

Greg Edds, Chairman
Jim Greene, Vice- Chairman
Mike Caskey
Judy Klusman
Craig Pierce



Aaron Church, County Manager
Sarah Pack, Clerk to the Board
John W. Dees, II, County Attorney

Rowan County Board of Commissioners

130 West Innes Street • Salisbury, NC 28144
Telephone 704-216-8181 • Fax 704-216-8195

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE ROWAN COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

May 1, 2023 – 3:00 PM

J. NEWTON COHEN, SR. ROOM

J. NEWTON COHEN, SR. ROWAN COUNTY ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

PRESENT:

Greg Edds, Chairman
Jim Greene, Vice-Chairman
Judy Klusman, Commissioner
Craig Pierce, Commissioner
Mike Caskey, Commissioner (entered where noted)

County Manager Aaron Church, Clerk to the Board Sarah Pack, County Attorney Jay Dees, and Finance Director Anna Bumgarner were also present.

Call to Order

Chairman Edds called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. Chaplain Michael Taylor provided the invocation via Zoom videoconferencing software. Chairman Edds lead the Pledge of Allegiance.

Chairman Edds recognized members of the County Leadership Team.

Commissioner Caskey entered at 3:05 p.m.

Consider Additions to the Agenda

Chairman Edds said the following three items will be added to the agenda:

- Additional budget amendments (Added to Consent Item M)
- Grant application request for COPS Grant – Sheriff's Office (Consent Item AC)
- Consider approval of the April 17, 2023, regular meeting minutes (Consent Item AD)

Consider Deletions From the Agenda

Chairman Edds said Consent Item W, Shield-A-Badge with Prayer Awareness Month, will be pulled and placed on a future agenda.

Consider Approval of the Agenda

On motion of Klusman, seconded by Pierce, the Board voted 5-0 to approve the agenda as amended.

Consider Approval of the Consent Agenda

On motion of Klusman, seconded by Pierce, the Board voted 5-0 to approve the Consent Agenda as amended, as follows:

A. Proclamation Recognizing Clerks to the Board of Commissioners Week, as follows:

***PROCLAMATION DECLARING
CLERKS TO THE BOARDS OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' WEEK
AS APRIL 30 THROUGH MAY 6, 2023, IN ROWAN COUNTY***

WHEREAS: It is imperative to the democratic process that a well-informed citizenry participates in the operation of their local government; and

WHEREAS: The office of the Clerk to the Board provides the communication link between the citizens, the local governing body and administrative departments, and local government partners; and

WHEREAS: The position of clerk is one of the oldest in local government, dating at least to biblical times, and whose term has long been associated with the written word; so, it is that modern-day clerks are official recordkeepers for their counties; and

WHEREAS: North Carolina law requires every board of county commissioners to appoint a clerk and the clerk continues in that position "at the pleasure of the board"; and

WHEREAS: The clerk's most significant statutory duties concern the preparation, filing and safeguarding of local government records, but the statutory duties constitute only a portion of what the clerk actually does; and

WHEREAS: The clerk plays a vital role in county government and provides the written record needed to ensure that the board is accountable to the county's citizens and to other public and private officials; and

WHEREAS: The clerk is sometimes described as "the hub of the wheel" in local government because of the central work that the clerk plays in the government's communication network; and

WHEREAS: As local government becomes larger and more complicated, the clerk's role as a professional, dispassionate provider of information to citizens, government officials, and the media becomes more and more important; and

WHEREAS: Clerks have the opportunity to participate in the North Carolina Association of County Clerks, a very active professional association of public officials dedicated to improving the professional competency of clerks through regular regional and statewide educational opportunities; and

WHEREAS: In cooperation with the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill School of Government and International Institute of Municipal Clerks (IIMC), the North Carolina Association of County Clerks helps to sponsor a nationally recognized, examination-based certification program that culminates in receipt of the designation of Certified Municipal Clerk; and

WHEREAS: In addition, the North Carolina Association of County Clerks and the School of Government sponsor state certification programs leading to the designation of North Carolina Certified County Clerk, as well as opportunities for experienced clerks to obtain the continuing professional education needed to remain state-certified or to earn an advanced Master Clerk designation; and

WHEREAS: In addition to conducting education programs, the North Carolina Association of County Clerks also directly assists clerks on the job with mentoring programs to provide guidance to assist clerks in their day-to-day work; and

WHEREAS: Clerks, upon their own initiative, participate in these certification and education programs, including annual meetings of the North Carolina Association of County Clerks and the International Institute of Municipal Clerks, which not only improve the operation of their office, but through their achievements and awards bring favorable publicity to the counties in which they serve; and

