the data reporting mentioned in 5.0 of the Scope of Work,
77 will that represent how you came to the conclusions for 4.0 specifically economic data justifying
78 decisions that you've proposed so that we can actually see those numbers and it backs up for
79 example why reversionary is better than non-reversionary? Will we have all that information
80 available to us? He asked the Board if this was a fair representation of what they wanted him to
81 ask. The Boardmembers affirmed this.

82
83 The call to Kirk Nielsen and Craig Sparks was made at this time, 5:05 p.m., and Chairman
84 Rowland asked Nielsen the aforementioned questions. Nielsen answered that the primary factors
85 used for putting together the comparable airports list were airports that were similar in nature and
86 area such as Driggs, Idaho. He further commented in answer to the second question that the

87 airports already selected were really close to Heber in operations and in based aircraft. Based
88 aircraft usually translates into similar operations and that is also why these were chosen instead
89 and other airports that were similar that had smaller based aircraft and less operations were
90 removed from the list. He indicated that if there were some airports they'd like to have added to
91 the list they would be happy to add them to the list. The airports mentioned earlier and some
92 new airports to look at were relayed to Nielsen; Sun Valley, Santa Fe, and Grand Junction.
93 Rowland tasked him with looking at these airports based on three criteria discussed earlier; the
94 number of annual operations, volume of fuel consumed; and number of based aircraft and if
95 Nielsen felt there were no factors that would disqualify them to add them to the list of
96 comparable airports. Page, AR, was also mentioned as another comparable airport.

97
98 Regarding the lease rates and charges policy document, Chairman Rowland indicated that some
99 Boardmembers wanted to make sure the process that is going to be implemented to create that
100 document will be satisfactory in getting that end result of what they are looking for. He asked,
101 once this document is created and there are recommendations provided for that document will
102 you provide the data to backup why you proposed what you proposed? Is that going to be
103 provided? Nielsen answered that the information that they collect that goes into the decision
104 making will be prepared (the information that they do use); he pointed out that this is in the
105 scope of work under deliverables. Nielsen suggested moving the open house off a month and to
106 get input beforehand to ensure they are going in the right direction. The Board concurred with
107 this although it could push the end date off another month.

108
109 **Item 3** **Review of Heber City Airport Rules and Regulations and Chapter 14 of FAA**
110 **Compliance Manual 5190.6B as it Relates to Ultralights and Skydiving**
111 **Operations**
112

113 In the past, the Board had expressed concern with certain types of operations at the Airport. The
114 meeting information packet included Section 6.16 of the Heber City Airport Rules and
115 Regulations relating to limitations and activities that require approval and Chapter 14 of the FAA
116 Compliance Manual 5190.6B. The FAA manual gives clarity on the types of conditions that can
117 be imposed by an airport on certain aeronautical activities.

118
119 Mark Anderson related the basic gist of the discussion was that the Airport Rules and
120 Regulations say that certain types of activities need to have permission from the Airport Manager
121 to function at our airport. The FAA regulations basically say that you can impose restrictions on
122 certain types of activities such as gliders, parachute operations, etc., but there has to be some
123 kind of a related safety justification to impose those restrictions. Alan Robertson commented not
124 only safety justification but also efficiency; he felt it was two pronged and could be addressed
125 from both ends; safety or efficiency of aircraft operations. Anderson indicated that although
126 there was nothing glaring there has been concern expressed over the powered parachutes. He
127 expressed that we need to understand the 5190.6B document; as long as we have findings that
128 support restrictions we are on solid ground but we can't impose restrictions unless there is some
129 related safety or act or efficiency and operations criteria that would allow us to do so. Terry
130 Loboschfsky said to keep in mind that if there is any conflict that the FAA has jurisdiction. The
131 point was the Board needs to be cognizant of the FAA's standpoint. If there is any conflict the
132 FAA has jurisdiction over it.

133
134 Discussion on whether there is a need for the aforementioned activities to obtain permission from
135 the Airport Manager. Are the airport rules in line with the FAA regulations? Some thought that
136 the airport's rules may be more restrictive. Chairman Rowland asked the Board, do we want to

137 lighten the regulations that we have currently written to be in more line with what the FAA has
138 written or do we want to leave them as is and beg for forgiveness if there is a complaint and
139 address those as they come in? Alan Robertson answered the second option. Terry
140 Loboschefskey mentioned to keep in mind the other dimension is enforcement; what is the way to
141 go about enforcing something such as a balloon landing and unless someone is there all the time
142 enforcement is a problem. Having these operators obtain written permission from Loboschefskey
143 and that they understand what they need for safety purposes was mentioned. Further discussion
144 on this topic.

145
146 Chairman Rowland summarized the Board's discussion; we are not going to modify our current
147 regulations, leave them as is, and if we do need to introduce new regulations that document our
148 rules and regulations that we make sure they are they are compliant with what the FAA currently
149 has stipulated and we are going to ask Terry Loboschefskey, that as he sees these types of
150 operations that require written permission to visit with them and make sure they understand what
151 is expected of them; that they have radios and whatever safety features (needed). Boardmember
152 McQuarrie stated he seconded the motion. Chairman Rowland indicated he was going to ask for
153 a motion; his summation became the motion which Boardmember McQuarrie had seconded.
154 Voting Aye: Boardmembers Robertson, McQuarrie, Melville, Hansen, Rowland, and McFee.
155 Voting Nay: none. The motion passed.

156
157 **Item 4** **Discuss Future Hangar Development Process**

158
159 This item was continued due to time constraints.

