

This email from Dave Angelovich describes the airport subcommittee's "Alternative D."

Thank you to all of the subcommittee members who participated in the following agreement of a alternate proposal for the HMB Airport Masterplan.

At the subcommittee meeting on July 3, 1997, we agreed to the following proposal termed Alternative D:

Please note that the agreement consists of our best estimate of the costs necessary to meet the alternative proposal and that the proposal consists of our notes/comments as to the reasons for the changes to Alternative B.

Half Moon Bay Airport Master Plan

Proposed	Plan B	Plan D
1. Taxiway extension	\$ 656,300	\$ 0
2. Run up areas	48,000	48,000
3. Connector taxiways	249,200	100,000
4. Relocate threshold lights	30,000	0
5. Relocate REILS	10,000	0
6. PAPI's	60,000	0
7. ASOS	150,000	150,000
8. MITL's	326,000	200,000
9. Runway markings	40,000	10,000
10. Heliport	75,000	1,000
11. Utility system upgrade	250,000	175,000
12. T-Hangars	1,120,000	800,000
13. Conventional hangars	3,937,500	0
14. Rec. aircraft tiedowns	65,000	65,000
15. Access roads	525,000	250,000
16. Automobile parking	118,100	82,000
<hr/>		
Total per Table 4E	\$ 7,660,100	\$ 1,881,000
Unexplained difference	\$ 1,288,300	
Total per Table 6B	\$ 8,948,400	

See notes that support the alternative proposal D

The unexplained difference represents the difference between the information supplied in the master plan on page 4-11 which lists the three alternatives (A,B,C) and the information on page 6-4 which breaks down the recommended alternative (B?) into three stages over the next twenty years. I do not know why there is this unexplained difference. Perhaps, it is some type of inflation factor or estimate factor!

Our agreement represents a decrease of \$ 5,779,100 from Alternative B as noted in Table 4E. The major

differences are as follows:

Elimination of conventional hangars	\$3,937,500
Elimination of taxiway extension	656,300
Elimination of threshold lights	30,000
Elimination of REILS	10,000
Elimination of PAPI's	60,000
Modification of connector taxiways	149,200
Modification of MITL's	126,000
Modification of runway markings	30,000
Modification of heliport	74,000
Modification of utility system upgrades	75,000
Modification of T-hangars	320,000
Modifiaction of access roads	275,000
Modification of automobile parking	36,100
Total changes from alternative B	\$5,779,100

Notes to accompany the Alternative Proposal D

I have divided the airport into a Northern half and a Southern half. The "equator" is the Three Zero cafe. The notes are arranged to the items listed in Table 4E.

1. The proposed extension of a taxiway that now ends in the Southern half of the airport is not needed. The T-Hangars along the Northern half of the current taxiway will be relocated and rebuilt in the Southern half of the airport where all of the other hangars are located. This will eliminate automobile traffic on the current existing taxiway located in the Northern half of the airport. Thus no extension is needed and we feel that safety will be improved by the relocation of the existing T hangars. See note 3.

2. No change. This will improve operations and safety.

3. Since a new taxiway is not needed, there is no need for the proposed three new connectors. However, we feel that one high speed connector should be constructed to allow aircraft to quickly exit the current runway. This should also improve operations and safety. The exact location of this high speed connector will be determined in the future. The proposed amount of \$ 100,000 is intended to cover the costs on one high speed connector from the existing runway to the existing taxiway.

4. Not needed since we feel that no change should be made to the existing thresholds.

5. Not needed since no change to existing taxiways.

6. Not considered necessary at this time.

7. We agree that this will improve operations and safety.

8. Medium Intensity Taxiway Lights should be installed in the existing taxiway areas that do not have them. The proposed \$ 200,000 is intended to cover the cost of providing MITL's to the existing taxiways that do not have them. This should also improve operations and safety.

9. The proposed \$ 10,000 is intended to provide any additional markings to the new high speed connector recommended in Note 3.

10. An EMERGENCY heliport landing area should be designated at the airport. This can be accomplished by painting a large H and adding necessary lighting. This will also improve operations and safety. It was not felt that a heliport should be established at this airport.

11. The existing utilities should be upgraded as necessary to support the items in the proposed alternative D only. Consideration should be given to solar panels to provide power to the new T-hangars. The public water system located below the airport MUST be protected. The proposed amount of \$ 175,000 is intended to benefit only those items contained in alternative D.

12. The master plan calls for 56 new T-Hangars. We propose 40 new T-Hangars to replace the existing T-Hangars, the Andrenni hangars and to provide for future demand. Each new hangar is budgeted at \$ 20,000 per hangar which is consistent with cost estimates in Alternative B.

13. It was felt that new conventional hangars should not be part of the master plan. Future commercial development should be accomplished by leasing the land to a developer and then requiring the developer to provide the necessary facilities. Any future commercial development will be subject to a separate approval process.

14. Additional recreational tiedown areas should be provided to visitors of the airport.

15. The masterplan provides for access roads to the Northern and Southern half of the airport. Since we propose relocating the hangars to the southern half of the airport, then only a portion of the access roads are now needed. The proposed amount of \$ 250,000 is intended to cover the costs of new access roads to the Southern half of the airport. This should also improve operations and safety.

16. The automobile parking area should be expanded. The proposed amount of \$ 82,000 is estimated for this improvement.

In addition to the new proposal, the subcommittee also agreed that there are a number of "errors" in the draft master plan that must be changed before the final plan is adopted. Jim Washington has prepared a list of these changes dated June 9, 1997. There will probably be more of these "errors" as our review of the master plan continues.

I hope that I have captured the spirit and intent of the subcommittee in the above proposal D. We have all given a bit so that we could come up with a sensible plan that provides the county with our goals for the next twenty years. Thanks again!!!

Dave Angelovich



[Back](#)