WHEREAS: Clerks are involved at the state level, as well as in potential legislative and other matters of interest; and

WHEREAS: Although clerks work for the boards of county commissioners, they truly provide public service;

NOW, THEREFORE, the Rowan County Board of Commissioners does hereby recognize the week of April 30 through May 6, 2023, as Clerks to the Boards of County Commissioners' Week, and extends our appreciation to our Clerk to the Board, Sarah Pack, and to our Deputy Clerk to the Board, Rebecca Saleeby, and to all County Clerks for the vital services they perform and their exemplary dedication to the county they represent.

- B. Trexler Farm - Lease Renewal*
- C. Rate Increase of 15% to Ground Lease Hangars*
- D. Award Master Service Agreement -REI - Roof Consultation*
- E. Sole-Source Main Street Mission of China Grove*
- F. Sole-Source Clearwater Packaging, Inc. doing business as CPI/Guardian*
- G. Lease Agreement - HG High Road, Inc. 1st Amendment – West End Plaza*
- H. Sole-Source - Carolina CAT*
- I. Facilities Management and Parks Request to Reclassify a Position*
- J. Resolution Supporting Incorporation & Authorization to Join Yadkin-Pee Dee Water Management Group*
- K. Schedule May 15, 2023 Public Hearing for Road Name Changes -Dogwood/Ray Drives*
- L. Sole-Source Richland County Sheriff's Department*
- M. Budget Amendments, including Agenda Additions, as follows:*

| | | |
|------------------------------|---|--------------------|
| <i>Cooperative Extension</i> | <i>To budget additional revenue and expenses</i> | <i>\$5,000</i> |
| <i>Finance</i> | <i>To recognize increase in ambulance revenue and expense</i> | <i>\$100,000</i> |
| <i>Finance</i> | <i>To budget for Woodleaf Park contract</i> | <i>\$340,000</i> |
| <i>Finance</i> | <i>To Budget for Woodleaf Park Parks and Recreation Trust Fund grant</i> | <i>\$354,346</i> |
| <i>Finance</i> | <i>To transfer remaining funds needed for Rowan Cabarrus Community College purchase of property</i> | <i>\$130,248</i> |
| <i>Finance</i> | <i>To reverse BA-03-587 to correct out of balance funds</i> | <i>\$874,893</i> |
| <i>Finance</i> | <i>To reverse BA-03-586 to correct out of</i> | <i>\$2,494,030</i> |

| | | |
|------------------------|--|--------------------|
| | <i>balance funds</i> | |
| <i>Finance</i> | <i>To reverse BA-01-823 to correct out of balance funds</i> | <i>\$3,368,923</i> |
| <i>Risk Management</i> | <i>To increase Risk Management budget for Worker's Compensation Claims and Settlements</i> | <i>\$390,000</i> |

- N. *Hangar Policy & Waitlist Procedures*
- O. *Annual Hangar Lease Agreement*
- P. *Randolph & Sons Builders Incorporated -Woodleaf Park - Contract Approval*
- Q. *Sole Source - Patagonia Health Subscription*
- R. *Request to Change Funding Source*
- S. *INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT: Agreement with Spencer for Yadkin River Master Plan*
- T. *Memorandum of Agreement: Agreement with Rowan Cabarrus Community College for Land Purchase for Technology Education Center*
- U. *Public Safety Hangar: Right-of-Way and Permit*
- V. *Sole-Source Dell Computer Corp.*
- W. *Shield a Badge with Prayer Awareness Month*
- X. *Offer to Purchase Gravel Parking Lot*
- Y. *Addendum to the GREAT Grant Agreement*
- Z. *Revised Funding Request – Session Law 2022-74*
- AA. *Temporary Public Art Easement*
- AB. *Revised Juvenile Crime Prevention Council fiscal year 22-23 Funding Plan*
- AC. *Grant application request for COPS Grant – Sheriff's Office (Agenda Addition)*
- AD. *Consider Approval of the April 17, 2023, Regular Meeting Minutes (Agenda Addition)*

Public Comment Period

Gary Perry, 3003 Sides Road, is here to support Valerie Steele and the Airport. He said Ms. Steele has done a great job managing the Airport.

Aviation Management Consulting Group

Valerie Steele, Airport and Transit Director introduced David Benner, C.M. (Certified Member), Managing Consultant, and Katie Gainer, C.M., Senior Aviation Analyst, of Aviation Management Consulting Group (AMCG).