160
161 **Item 5** **Discussion on Glider Trailer Storage Fees**

162
163 At the last Airport Advisory Board meeting the Board had discussed the City allowing the
164 storage of glider trailers on the northeastern end of the Airport where future hangar development
165 is planned. There was no opposition to this but the topic of whether to charge fees or not had
166 been discussed. Brief discussion ensued on this topic. There was consensus that the City should
167 charge a fee for this use and that it should be the same amount that the FBO is charging for this
168 use. There were comments from the Board that they did not want the City to undercut the FBO's
169 rates; they did not want to be in competition with the FBO.

170
171 Boardmember McFee moved that we charge the \$20.00, whatever is comparable to the FBO to
172 the glider group; if they are renting or storing their hangars in another rental place then we waive
173 the rental fee for the trailer. Boardmember Melville seconded the motion. Voting Aye:
174 Boardmembers Robertson, McQuarrie, Melville, Hansen, Rowland, and McFee. Voting Nay:
175 none. The motion passed.

176
177 Mark Anderson indicated they could look at adding this as an amendment to the consolidated fee
178 schedule when the City Council is looking at adopting the budget next week.

179
180 **Item 6** **Discuss Airport Board Goals/Projects**

181
182 Chairman Rowland indicated that there would be important information coming from the study
183 discussed earlier and the Board should come prepared to articulate what the Airport means for

184 the City and at some point to present this information to the City Council and this could be very
185 helpful for future potential. He indicated that they should look at and add any other goals or
186 projects that they think they may need to look at at the Airport.

187

188 **Comments from public:**

189 A member of the public, Mitch Iordaschescu, asked to be able to comment on future hangar
190 development at the Airport. He indicated he is probably going to lose his hangar because the
191 owner has sold it. He has three or four people who would like to build t-hangars. He proposed
192 to use the same builder who built the last hangars and they would pay for the cost of them. He
193 indicated they need decisions from the City as to what they can do as far as dimensions, etc. He
194 would like to get enough people to do at least half of the t-hangars. Anderson indicated there
195 was room for 19. Iordaschescu has interest for seven right now. Terry Loboschefskey noted that
196 he probably gets a call a day from people looking for hangar space. Discussion on t-hangars.

197

198 **Other Items as Needed**

199

200 Boardmember Melville moved to adjourn the meeting. Boardmember McFee seconded the
201 motion. Voting Aye: Boardmembers Robertson, McQuarrie, Melville, Hansen, Rowland, and
202 McFee. Voting Nay: none. The motion passed. The meeting adjourned at 5:53 p.m.

DRAFT- Unapproved Minutes

Memo

To: Airport Advisory Board
From: Mark K. Anderson
CC: Mayor & Council
Date: 8/8/2013
Re: August 14, 2013 - Agenda Items

4:00 P.M.

Airport Manager Report: Enclosed is the monthly Airport Manager's report that has been prepared by Terry Loboschfsky for June/July. Terry will review the document with the Board and answer any questions that the Board might have regarding airport operations.

Kirk Nielsen, Jviation, Review of Draft Lease Rates and Policy Analysis Report: Enclosed is a draft report prepared by Kirk Nielsen of Jviation for your review. Kirk will be at the meeting to go over the document and seek your feedback. My understanding is that once the document is finalized, it will be used to develop a hangar leasing policy document.

Discuss Use of Pilot's Lounge: The City has received a request to make the pilot's lounge in the SRE Building available for use. The City is working on installing a keyless entry pad to allow access to the building. It appears that a programmable lock will cost around \$600 - \$700 to install. The Board should discuss what furnishings the City ought to provide in addition to access to restroom facilities to make the lounge functional for pilots.

Update on Hangar Sales – Discuss Future Hangar Development: Since the Board last met, the City has completed the sale of Daniel Hangar #27 and Hangar #21 on hangar row. Additionally, the City has accepted an offer for Daniel Hangar #28 which should be closed before the Board meets on August 14th. This will leave Hangar #12 (hangar row) as the only remaining hangar owned by the City.

I have enclosed a copy of the draft Hangar Construction and Design Standards which properly spells "hangar" and includes the recommended change to Section A-3 to read "When satisfied that all applicable provisions of this directive have been, or will be fulfilled; ...". Terry Loboschfsky has indicated that he has not yet spent any time looking at architectural guidelines to incorporate into the document, but I think it appropriate to begin talking about the best way to pursue the development of additional hangars. Some options the Board may consider are as follows:

- Adopt a pad fee that would be paid to the City by anyone wanting to construct their own hangar to recoup costs the City has invested in the infrastructure that supports the development of the hangar.
- Discuss if ownership of the “T Hangars” should be held individually, by a developer or by the City.
- Have the City construct the hangars after a binding contract is entered into with a potential purchaser which includes a significant down payment that would be forfeited if the sale did not occur.
- Use the pad fees to pay for the construction of “T hangars” that would be leased by the City on a yearly or monthly basis.

Each option has its own pros and cons, but there is a high likelihood that there will soon be a shortage of storage/hangar space at the airport.

Lastly, Oliver Button of Homeland Construction has provided the enclosed cost estimate to build T-hangars. Based on 19 T-hangars, the estimated cost per hangar is \$51,348 which does not include the following costs:

- 30’ of asphalt paving in front of the hangars (1,260 sq. feet per hangar)
- Heber Light & Power impact fees
- Engineering for the project
- Building Permit Fees
- Pad Cost/Heber City costs for existing improvements

This should give the Board some sense of cost as we discuss how to proceed with development.

Discuss Airport Board Goals/Projects: Erik Rowland asked that this item be placed on the agenda for the Board to discuss the most pressing issues the Airport Board needs to address. The Board should come prepared to bring up items that they believe are of priority to help guide future meetings.

Discuss Airport Garbage: The City has received requests to provide some garbage service at the airport. It appears that most hangar users have been using the FBO’s garbage can which has now been locked. The Board should discuss what is needed, where it should be placed and who should be expected to bear the cost.

