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MASTER PLAN OVERVIEW
History of planning at U42

1990 Master Plan

2006 Master Plan

Current 2023 Master Plan
Master Plan Work Products

Airport Layout Plan:
(Illustrates the plan)

Technical Report:
(Documented the why and how)
“Current” Airport Layout Plan
U42 History & Grant Assurances

- Owned by US Govt
- Began as an Army Base in 1942
- Ownership Transferred To SLC Shortly after WWII
- Accepted Federal Funding
- Grant Assurances (Obligations)
  - U42 has received almost $7.4 million in federal funding since 2006

FAA Requirements
What Are FAA Grant Assurances?

- When SLCDA accepts funds from the FAA, they agree to 39 obligations or “assurances”

- Airport open for public use without discrimination of types of aeronautical activities.
- Airport must be self-sustaining by maintaining an appropriate fee and rental structure.
- All facilities developed with Federal assistance must be made available to government aircraft.
- All revenues generated by the airport must be used for the capital or operating costs of the airport.
- Take appropriate action to restrict incompatible land use in the immediate vicinity of the airport.
- Airport Layout Plans must be kept up to date at all times.
KEY STUDY CONCLUSIONS
Airspace – Confirmed Parameters

» Adjusting runway orientation has little to no benefit
  – Counter-clockwise shift may have slight benefit but conflicts with VFR corridors
  – Clockwise shift is not beneficial as it would conflict with SLC operations

» Pattern on the east side of the airport will not work with the valley’s airspace.
  – FAA confirmed an east side pattern would conflict with arrivals to SLC.
  – TCAS warnings would be constant. Safety would be degraded
East Side Pattern – Not practical
Examed 27 airspaces with similar issues as SLC-U42

» Found 18 conflicted airspaces with Class D resolution (ATCT tower)
  – Majority with 200+ based aircraft

» Analysis indicates an ATCT tower should be planned for
  – East side location

ATCT Tower – Land should be preserved
VFR Traffic Pattern Analysis

Existing VFR traffic pattern tightly situated between VFR corridor and Class B Airspace and all west of the runway to avoid SLC approach traffic.
Land Use – Study in progress

» Safety Study
  – Runway Protection Zone based study
    • ACRP reports
    • FAA statistics

» Fair market rate land appraisal
## Aviation Forecast

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forecast Year</th>
<th>Planning Activity Level (PAL)</th>
<th>Based Aircraft</th>
<th>Based Aircraft</th>
<th>Operations</th>
<th>Operations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Base Case</td>
<td>High Growth</td>
<td>Base Case</td>
<td>High Growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>Base Year</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>70,990</td>
<td>70,990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>PAL 1</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>73,000</td>
<td>111,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>PAL 2</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>76,000</td>
<td>115,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2040</td>
<td>PAL 3</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>82,000</td>
<td>125,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
U42 Forecast Based Aircraft

- 2006 Master Plan Forecast
- Historical
- High Growth Forecast
- Baseline Forecast
## Facility Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Action Needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Runway Length</td>
<td>Plan for longer runway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airfield Geometries</td>
<td>Plan for C-II compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airspace and Approach Capability</td>
<td>Plan for better approaches/departures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runway Protection Zones (RPZ)</td>
<td>Move RPZ off of public building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Facilities</td>
<td>Maintenance and Fuel Farm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aircraft Parking and Storage</td>
<td>Plan for more aircraft storage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Somewhat Deficient**  [ ]  **Highly Deficient**  [ ]
ALTERNATIVES
U42 leading to trailing elements

**Leading**
- Runway Length & Approaches
- Hangar Development & Apron Expansion
- Support Facilities

**Trailing**
- Ultimate Land Use – Aero/Nonaeronautical
Runway alternatives objectives

- Provide for 1,000’ Safety Area (C-II upgrade)
- Extend runway to 6,600’ (currently 5,862’)
- Move RPZ off West Jordan Building
What is a Runway Protection Zone?

» Runway Protection Zone (RPZ)
  – “The RPZ function is to enhance the protection of people and property on the ground.”
  – Permissible land uses under an RPZ
    • Farming
    • Irrigation channels
    • Airport service roads
    • Underground facilities
    • NAVAIDS
    • Above ground fuel tanks for back up generators for unstaffed NAVAIDS
What did the last master plan propose:

- Large RPZ for precision approach
- Offset Runway 34 415’ north (C-II)
- Extend Taxiway A and B
- RPZ for >3/4 mile approach
- MALSR lighting to support precision approach
- Extend runway to 6,600’
Extension Alternatives Analyzed

Current

Alt 1

Alt 2

Alt 3

Alt 4

5862'

1,842'

6600'

1,452'

1,092'

6210'

6600'

34 LDA = 5496'

34

34

34

1100'

300'

1,042'
ALT 1: Runway Shift North – 6,600'
VFR Traffic Pattern Analysis

Current CAT A & B VFR Traffic Pattern

CAT A & B VFR Traffic Pattern for Proposed Alternate #1

Existing VFR traffic pattern tightly situated between VFR corridor and Class B Airspace and all west of the runway to avoid SLC approach traffic
ALT 2: Runway Shift North – 6,210’
ALT 3: Declared Distances – 6,600’
ALT 4 – No RPZ Enhancement
Decision to not plan for <3/4 Mile Vis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Runway Alternative 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No RPZ enhancement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,600’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Airspace Integration
- Aircraft Performance
- Land Use Integration
- Facility Integration
- ROM Costs
- Carbon Footprint
- FAA Preferences
U42 typically available to arriving aircraft

» A level above 95% is essentially hub airport level reliability

» Indicates that significant investments on the airport to achieve lower minimums are not necessary at this time.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Runway Alternative 1</th>
<th>Runway Alternative 2</th>
<th>Runway Alternative 3</th>
<th>Runway Alternative 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shift N into Class B 6,600’</strong></td>
<td><strong>Shift N w/out Class B 6,210’</strong></td>
<td><strong>Declared Distances 6,600’</strong></td>
<td><strong>No RPZ enhancement 6,600’</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airspace Integration</td>
<td>CAT B Pattern</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aircraft Performance</td>
<td>Shorter Runway</td>
<td>Shorter LDA RWY 34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Integration</td>
<td>RPZ compliance</td>
<td>RPZ compliance</td>
<td>RPZ compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Integration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROM Costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon Footprint</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAA Preferences</td>
<td></td>
<td>Uneven Declared Distance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evaluation**
- **Runway Alternative 1**: In Progress
- **Runway Alternative 2**: Favorable
- **Runway Alternative 3**: Less Favorable
- **Runway Alternative 4**: Least Favorable
Ultimate Development Alternative
North Hangar Development Comparison

2006 Airport Layout Plan

2023 Master Plan ultimate concept
South Hangar Development Comparison

2006 Airport Layout Plan

2023 Master Plan ultimate concept
East Side Development Comparison

2006 Airport Layout Plan

2023 Master Plan ultimate concept

ATCT Site
Next Steps

» Preferred alternative selection

» Implementation and financial planning

» Stakeholder committee meetings
  – Next Public Open House expected fall 2023
Draft Reports Available Online

» [https://slcairport.com/about-the-airport/master-plan](https://slcairport.com/about-the-airport/master-plan)
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