Mr. Benner gave background information related to AMCG. He said AMCG was contracted to complete an Airport Assessment, Aeronautical Rent Study, Aeronautical Fee Study, and assist in the development of Primary Management and Compliance Documents (PMCD), Rules and Regulations and Minimum Standards, and updated Airport Advisory Board Bylaws.

Over the past sixteen months AMCG and internal and external Stakeholders have reviewed drafts of the PMCD documents and provided input. The review process included tenant and advisory board meetings as well as an online portal created to anonymously collect feedback. Each comment received was documented and responded to appropriately. Mr. Benner reviewed a timeline of the process thus far.

Mr. Benner described each aspect of the of the contract and explained each facet of the process. He described relevant rules and regulations pertaining to the Airport.

Commissioner Klusman asked if the Rules and Regulations are driven by the Federal Aviation Administration and Mr. Benner said yes.

Mr. Benner reviewed General Aviation Minimum Standards and PMCDs. He explained the background of the Airport Advisory Body Bylaws and certain parts that were addressed. He also described the Airport Rent Study and provided a handout (Attachment A) before providing recommendations.

He detailed the Airport Fee Study and provided a second handout (Attachment B) before providing recommendations.

Vice-Chairman Greene asked about the impact to long-term leases. Mr. Benner said the long-term leases won't be impacted if the terms of the lease are already set.

Commissioner Klusman asked for clarification regarding fees. Mr. Benner clarified the terms used on Attachment B (shown as handwritten note on the attachment).

Mr. Benner reviewed the recommendations that AMCG proposed.

Chairman Edds asked for clarification regarding the request and Ms. Steele clarified the items that are requested to be adopted for implementation.

Commissioner Caskey asked if there was a reason approval was needed tonight. Ms. Steele said there is no requirement, but it has been a sixteen-month process. Ideally, new rents would be implemented in July to give tenants plenty of notice.

Chairman Edds asked what the major changes regarding the Airport Advisory Body are. Mr. Benner said the purpose of the Body is to help the Commissioners and Ms. Steele to manage the Airport to the benefit of the community. Airports are dynamic. There are public requirements, but if an issue arises that needs to be addressed, the request can come straight to the Board. The Body can support the Airport. Participation needs to be ensured. Chairman Edds said the Airport Advisory Board is highly valued by the Commissioners. He asked Mr. Benner to clarify why he referred to County policy as a weakness. Mr. Benner said there are comments in the airport tenant survey results that say there is wasted steps in the process and the Commissioners will do what they want to do regardless.

Commissioner Pierce said at a recent airport meeting, there was discussion about the purpose of airport hangars. They should be used for aviation; however, many of the tenants were using the hangars as storage. This is an opportunity for tenants to tell the Commissioners what they need. People do not like change. In general, the Advisory does a good job keeping the Commissioners apprised of events and needs. Many of the tenants are at the airport every day. People like that the Commissioners are supporting the airport continuously.

On motion of Pierce, seconded by Caskey, the Board voted 5-0 to table the vote to approve and adopt the proposed Rules and Regulations, Minimum Standards, Advisory Board Bylaws, and associated forms until the May 15, 2023 meeting.

Public Hearing for SNIA 01-23: Doug Foley

Shane Stewart, Planning and Development Assistant Director said Planning Staff received a Special Non-residential Intensity Allocation (SNIA) request from property owner Doug Foley to build a 12,000 square foot “storage/light manufacturing building” at 195 Nitro Alley, further referenced as Lot 4 in Horsepower Park and Parcel ID 230E-004. Approving this request would allow the project to exceed the administrative allowance of twelve percent built-upon area limitation requirement of the Coddle Creek watershed and allow up to seventy percent built-upon area for the project. A total of ten percent of the watershed acres may be removed from the twelve percent limitation and permit up to seventy percent coverage. He showed a site plan and other maps of the site.

Mr. Stewart reviewed the Land Use Plan recommendations. The subject parcel totals 1.09 acres. The proposed building is similarly sized to other lots in the IND zoned parks in the vicinity and proportionate to the lot size. Prior to establishing Horsepower Park, the 12 ½ acre property was rezoned to IND on February 19, 2018, creating the intension of future requests for the allocation. Current non-residential zoned acreage in Coddle Creek is well under the available allocation acreage. Site is located within a Commercial/Industrial area noted on the future land use map. In addition to the 2018 rezoning, Horsepower Park was developed in 2021 and has received two (2) SNIA approvals to date – both of which were under the former administrative review process.