Other Items As Needed:

Heber City Airport – Russ McDonald Field

Airport Manager's Report June - July 2013

1. Existing Grants/Projects

- RFP for hangar lease study awarded to Jviation. Resultant of May's Board meeting, 14 potential airports were identified for comparative purposes. Jviation has narrowed it to 10. Additional airports will require a revised bid and price increase.

2. Upcoming Projects

- Terminal Area Development plan (TAD) finalized. Initial review by FAA was positive; no airspace concerns. Heber City Council approved the TAD 6/6. Armstrong Consultants (ACI) has submitted to FAA for final determination.
- The 2013 Airport Development Plan (ADP) RW 4/22 rehab *design* grant funding from the FAA was approved by the City Council on July 18th. This 2013 ADP includes runway 4/22 rehabilitation and a large portion of the apron. Because of budgetary delays, implementation may not begin until spring of 2015.
- Upcoming UAOA (Utah Airport Operators Assoc) Conference scheduled in Logan 9/5-6. TLoBo to attend. FAA Regional and Armstrong Consultants will be represented.

3. Airport Condition

- Runway lights operational – except for one RW4 approach – HBE has been contacted
- AWOS operational
- Taxiway lights, other than those previously identified, are operational
- Segmented circle OK.
- PAPI Lights operational
- Rotating beacon operational
- Windsock & lights operational
- The two non-airworthy aircraft owners have been sent letters (w/pictures) as to their disposition. The Stinson owner has removed AC.
- Stop signs at primary airport exit intersection installed 8/5
- EAA Young Eagles Program was very successful and furnished 33 youth airplane rides (6/29).
- Sale of Hangar #27 has closed.
- Offer has been made on Hangar #28, awaiting closing 8/9
- East side gate card reader malfunctioned and needed new circuit board. Was repaired 7/25.

4. Discussion Topics

- Glider trailer parking fee collection to be considered by City Council.
- Consider: City funded dumpster on airport and location
- Locksmith has been engaged to install combination lock on pilot lounge in SRE Building. This should allow afterhours access. Install should occur 8/9. Discussion on access code and "outside of fence" locking needs addressing.

Heber City Airport – Russ McDonald Field

- T-hangar construction: policies concerning construction approaches (i.e. Individuals, City, developers). Potential suppliers and construction details are being compiled.

Heber City Airport/Russ McDonald Field

Lease Rates and Policy Analysis

August 8, 2013

Prepared by Jviation Inc.

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION 2

SECTION 1 – AIRPORT MARKET PROFILE 2

SECTION 2 – SURVEYED AIRPORTS 3

SECTION 3 – SUMMARY OF KEY FINDINGS 5

SECTION 4 – OBSERVATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 6

Appendix A – ADDITIONAL SURVEY DATA 11

INTRODUCTION

It is essential for airports to charge fees that are both fair and reasonable for users and tenants, as well as assist in covering the operating costs of the airport. The purpose of the Lease Rates and Policy Analysis (Study) is to provide guidance and recommendations in achieving these two goals. The data collected as part of this study will help Heber City/Russ McDonald Field's (Heber) establish fair lease rates and policies for the future.

The Lease Rates and Policy Analysis is a companion document and the basis for the "Leasing Policy". The Study reviews existing airport lease rates and compares lease rates of similar airports to Heber City Airport. It identifies Heber City Airport's overall market position, ascertains the adequacy of the airport's leasing structure and policy, and recommends where improvements should be considered.

The foundation of this Study is the airport survey. The survey gathers leasing information from airports that are in similar markets, size and direct competitors.

The data gathered is a gauge to compare Heber City Airport's lease rates and provide assistance with the establishment of future rates within the context of the airport's market environment. It should be stated that a lease rates analysis does not supplement a property appraisal for specific lease negotiations.

The key objective of this Study is to analyze lease rates at comparable airports. This was accomplished by:

1. Obtaining and reviewing the existing leases and lease rates at the airport.
2. Identifying current lease issues and concerns.
3. Working with the Airport Board to develop a list of similar airports or airports that compete in the same market.
4. Survey airports on their lease rates and practices.

SECTION 1 – AIRPORT MARKET PROFILE

Heber is a general aviation airport in Wasatch County, located approximately 1 mile south of Heber City's central business district. The airport serves Wasatch County and the most populated area of Summit County. The airport is owned and operated by Heber City.

The airport serves the general aviation needs for the area, including Heber City, Midway and Park City. Four of Utah's Ski Resorts are in close proximity to the airport, including three of the largest ski resorts in the state; Deer Valley, Park City and the Canyons.

OK3 Air is the only Fixed Based Operator (FBO) at the airport and services the 73 single engine, four twin engine, four helicopters and four jets based at the airport. It is a full-service FBO that offers line services, aircraft maintenance, flight training, aircraft sales, private charter planes, and scenic flight tours.

SECTION 2 – SURVEYED AIRPORTS

In order to collect and review lease rates for airports similar to Heber City Airport, criteria were developed to determine a list of comparable airports. The following criteria were used to develop the list of airports shown in Table 1:

- Similar airports located within 50 miles of Heber;
- Airports of similar size and scope in terms of ownership and use, type, and based aircraft;
- Airports in similar type of communities: aircraft operations and resort towns.

