MINUTES

XWA Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC) Meeting #4
January 18, 2023
9:00 a.m. – 10:30 a.m.
Airport Operations Center

Copies to: Attendees

XWA Staff
Anthony Dudas (In person)
Ryan O'Rear (In person)

City of Williston
Tate Cymbaluk (In person)

Williston Convention & Visitor Bureau
Amy Krueger

Williston Economic Development
Shawn Wenko

McKenzie County
Daniel Stenberg
Grace Demars

Williams County
Cory Hanson (In person)

Overland Aviation
Tanner Overland (In person)

Airport Users
David Anfinson
Paul Weyrouch
Tanner Overland (In person)

FAA
Mark Holzer
Brian Schuck

NDAC
Kyle Wanner
Grant Erwin

SEH
Kaci Nowicki (In person)
Melissa Underwood
Megan Moll

Burns McDonnell
Andy Loftus (In person)
Bryan Hansen
Mike Devault

I. Welcome & Introductions (5 minutes)

II. Master Plan Progress Update (5 minutes)
   A. Project Flow Chart

1. This meeting focuses on additional analysis completed within the Airside Facility Recommendations. The airside recommendations focus on all areas where aircraft operate.
2. The last portion of this meeting will include some Landside Facility Recommendations & Alternatives with the majority of this information being presented at the upcoming May SAC meeting.

III. Airside Facility Recommendations & Alternatives

A. Critical Aircraft

1. Per discussions at the previous SAC meeting, the operations from 2020 and 2022 were added to the table to reflect the operations at XWA since the airport opened in October 2019 and the aviation forecasts tend to follow the federal fiscal year (Oct – Sept).
2. The existing and future critical aircraft at XWA was updated to a C-III aircraft, represented by the CRJ-900 or E-175. There were over 500 operations of C-III aircraft in 2020; however, the number of C-III operations dipped below the critical aircraft threshold of 500 operations in 2022.
3. Anthony Dudas mentioned Delta is eliminating 50 seat aircraft from their fleet this year. To compensate, some air carriers are looking into operating under Part 135 (charter aircraft) requirements, instead of Part 139 (commercial aircraft) requirements. Planes would be reduced to 30 seats or less, but pilot training requirements are much lower (though still at a safe level), so it could help ease the pilot shortage. For XWA this may increase the price of airline tickets or fly in more E0175 or CRJ900s to minimize the impacts.

B. Cargo Apron Developments

1. Cargo operations on the existing GA apron often create congestion with GA users.
    a. Cargo operations include the cargo aircraft and also trucks, vans, and other equipment required for loading and unloading cargo.
        (1) XWA trains the cargo staff on how to operate vehicles on the airport, but cargo operations near GA operations could potentially cause safety concerns.
    b. Alternative A
        (1) Expands the GA apron and provides additional space for cargo operations but is not a dedicated cargo space.
        (2) Space is available for hangar(s) northeast of the apron. This area is intended for GA hangar development, so this alternative does not allow for a dedicated cargo facility.
        (3) Anthony Dudas discussed how this alternative would divide the GA development area in two. This is not desirable to the airport. XWA would prefer one continuous GA development area.
    c. Alternatives were developed for a cargo apron area separated from the existing GA apron.
        (1)
    d. Alternative B
        (1) This alternative is located separately from the GA development area.
        (2) Apron development is divided into two phases: future (during the 20-year planning period) and ultimate (beyond the planning period).
        (3) This alternative allows for dedicated cargo facilities (including buildings).
        (4) Alternative B and all following cargo alternatives require construction of partial parallel Taxiway D.
            (a) Construction of partial parallel Taxiway D eliminates the need for back taxiing on Runway 4/22, improving safety on the airfield.
    e. Alternative C
        (1) This alternative is similar to Alternative B; however, it shows a different building layout.

