



Terminal Alternatives Meeting Summary

Airport Master Plan

Madison Municipal Airport

Date: 9/29/2026

Time: 9:00 AM

Subject: Terminal Alternatives Meeting

Facilitator: KLJ Engineering

Attendees: Morris Riggin, Heather Lee, Ryan Hegg, Tim Peters, Kenny Johnson, Roy Lindsay, Jon Becker (SDDOT), Brian Schuck (FAA), Kent Penney (KLJ), Andrew Zielike (KLJ), Aaron Storm (KLJ), Jack Vogt (KLJ)

Agenda Topics

A Master Plan meeting was held on September 29th, 2026, with the Planning Advisory Committee (PAC). The purpose of the meeting was to present terminal area development concepts. The following presents a synopsis of the agenda items discussed.

Progress to Date

- Critical Design Aircraft approval was received from the FAA in March 2026.
- FAA/State comments received for Chapter 1, 2 and 3. Revisions have been made and chapters resubmitted.
- Exhibit A/Airport Property Map deeds and easements have been drafted. Research on encumbrances is underway.
- Existing obstacle impacts to Runway 15-33 are currently being evaluated through OE/AAA.
- ALP existing conditions have been drafted.

Considerations for Terminal Alternatives

- The terminal area alternatives will explore distinct development zones for various activity and address specific terminal area needs:
 - Increased aircraft parking
 - Aerial Application space
 - Additional hangar space
- The alternatives presented are not meant to be implemented immediately. Phasing will be based on remaining useful life in existing infrastructure and demonstrated demand.
- The purpose of these alternatives is to show where development could occur and gather feedback from the PAC. Concepts can be merged with others and carried forward in refined alternatives.

Alternative 1

- Key features of this alternative:
 - A new apron is repositioned along the primary runway providing ADG-II maneuvering and parking, displacing current hangar development. The apron configuration allows for approximately 80 feet of crosswind runway length due to the change in RVZ.
 - North hangar development laid out to provide efficient access to box hangars for ADG-I aircraft.

- Large dedicated Aerial Applicator location south of the crosswind runway, replacing future south run-up pad area.
- North Hangar development will require earthwork due to the rise in terrain north of the existing hangars.
- PAC did not want to lose the south run-up pad. Explained that aerial application is a limited season, while a run-up pad is utilized year-round.
- It was asked how vehicles would access the north hangar development
 - Refined alternatives will show options for vehicle access.
- PAC noted that the main apron was very large and would require lots of pavement, likely not feasible for the city.
- The PAC does not anticipate the airport being busy enough to necessitate a dedicated self-fueling location as shown with this alternative.
- Flight school is isolated from vehicle access and parking. Southwest hangar development would not work for flight school operation.

Alternative 2

- Key features of this alternative:
 - An ADG-II Apron is developed along the primary runway, with less expansion to the north than Alternative 1 resulting in less impact to existing hangars. Aircraft parking is reoriented perpendicular for maximum storage. The apron configuration allows for an additional 100 feet of crosswind runway length due to the change in RVZ.
 - T-Hangars are shown in the north hangar area as a more efficient form of aircraft storage.
 - Aerial Applicator area is located on the southwest edge of the apron which is more readily developable but requires aircraft to pass through flight general aviation activity on the apron and is furthest away from the primary runway.
 - The existing terminal building site is expanded.
- The PAC noted that the aerial applicator location shown on this alternative was more financially feasible and due to the shorter spray season the impact of mixing of aircraft operation types would be limited.
- Providing the option for T-Hangars is desirable as they are easier to find tenants for.
- The new Apron was seen as too large and likely not feasible.

Alternative 3

- Key features of this alternative:
 - The new apron aligned with the primary runway is minimized to have no impact on existing private hangars, while still providing ADG-II parking and maneuvering. It features a combined public terminal and transient hangar and allows for an additional 80 feet of crosswind runway length due to the change in RVZ.
 - The aerial applicator area is located to the north and allows for larger 100'x100' hangars.
 - The existing terminal and equipment storage building is removed for apron connections and self-fueling.
 - The southwest hangar development is optimized for T-hangar and private hangars.
- The PAC noted the north location for the aerial applicator area is desirable as it is separate from other operations and allows for both runup pads.
- It was asked if the north development area could be configured to T-Hangars

- This can be accommodated. The final plan will have flexibility to preserve for either.
- This apron layout was more favorable as it has less impact on existing infrastructure and implementation will be lower cost.
- The southwest hangar development area accommodates a good mix of additional T-Hangars and private hangars. The PAC desired to see this element carried forward in refined alternatives.
- SDDOT asked why the parallel taxiway realignment was shown for all the alternatives
 - This is done to meet FAA Design standards requiring taxiways to cross a runway at 90 degrees plus/minus 15 degrees). The parallel taxiway is in good condition, and this realignment would only be required when the pavement needs full reconstruction

Alternative 4

- Key features of this alternative:
 - The ADG-I apron in front of the existing terminal building extends to the north and northwest following the recent apron use plan with no displacement of private hangars.
 - Additional ADG-II aircraft parking apron and hangar development extend to the southwest.
 - The aerial applicator is located to the south of the crosswind runway, with orientation aligned with the parallel taxiway, and sufficient space for a south run-up pad. Hangar height is limited by crosswind runway approach and transitional surfaces.
- Members of the PAC preferred the progression of the ADG-I apron area and noted that majority of the aircraft activity at MDS is smaller ADG-I aircraft.
- SDDOT noted that separation of transient and flight training aircraft could be beneficial.

Alternative 5

- Key features of this alternative:
 - Additional ADG-II apron aligned with the primary runway, displacing a few private hangars. Relocation of the existing fuel system and hangar/terminal building to allow for all three aprons to connect and accommodate ADG-II aircraft movement.
 - This apron configuration allows for an additional 120 feet of crosswind runway length due to the change in RVZ.
 - A large ADG-I aircraft parking apron is located in the existing turf tiedown area.
 - The aerial applicator area is shown along the south end of the parallel taxiway, positioned at an angle to allow for a larger facility without impacting the run-up pad.
- The PAC did not favor this apron layout as corporate traffic will likely not grow that much to demand the space.
- It was noted that the aprons should be separated for transient and flight training aircraft.
- The additional ADG-I tie-down parking apron to the west was seen as expensive and unnecessary for the small aircraft.
- The location of the aerial applicator was favorable, however site development cost and land access would be a consideration when compared to the north side.
- Zielike noted that relocating or removing the existing fuel system, terminal and hangar building in the future would allow for the existing apron to be utilized more efficiently.

- It was questioned if the added crosswind runway length would offset the costs of the apron development
 - This will be analyzed prior to the next meeting.

Next Steps

- Based on the feedback from this meeting, the alternatives will be changed and refined to reflect the PAC's goals for the airport. The refined alternatives will be presented at the next meeting, to help the airport select a preferred layout which will be depicted on the Airport Layout Plan (ALP).
- The next project meeting will also include a public open house.
- The final disposition of Runway 15-33 is pending airspace study and determination from the FAA.

Action Items

- KLJ will revise terminal alternatives prior to the next meeting.
- KLJ will continue coordination with FAA OE/AAA regarding evaluation of the obstacles in Runway 15 and 33 approaches.