Table 1
Airports Considered for Comparison

Airport	Distance	Ownership /Use	Airport Type	# of Based A/C	Operations	Comparable Criteria
Heber City Municipal		City	GA	73	19,468 (2011)	Resort Town
South Valley Regional	50 miles	City	GA	165	75,000 (2011)	Competitor
Provo Municipal	30 miles	City	CS	104	172,014 (2011)	Competitor
Driggs-Reed Memorial	285 miles	City	GA	81	7,600 (2006)	Resort Town
Aspen-Pitkin County	340 miles	County	CS	77	36,900 (2013)	Resort Town
Grand Junction Regional	270 miles	City	CS	99	50,987 (2013)	Similar Size
Friedman Memorial (Hailey)	320 miles	City	CS	147	44,237 (2012)	Resort Town
Garfield County Regional (Rifle)	280 miles	County	GA	52	8,129 (2011)	Resort Town
Montrose Regional	330 miles	County	CS	81	26,460 (2012)	Resort Town
Yampa Valley (Hayden)	270 miles	County	CS	4	9,677 (2011)	Resort Town
Eagle County Regional	330 miles	County	CS	78	36,401 (2012)	Resort Town

Source: U.S. Department of Transportation Federal Aviation Administration, Airport Master Record, Accessed 2013

Surveys were sent to each airport requesting relevant lease information not provided on their public airport master record. If a response was not received, the airport was contacted and information was gathered over the phone.

The airports were provided with a matrix designed to gather information in five areas of interest with respect to leases, fees, investments, lease clauses, inflators, and any additional information that the airport could provide that would assist with the analysis. The survey results are provided in Table 2.

**Table 2
Survey Results**

Airport	Hangar Information					Lease Information			Lease Terms		Escalation Clauses			
	No. Hangars	No. Sponsor owned Hangars	Hangar Built in 2012	Hangars Built 2009-2011	Waiting List	Ground Lease Type	Lease Amount per sqft/yr	% Gross Revenue	Initial Term-Yrs	Extensions available	Y/N	Basis	Freq.	Reversionary Lease
Heber City Municipal	67	3	0	9	No	Improved	\$0.30		20	two 5yr	Yes	CPI	Annual	Yes
						Non-improved	\$0.15		20	two 5yr				
South Valley Regional	140	140	0	0	Yes	Commercial/Improved	\$0.18		15+	Yes	Yes	Chart	5 yrs	Yes
Provo Municipal	97	47	3	18	Yes	Improved	\$0.28	55%	30	two 5yr	Yes	CPI	2 yrs	Yes
Driggs-Reed Memorial	71	1	0	6	No	Improved	\$0.22		20	infinite 5 yr	Yes	CIP	Annual	No
Aspen-Pitkin County						Improved	\$0.47		3-5					Yes
Grand Junction Regional						Improved	\$0.18		20	one 10yr		CPI		Yes
Friedman Memorial (Hailey)														
Garfield County Regional (Rifle)						Improved	\$0.21					CPI	Annual	Yes
Montrose Regional	33	5	0	1	No	Private Hangar	\$0.19		20	10 years	Yes	CPI	Annual	No
						Commercial Aeronautical	\$0.10		Negotiable	Negotiable	Yes	CPI	Annual	Negotiable
Yampa Valley (Hayden)	7	1	0	0	Yes	Private Hangar	\$0.15	5%	35	5 years	Yes	CPI	Annual	Yes
						Commercial Aeronautical	\$0.26	5%	35	5 years	Yes	CPI	Annual	Yes
						Other Aeronautical	\$0.26	5%	5	No	Yes	CPI	Annual	Yes
						Commercial Non-Aeronautical	\$0.26	10%	5	No	Yes	CPI	Annual	Yes
						Industrial	\$0.26	10%	5	No	Yes	CPI	Annual	Yes
Eagle County Regional	15	9	0	1		Private Hangar	\$0.35		25	yes	Yes	CPI	Annual	Yes

Source: Jviation Inc., 2013

SECTION 3 – SUMMARY OF KEY FINDINGS

After reviewing the data collected, several observations were made from the averages of the data and most common answers, as depicted in Table 3.

- The average lease amount per square foot was \$0.24.
- The initial lease terms ranged from 5 years to 30 years, with 19 years being the average.
- Nearly every airport offer some sort of extension, after the initial lease term. The extensions are primarily used to update the lease agreements. A five year extension is the most common.
- Every airport’s lease included an escalation clauses based on CPI, with most of the escalations occurring annually.
- All but one airport have reversionary leases; however, the terms of the reversionary clause varied by airport.
- The most common extensions, beyond the initial lease terms, were based on the amount (in dollars) of improvements.

Table 3
Summary of Key Findings

	Survey Question	Average/Most Common	Heber City
Hangar Information	No. Hangars	61	67
	No. Sponsor owned Hangars	29	3
	Hangar Built in 2012	1	0
	Hangar Built 2009-2011	5	9
	Waiting list	Varies	No
Lease Information	Ground Lease Type	Varies	Improved and Unimproved
	Lease Amount per sqft/yr	\$0.24	\$0.30/\$0.15
Lease Terms	Initial Term	19 years	20 years
	Extensions available	Yes – 5 years	Yes – 2, 5 year extensions
Escalation Clauses	Y/N	Yes	Yes
	Basis	CPI	CPI
	Frequency	Annual	Annual
	Reversionary Lease (Y/N)	Yes	Yes

Source: Jviation Inc., 2013

SECTION 4 – OBSERVATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Heber City Airport has leasing policies in place that have worked efficiently in the past; however, the policies may not account for the change in operations and demand for hangars that the airport is starting to experience. In order to determine how the existing policies and rates compare to similar airports, the existing rates and policies at Heber City Airport were compared to the surveyed airports and overall averages from the survey data.