At 4:08 p.m. Chairman Edds opened the Public Hearing and closed it after no one wished to speak.

On motion of Edds, seconded by Pierce, the Board voted 5-0 that SNIA 01-23 is reasonable, appropriate, and necessary to meet the development needs of Rowan County not previously envisioned by the West Rowan Land Use Plan with the Watershed Overlay based on the following:

- 1) It allows for the parcel to be used consistently with other surrounding parcels.*
- 2) It increases the tax base and job creation.*
- 3) It is below the maximum allowable threshold.*
- 4) It is located within a commercial/industrial park, which is strongly recommended in the Watershed Overlay.*

On motion of Pierce, seconded by Greene, the Board voted 5-0 to approve SNIA 01-23.

Public Hearing for ZTA 01:23: Agritourism Text

Ed Muire, Planning and Development Director, said Zoning Text Amendment (ZTA) 01-23 is a text amendment request submitted by Rowan County Tourism Development Authority suggesting the County review its zoning ordinance and consider amending its policies applicable to allowing drinking places such as “bars” at agritourism sites. Background information was presented at the April 17, 2023, meeting.

Although the request from TDA requested alcohol on-site sales and consumption at agritourism sites, Staff has expanded this amendment to include some customary retail trade and service businesses that may provide additional revenue related opportunities for agritourism sites. As a whole, bars and these additional uses are proposed for inclusion in the Agricultural Overlay district. Mr. Muire reviewed the proposed amendments.

Commissioner Pierce asked for clarification regarding the requirements of the farm. Mr. Muire said Planning and Development will work with Cooperative Extension to prepare a report to submit to the Planning Board and subsequently the Board of Commissioners.

County Attorney Jay Dees explained the uses that may need to be distinguished from typical use. This text proposal seeks to set apart uses that need special standards. Mr. Muire said this text amendment would allow for enforcement.

Mr. Muire said text is not set in stone; text amendments occur all the time.

At 4:27 p.m. Chairman Edds opened the Public Hearing.

James Meachum, 204 East Innes Street, Salisbury, said this is a strong middle ground that presents options. This gives opportunities to generational farms. There is no requirement of any bona fide farms to do this but gives them the option for diversifying and obtaining additional revenue. This text amendment offers protection to farms while allowing them to grow.

Hearing no further comments, Chairman Edds closed the Public Hearing at 4:30 p.m.

On motion of Pierce, seconded by Greene, the Board voted 5-0 that ZTA 01-23 is consistent with the West Rowan Land Use Plan, the East Rowan Land Use Plan and the Rowan County Working Agricultural Land Plan and is reasonable and appropriate based on the following:

- 1) It creates a Legislative Process*
- 2) Supports measures to protect and promote working forest and farmland*
- 3) Encourages agribusiness and natural resources as related to the industry*
- 4) Encourages entrepreneurship in our community*

On motion of Pierce, seconded by Greene, the Board voted 5-0 to approve ZTA 01-23.

Public Hearing for Incentive Agreement: Macy's

Scott Shelton, Rowan Economic Development Corporation (EDC) Vice President, said on 18, 2022, the Board of Commissioners approved an incentive grant to Macy's, Inc. (Macy's) based on 2,500 full-time jobs, 2,600 part-time jobs and an investment of \$584.3 million to build a 1.4 million square foot distribution center in Rowan County. This was the largest economic development announcement in the County's history.

Since this announcement, Macy's has finalized its payroll and capital investment plans for the new facility to reflect current market conditions and technological advances. Upon finalizing these plans, the company has informed the Rowan EDC of the following changes to the project's

scope: The Company will create 1,317 full-time jobs, 383 part-time jobs, and 2,260 seasonal jobs by the end of 2030. With these revised numbers the project still retains its status as the largest announcement in the County's history. Although total job creation will decrease, the average salary for these new full-time jobs will rise nearly 19%, from \$37,607 to \$44,610. In addition, Macy's has informed the EDC that their total capital investment in the project will increase from \$584.3 million to \$640.6 million.

The Board approved a fifteen-year incentive grant for the project equal to 80% of new taxes paid for both real and personal property. It was estimated that the project, based on the \$584.3 million investment, would directly generate approximately \$34 million in total tax revenue for the County during the incentive period. The total value of the incentive grant for Macy's was estimated to be \$27.2 million, which would result in approximately \$6.8 million in net tax revenue to the County during the incentive period.