f. Alternative D
    (1) This alternative reduces the future apron size to the minimum amount of pavement required.
    (2) The airfield perimeter road is not impacted by this alternative.
    (3) Estimated cost for construction of the apron, connector taxiways, partial parallel Taxiway D is $10.88 million.
g. Alternative E
    (1) This alternative is the same as Alternative D, except the apron is shifted as close to Taxiway D as standards will allow.
    (2) The perimeter road would require relocation.
    (3) This alternative does not have significant cost savings compared to Alternative D. The estimated cost for construction of the apron, connector taxiways, perimeter road, and partial parallel Taxiway D is $10.78 million.
h. Preferred Alternative
    (1) Alternative A is not preferred because it does not provide a separate, dedicated cargo facility. XWA was initially designed so that the GA development area could be one continuous area, and GA operations and cargo operations could be separate.
        (a) Tanner Overland commented that three to four cargo box trucks and five or six cargo vans regularly take up space in the FBO parking lot during cargo operations.
    (2) Paul Weyrouch thought that Alternative A might work well in the short-term, but Alternatives B-E are better long-term options.
    (3) Anthony Dundas explained federal funding would be explored for the preferred alternative. The best funding scenario would be 90% participation by the FAA, 5% participation from the state, and 5% of the costs would be a local share.

C. Runway 4/22 Visibility Minimums
1. Construction of parallel Taxiway D would provide the opportunity for Runway 4/22 visibility minimums to be lowered from 1 mile to ¾ mile.
2. Lowering visibility minimums would increase the size of the Runway Protection Zone (RPZ) on both ends of the runway and increase the runway to taxiway centerline separation for A/B-I small aircraft by 25 feet.
    a. The FAA requires the airport sponsor to own all land within the RPZ in fee or easement. Portions of these larger RPZs are outside existing airport property and would need to be acquired.
    b. The benefits of lower runway visibility minimums do not outweigh the negative impact the larger RPZs and required land acquisition would have on surrounding landowners.

D. Self-Service Fueling & Agricultural Spraying Facilities
1. Self-Service Fuel
    a. The FBO provides fueling at XWA but is closed overnight. XWA does not allow tenants to have their own fueling facilities at their hangars, so users are sometimes left without the ability to fuel their aircraft. Adding a self-service fuel facility would allow for fueling at all times of day.
    b. Two potential self-service fuel locations in the GA development area were evaluated.
2. Agricultural Spraying Facilities
    a. Three ag spraying services operate out of XWA. Development of an ag spray apron would allow for a dedicated operations area for ag spray operators.
    b. Three alternatives were developed. Each has an apron area to accommodate two aircraft, a building for chemical storage, and vehicle access.
    c. Drive-through hangars were also discussed as an option for a dedicated ag spray area. This would allow for quicker turns as ag spray aircraft reload. XWA already

has potential areas with taxilanes on both sides for this type of hangar development.

E. Air Traffic Control Tower Siting
   1. Construction of an ATCT is justified when the benefits of an ATCT outweigh the costs.
   2. XWA does not currently have an ATCT.
   3. Three potential ATCT sites were identified as options for when an ATCT is justified at XWA.
      a. If XWA is eligible for an ATCT in the future, it would likely be under the federal contract tower program.
      b. A remote ATCT could be a possible option. Remote ATCT are under evaluation, but airports could potentially be eligible for funding for remote ATCT facilities once they are certified.
      c. A number of ATCT siting requirements were taken into consideration when choosing potential ATCT locations.
   4. Next step: **SEH will submit the three potential ATCT locations for FAA airspace review to see if there are any impacts to instrument approach procedures and other airport operations.**
   5. Once airport operations justify construction of an ATCT, a positive benefit/cost analysis and environmental assessment would need to be performed before beginning design of the project, and ultimately starting construction.

IV. Landside Facility Recommendations & Alternatives
   A. Airport Fencing
      1. Existing fencing meets requirements. Recommendations include continuing to inspect the fence line daily.
   B. Airport Property, Acquisition, and Easements
      1. Existing airport property is sufficient for current airport operations. Future property acquisition is required prior to construction of the ultimate Runway 14 extension.
   C. Zoning
      1. The current airport safety overlay zoning and municipal land use zoning meet FAA and state requirements and accommodate future airport expansion. No changes recommended.

V. Next Steps (5 minutes)
   A. Project Schedule
   B. Next meeting scheduled for **May 16, 2023, from 9:00-10:**30 a.m. at the airport
      1. This meeting will continue discussion of the Landside Facility Recommendations and Alternatives.
   C. The February meeting has been cancelled and a final meeting will be added in August 2023. The airport staff will send calendar updates to the group.
   D. Two public open houses will be held before the conclusion of the project. One will likely occur around the same timeframe as the May 16 SAC meeting, and the other will likely be scheduled for August.
   E. FAA and NDAC are currently reviewing the Forecast chapter and Airside Facility Recommendations & Alternatives chapter.

VI. Discussion/Questions