Observations

A collective look at the data gathered through the surveys gives a general idea of what the market trends are for airports similar to Heber City Airport. Table 4 depicts how Heber City Airport compares to market trends. Observations gathered from the survey are:

- **Rates:** The rates at Heber City Airport are slightly higher than many of the airports surveyed; however, airports with similar demographics (Aspen and Eagle) charged more than Heber City Airport. It should also be noted that Heber City Airport charges \$0.30 per square foot of the hangar footprint and then \$0.15 for an additional 15 feet around the hangar. Many airports charge the same rate for the building footprint and the 15 foot perimeter. As such, the total rate charged at Heber is less than \$0.30 per square foot which brings the rate in line with the market trends.
- **Commercial Lease Value:** It is likely that a commercial appraisal of the hangar pads would show the rates of return, for the current economic conditions, as being undervalued.
- **Growth:** Hangar construction is in line with market trends as Heber City Airport experienced roughly a 13% growth with the construction of nine hangars between 2009 and 2011. The majority of the hangars built during this time period were by the airport sponsors.

Table 4
Leasing Observations and Recommendations

	Survey Question	Average/Most Common	Heber City	Observation
Hangar Information	No. Hangars	61	67	In-line with Market
	Sponsor owned Hangars	29	3	Lower than Market
	Hangar Built in 2012	1	0	In-line with Market
	Hangar Built 2009-2011	5	9	In-line with Market
Lease Information	Ground Lease Type	Varies	Improved and Unimproved	NA
	Initial Lease Amount per sqft/yr	\$0.24	\$0.30/\$0.15	In-line with Market
	% Gross Revenue	15%	NA	NA
Lease Terms	Initial Term	19 years	20 years	In-line with Market
	Extensions available	Yes, 5 years	2, 5 year extensions	In-line with Market
Escalation Clauses	Y/N	Yes	Yes	In-line with Market
	Basis	CPI	CPI	In-line with Market
	Frequency	Annual	Annual	In-line with Market
	Reversionary Lease (Y/N)	Yes	Yes	In-line with Market

Source: Jviation Inc., 2013

Recommendations

From the observations and data collected, recommendations for the Airport’s future lease and rates were developed. In general, Heber City Airport is very comparable to the airports surveyed and the market trends. However, for the Airport to capitalize on the emerging market demand at Heber City Airport, the following recommendations are given:

- **Hangar Ownership:** The number of hangars owned by Heber City Airport is much less than most of the airports surveyed. This hinders the amount of control the airport has on the hangars and ultimately land use. As demand increases for hangar space and development, it will become critical for the airport to have more control over each hangar. As such, it is recommended that the practice of using reversionary clauses in the leases be continued. Table 5 provides a summary of the rental rates from hangars that are owned by the airport.
- **Lease extension:** If the land is not needed by the airport for current or future development many airports with reversionary leases offer lease extensions for capital improvements to the hangars. The duration of the extension is based upon the cost of the capital improvement. At the surveyed airports, a fixed dollar amount was used to determine the length of the extension. The amount needed to qualify for the extension was adjusted periodically. The size or value of the hangar was not taken into account. At one airport the age of the hanger was a factor. Capital improvements on older hangars could only use a fraction of the investment to qualify for an extension.

An extension based upon a set dollar amount was not found to be practical as it would need to be updated over time. It is recommended that extensions be offered for improvements worth 1/30 of the value of a new hangar of similar size.

For example a lessee has 10 years left on the lease and installs a new hangar door. The new hangar door costs \$5,000. A new hangar of similar size currently sells at the airport for \$150,000. The number of years the lease would be extended would be 1 year for every \$5,000 of verifiable and airport approved improvements (\$150,000 divided by 30). In this example the hangar owner would qualify for 1 additional year on their lease.

- **Future Rates:** The demand for new hangars will eventually exceed the existing buildable hangar space and new hangars will need to be constructed. It is recommended that when the airport reaches maximum capacity for new hangars, appraisal values be used to establish lease rates.
- **Future Commercial Rates:** To ensure market value is maintained, at the end of the current life of the commercial hangar leases, the lease should go through a competitive process to establish an updated rate.

Table 5
Summary of Reversionary Lease Data

Survey Question	Average/Most Common
Rent Base on (sq. ft., flat)	Flat Fee
Approx size of Hangars	1552 sq. ft.
Monthly Rent Amount	>10,000 sq. ft. (Flat Fee) - \$3,764.27
	<2500 sq. ft. (Flat Fee) - \$242.33
	<2500 sq. ft. (Sq. Ft.) - \$0.25

Source: Jviation Inc., 2013

- It is recommended that non-commercial hangar leases be standardized. The Commercial leases currently utilized at the airport have been tailored to meet the business models at the airport. Some degree of flexibility should be maintained when dealing with current and future businesses at the airport. Recommendations for the leases are as follows:

a. Hangar Row

The hangars comprising “Hangar Row” were built between 1989 and 1993. The hangar leases are reversionary lease for a term of 30 years. The leases are non-escalating and are for a flat fee for \$50 per year. The first leases granted will come due in 2019. The area where these hangars sit will be needed for future development if the airport decides to expand to meet the demands of aircraft that are already operating at the airport. It is suggested that none of the leases in this area be extended. Depending on the economic conditions at the time of reversion, the City can either, remove the hangars or rent them on a month to month basis. The FAA currently has funding place holders for the airport upgrade in 2021.

It is likely that relocation or condemnation will be necessary if the airport upgrade comes to fruition in or before 2021. The City should provide airport land and/or improvements that are comparable to the improvements currently being occupied by these lessees. If comparable airport land or improvements are not available, the City should buyout the leasehold interest held by the lessee at the market value determined by an appraiser.

b. Daniel Hangars 2 - 22

The Daniel Hangars 2-22 were built between 1995 and 2008. These hangar leases are non-reversionary leases with terms of 20 years and one 5-year extension. The leases have an escalation clause and were initially set at \$0.25 per sq. ft. per year for improved and \$0.125 per sq. ft. per year for unimproved. No provision has been made to deal with the lessees or improvements at the end of the lease. One hanger owner (hanger 5) has opted for a 30 year (20 yr plus two 5 years extensions) reversionary lease instead of a non-reversionary lease.

The land in which the hangars are currently located on has not been identified as being needed for future development. It is recommended that a 5-year reversionary lease be offered at the end of the 25 years (the initial term and the 5 year extension), but only if the hangar is in good condition.

If the hangar is in poor condition, then the hangar owner will retain the improvements (the hangar structure) and be required to remove it from airport property. Heber City will at all times will maintain ownership of the property.

If the hangar is in good condition at the end of the reversionary lease, the City can do what is economically best for the City. The options include, but are not limited to:

- Month to month leases, giving the prior lease holder the first right of refusal to rent the hangar
- Resell the hangar and issue a new lease (giving the prior lease holder the first right of refusal to purchase the hangar)
- Remove the hangar

It would be advantageous to implement a means for extending the leases on these 20 hangars beyond 30 years. Following the recommendation previously laid out in this study, extensions could be offered to the lessees for improvements worth 1/30 of the value, of a new hangar of similar size.

c. Daniel Hangars 23 – 30

The Daniel Hangars 23 -30 are comprised of 8 hangars the City built in 2009. These hangar leases are reversionary leases with terms of 20 years and two, 5-year extensions. The leases have an escalation clause. The hangars are 75'x75' on 95'x95' pads. The 75'x75' area under the hangar is initially leased at \$0.30 per sq. ft. The additional 15' around the hangar is leased at a different rate; \$0.15 per sq. ft. per year. No provision has been made to deal with the lessees or improvements at the end of the lease. It is anticipated that the structure and the land will revert to the City at 30 years. If the hangar is in good condition at the end of the reversionary lease, the City can do what is best economically for the City. The options include, but are not limited to:

- Month to month leases, giving the prior lease holder the first right of refusal to rent the hangar
- Resell the hangar and issue a new lease (giving the prior lease holder the first right of refusal purchase the hangar)
- Remove the hangar

It would be advantageous to implement a means for extending the leases in this area. It is recommended that extensions be offered for capital improvements to the hangar or leased pad.

d. Commercial Apron Area

Accommodations have been made to commercial operators at the airport. Geographically these buildings surround the main apron. Their lease terms and rates differ slightly from the reversionary hangar leases. Commercial leases have been extended to the commercial operators that meet the “Minimum Standards” adopted by the airport. The lease terms have been negotiated with the Airport Board and approved by the City Council. The terms are based upon the business model and economic benefits that the business will bring the airport and community.

Additional discussions on the commercial leasing practices are needed before specific recommendations can be given.

Appendix A
Reversionary Lease Information

Survey Response – Reversionary Leases

Reversionary Leases									
Airport	Extension Mechanism	Length of Extension	Hangar Ownership	Age of Hangars (yrs)	Condition of Hangar Group	Rent Amount	Approx Size of Hangars	Rent Amount	Utilities Included
South Valley Regional	Yes	Varies	Private						
			Private						
			Airport	10	Good	Flat Fee	1,554 Sq. Ft	\$310.00/mth	Yes
			Airport	30	Fair	Flat Fee	1,400 Sq. Ft	\$233.00/mth	Yes
			Airport	30	Fair	Flat Fee	1,702 Sq. Ft	\$310.00/mth	Yes
Provo Municipal	Yes	Varies (See Note)	Airport	30	Fair	Flat Fee	<2500 Sq. Ft	\$225.00/mth	Yes
			Airport	10	Good	Flat Fee	<2500 Sq. Ft	\$300.00/mth	Yes
			Private	30+	Poor to Fair	sqft	<2500 Sq. Ft	\$0.15/sqft/yr	
			Private	10-	Good	sqft	<2500 Sq. Ft	\$0.28/sqft/yr	
			Private	10-20	Good	sqft	<2500 Sq. Ft	\$0.28/sqft/yr	
			Private	20-30	Good	sqft	<2500 Sq. Ft	\$0.28/sqft/yr	
			Private	30+	Fair	sqft	<2500 Sq. Ft	\$0.28/sqft/yr	
Grand Junction Regional			Both				\$0.42/ sq ft/yr	No	
Yampa Valley (Hayden)	Improved	5 years							
			Private	<10	Good	Flat Fee	>10,000 Sq. Ft	\$2,041.32/mth	No
			Private	<10	Good	Flat Fee	>10,000 Sq. Ft	\$3,090.52/mth	No
			Private	<10	Good	Flat Fee	>10,000 Sq. Ft	\$6,160.96/mth	No
Eagle County Regional	NA	2, 5 year extensions							

Source: Jviation Inc., 2013

Appendix A
Reversionary Lease Information

Survey Response – Notes on Reversionary Leases

Airport	Extension Mechanism Note	General Remarks
South Valley Regional	1- 15 Yr for initial lease term with an investment up to \$111,500, an additional year for every \$65,000	First Right of Refusal once lease is up at new rate
	2- 50% of tenant investment is recognized in the first half of lease, 25% in the last half for improvement of \$65,000 or more	
Provo	1Yr extension with for every \$9000 of improvements.	At the end of the lease the lease can continue to lease the building at the same rate, but the ownership cannot change and it cannot be subleased.
Aspen-Pitkin County		Option to buy back or it reverts to airport
Grand Junction Regional		Tenant can remove the hangar or it reverts to airport

Source: Jviation Inc., 2013

Heber City Airport – Russ McDonald Field K36U Hangar Construction and Design Standards

Effective June 1, 2013

Introduction

These specifications shall be known as the Heber City Airport Hangar Construction and Design Standards

Purpose

The purpose of these design standards is to ensure development of consistent high quality, to protect and enhance the investment of all those locating within the Airport Layout Plan (ALP). These standards provide a basis for directing and evaluating the planning and architectural design of improvements to each building site.

1.0 Goals

The following goals form the basis for these design standards:

- Economic – Protection of property values and enhancement of investment
- Function – Encouragement of imaginative and innovative planning of facilities and sites and flexibility to respond to changes in market demand
- Visual – Variety, interest and a high standard of architectural and landscape design
- Social – Amenable working environment, which is integral part of the community
- Safety – Provide and secure storage of vehicles and equipment

2.0 General Provisions

Buildings may not be constructed on airport property unless approved by the Airport Board and the Heber City Council for conformance in each of the following areas:

2.1 Current Airport Layout Plan (ALP) and Terminal Area Development (TAD) plans.

2.2 All applicable building restriction lines and height restrictions.

2.3 Interference with any Airport or Federal Aviation Administration radio or guidance equipment due to location or type of structural material.

2.4 Minimum structural standards as appended

2.5 Access to the proposed building including any required easements, roads or taxiways.

2.6 An approved Aviation Ground Lease with the City of Heber. Such a lease to include all areas deemed necessary to the normal use of the building. Minimum separation beyond the outermost perimeters of the structure shall be in accordance with the

ALP. This provision may be waived, in whole or in part, by the Airport Board to facilitate Airport operations or access. Requests for waiver must be in writing, shall state the reason for the waiver and shall state in detail the mitigating measures to be taken with respect to the potential adverse impacts that may arise from granting the requested waiver.

3.0 Application

These standards shall apply to all properties in the ALP and are in addition to any other jurisdictional requirements including but not limited to Zoning Ordinances and Building Codes of the City of Heber.

- 3.1 Copies of all structural plans, site plans, and material specifications developed by a certified architect and/or engineer shall be provided to the City for review and approval and upon approval shall become the property of the City.
- 3.2 The City or its Agent shall make frequent inspections during construction of any approved building. No changes to, or variations from approved plans and specifications shall be permitted unless approved in writing by the authorized Agent.
- 3.3 Construction of any approved structure or material component thereof may not commence until the following documents or proofs thereof are provided to the Agent.
 - 3.3.1 Contractor's Comprehensive General Liability Insurance and Automobile Liability Insurance policies in an amount not less than Seven Hundred Fifty Thousand Dollars (\$750,000) for injuries, including accidental death, to any one person and subject to the same limit for each person, and in an amount of not less than One Million Five Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$1,500,000) on account of one occurrence. Contractor's Property Damage Liability Insurance shall be in an amount of not less than Five Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$500,000).
 - 3.3.2 Property insurance upon the entire Work at the site to the full insurable value thereof. This insurance shall include the interest of the Lessee, the Contractor, and Subcontractors in the Work and shall insure against the perils of fire and extended coverage and shall include "all risk" insurance for physical loss or damage including, without duplication of coverage, theft, vandalism and malicious mischief.
 - 3.3.3 A performance, Material and Labor Payment Bond payable to the City of Heber in an amount equal to the entire cost of the project. A one year maintenance bond equal to 10% of the amount of the Performance, Material and Labor Payment Bond shall be required upon substantial completion of the work.

- 3.4 Temporary buildings must be approved by Heber City as to type, use, design and location on an individual basis for a specified term and that removal of temporary buildings will be done by the Lessee, at their expense, within fifteen days of the end of the approved term.
- 3.5 In the event of any failure on the part of any Lessee to comply with Airport requirements or any failure to complete a construction project according to the approved plans and specifications, or within a reasonable time as determined by the City, shall be cause for the City to revoke any ground lease with the Lessee of the project and require that the structure be removed from the airport property. In addition to the foregoing remedies, the City shall retain all other remedies provided by the lease terms or provided by law.

Minimum Standards for Hangar and Buildings on Heber City Airport Property

Appendix A-1: General Requirements

- A-1 This general section requires permits for building, plumbing, electrical and mechanical.
- A-1.1 All structures shall be designed and constructed in accordance with the Building, Plumbing, Mechanical and Electrical Codes as adopted by the State of Utah and Heber City.
 - A-1.2 All plans must be approved by all required local Building Inspection offices and all permits must be obtained before construction begins.
 - A-1.3 All electrical, plumbing, mechanical or any other work that is governed by Federal, State, or local licensing regulations will be performed only by individuals or companies so licensed.
 - A-1.4 All construction shall be in compliance with all applicable zoning regulations, FAA regulations, height restrictions, and other regulations issued by any agency having jurisdiction over work or projects within the scope of these standards, shall apply.
 - A-1.5 Heber City must approve the schedule for all work and said approved schedule shall become binding upon the applicant unless modification of said schedule has been approved in writing by the City.

A-2 SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS

A-2 In addition to the General Requirements, the following Special Requirements are emphasized or added to promote safety and insurability of structures on airport properties and to maintain the value of airport properties.

A-2.1 Footings and Foundations

Soil bearing tests shall be performed at the location of any proposed structure and the design of footings and foundations based on the results. Copies of the design and test results bearing the seal of a registered architect or engineer shall be submitted to the City. Footings and foundations shall extend a minimum of one foot below normal frost depth. Any enclosed structure not designed with a continuous perimeter footing-foundation shall be provided with an approved, continuous perimeter frost barrier.

A-2.2 Structural Strength and Materials

The Uniform Building Code or the Building Code currently adopted by the jurisdiction shall apply as to allowable materials and structural strength for the structure class or type as determined by use, seismic zone, wind and snow loads.

The fire ratings of structures used for the storage of aircraft, motor vehicles, and flammable or hazardous materials shall comply with the Building Code and any Federal, State, or Municipal Fire Codes and are subject to approval by Heber City's Fire Marshall.

A-2.3 Framing

All framing shall be of metal.

A-2.4 Exterior

All exterior surfaces must be pre-finished aluminum, steel or CMU (concrete). No painted wood or other materials may be used.

All exterior materials and colors must be submitted to the City for approval before construction starts. A standard color will be identified and registered with the City. No galvanized metal shall be used on any exterior surface.

A-2.5 Exterior Finishes

Wood- No wood or wood composite siding or roofing shall be allowed. Exceptions to this rule may be granted by the Heber City based on

aesthetics or airport operational requirements. However, no exception shall be granted that would modify the requirements of Section 2.1.2. Requests for exceptions to this requirement must be made in writing at the time of initial plan approval.

Steel - The minimum gauge of steel used for roofing or siding shall be twenty-eight (28) and shall be factory finished in a color approved by the City and warranted by the manufacturer as to color fastness for a minimum of twenty (20) years.

Concrete - Where (CMU), poured or preformed concrete walls are used, the exterior shall be sealed and stained in a color approved by the Airport Manager.

A-2.6 Floor and Ramp Construction

All floors and ramps must be constructed of concrete having a minimum of four inch thickness and shall include steel reinforcement of a type approved by the City. A stiff broom finish is required on exterior ramps.

A-2.7 Doors

Bi-fold doors are recommended because of their ease of operation during the winter months. Approved swing out, overhead or sliding doors may also be used. All pedestrian doors must be of pit-finished metal construction.

A-2.8 Drainage

The gradient of the finished floor of any proposed structure and the surrounding surfaces shall provide for positive flow of water into the existing airport storm sewer system. In areas where no storm sewer exists, the City may require the installation of inlets and pipe designed for anticipated maximum flow and loading to be installed and attached to the existing storm sewer system. An approved system of oil/water separators may be required to prevent contamination of surface or ground water resources.

Oil/Water Separators. Aviation repair facilities and paint shops, dealerships, fuel stations, equipment degreasing areas, and other facilities generating wastewater with oil and grease content are required to pre-treat these wastes before discharging to the sanitary sewer system. Pre-treatment requires that an oil/water separator be installed and maintained on site.

Oil/water separators for commercial/industrial processes must be sized on a case-by-case analysis of wastewater characteristics. Typically a minimum capacity of 750 gallons is required for small fuel stations, aviation repairs, and light commercial sites; 1500 gallon capacity for large-scale aircraft washing and steam cleaning facilities. The ultimate

discharge must be directed to the sanitary sewer system. All units regardless of size shall be fitted with a standard final-stage sample box and spill-absorbent pillows.

Oil/water separators shall be commercially manufactured and sized for the intended discharge rates for the facility where it is to be installed.

A-2.9 Landscaping

The City may require landscaping due to location or use of a structure. All plans for landscaping shall be approved by the City.

A-2.10 Utilities

Connection to electric, gas, sanitary sewer or septic tank and telephone shall be the responsibility of the Lessee. All new electric, cable TV and telephone lines shall be placed underground. Upon completion of construction, a plot plan showing the exact location of all Lessee installed utilities shall be given to the City.

No trenching or excavation shall commence until all pipes and lines in the area have been located. The City and utility companies shall be contacted for locations. The Lessee shall be responsible for any damage to existing utilities or communications lines.

A-2.11 Access

The City may require the Lessee to construct paved roadways, taxiways, and controlled access gates to provide access to the structure. Plans for any roads or taxiways so required shall be submitted to the Airport Manager for approval. Under no circumstances will an uncontrolled opening in the Airport's security fence be allowed.

A-2.12 Further restrictions or requirements may be imposed by the Airport Manager when, in his judgment, such restrictions or requirements are necessary to insure safety, airport operations, aesthetics, or property value.

A-3 NOTICE TO PROCEED

A-3.1 When satisfied that all applicable provisions of this directive have been, or will be fulfilled; the City will issue a letter notifying the Lessee to proceed with the approved work.

A-3.2 Any loss incurred due to work performed, materials purchased, or subleases signed by the Lessee prior to receipt of a Notice to Proceed shall be the Lessee's responsibility.

HOMELAND CONSTRUCTION

Proposal

PO BOX 50176
PROVO, UT
84605-0176

Proposal Date: 7/8/2013

Proposal #: 20207

Project:

Bill To:

Heber City Corp.
75 North Main
Heber City, Utah 84032

Item	Description	Est. Hours/Qty.	Rate	Total
PROP...	19 T HANGER WITH THE FOLLOWING WITH PROPOSED			
Option	BI FOLD DOORS 16X38 WITH MAN DOOR IN MAIN BI FOLD DOOR. WITH INSTALL.	1	153,719.00	153,719.00
Option	END T HANGER AREA FOR BATHROOMS	1	15,000.00	15,000.00
Option	CONCRETE FLOOR 4" . CONCRETE FOOTINGS AND WALLS.	1	178,907.00	178,907.00
Option	INSULATION FOR BUILDINGS	1	50,400.00	50,400.00
Option	STEEL BUILDINGS	1	378,000.00	378,000.00
Option	ERECTION OF STEEL	1	89,600.00	89,600.00
Option	EXCAVATION BASED ON USING NATIVE FILL ONLY	1	25,000.00	25,000.00
Option	ELECTRICAL UTILITIES. ELECTRICAL INCLUDES: 1. 2 LIGHT FIXTURES PER HANGER. 2. 100 AMP SERVICE FROM METER BASE. 3. METER BASE IS TO BE MULTIPAC WITH HOUSE PANEL FOR BATHROOM AND SECURITY LIGHTING.	1	85,000.00	85,000.00
			Total	\$975,626.00