With these changes in the project's scope, Macy's has requested a modification of the originally approved incentive terms. This modification would be a reduction of the incentive grant percentage from 80% to 70%. The length of the incentive term would remain at fifteen years. The approximately \$56.3 million in increased capital investment by Macy's will generate a larger amount of tax revenue, resulting in a corresponding increase in both the incentive grant amount and the County's net tax revenue despite a reduction of grant percentages.

It is now estimated that the project will generate approximately \$41.5 million in total tax revenue to the County by FY 38-39. Under Macy's proposed grant revision, the company would receive approximately \$29.1 million in incentives during this period. This would result in the County receiving approximately \$12.4 million in net tax revenue during the incentive period, which is an increase of approximately \$5.6 million when compared to the original project parameters.

Mr. Shelton said the representatives from Macy's asked for the draft agreement to be pulled from the agenda and considered at a future meeting.

Chairman Edds said Macy's is using a different designer to add significantly more technology which is causing the increase, but it is more efficient which is affecting the projected number of employees. A labor study has shown that wages will need to be raised which is a good thing for the county. Management teams will be needed, but local colleges are involved to produce a training program for management.

Mr. Shelton said changes have been made from the original plan. There will also be an increase in real property investment. This is good news for the County.

Vice-Chairman Greene said Macy's has stated they want to be good corporate citizens and invest in the community.

At 4:41 p.m. Chairman Edds opened the Public Hearing and closed it after no one wished to speak.

On motion of Edds, seconded by Pierce, the Board voted 5-0 to approve the revised incentive terms of the Incentive Agreement with Macy's, Incorporated.

Financial Reports

Finance Director Anna Bumgarner presented the financial reports. She compared annual cumulative expenditures, with 2023 totaling \$119,240,542 for March. Annual cumulative revenue is up for 2023, with \$159,207,529 for March. In February, the annual cumulative property tax for 2023 was \$88,955,417. In December 2022, the annual cumulative sales tax was \$18,403,121 with a projected amount of \$20,720,497 for December 2023. Ms. Bumgarner compared monthly sales taxes from 2020 to 2023.

Commissioner Klusman asked if a total assessed value of properties in the county was available. Ms. Bumgarner said it was approximately \$18.7 billion.

Chairman Edds said three percent of property owners have appealed. Less than 100 have moved on to the Board of Adjustment.

Ms. Bumgarner said on September 19, 2022, the Rowan County Board of Commissioners adopted an Investment Policy for Rowan County that includes providing a quarterly investment report to the Board. Per the policy this report shall summarize the investment activities in the most recent quarter and comment on anticipated investments in the next quarter. Since this is the first year that reports are being provided to the Board, I will include an overview of activities going back to July 1, 2022.

The County has decided to be conservative in the purchase of investments and at this time will no longer be investing in commercial paper. Currently the County has 43.7% invested in Treasury Bill, Notes or Government Agencies, 53.1% of its total portfolio in North Carolina Capital Management Trust (NCCMT) and the remaining 3.2% in money market instruments. With the change in the market the County's investment portfolio has improved for the quarter ended March 31, 2023, 138 basis points higher than June 30, 2022. Year to date interest earnings total \$2,485,213 as rates continued to increase. Finance has mainly invested in shorter terms as the interest rates have been better in the 6 to 12-month range. In June 2022, the County was receiving rates around 2.5%, and as of March we have a few investments with rates over 5%.

Board Appointments

On motion of Pierce, seconded by Caskey, the Board voted 5-0 to appoint John Evans, Aaron Mini, and Connie McClain to the three available County seats on the Ellis Cross Country Volunteer Fire Department Fire Commissioners.

On motion of Pierce, seconded by Klusman, the Board voted 5-0 to appoint Jocelyn William to the Mental Health seat, Ryan Bravo to the Youth Under the Age of 21 seat, R. Todd Wyrick to the General Public seat, and Beth Dixon to the Chief District Court Judge Seat on the Juvenile Crime Prevention Council.

On motion of Pierce, seconded by Greene, the Board voted 5-0 to appoint Kyler Eagle and Richard Terrell, Sr. to the two available ETJ seats on the Town of Rockwell Planning and Zoning – ETJ.

On motion of Pierce, seconded by Greene, the Board voted 5-0 to appoint Tim Moore, Adam Taylor, and Kay Gregory to the three available County seats on the Woodleaf Volunteer Fire Department Fire Commissioners.

Adjournment

At 4:48 p.m., on motion of Pierce, seconded by Klusman, the Board voted 5-0 to adjourn.

Sarah Pack, NCCCC
Clerk to the Board

DRAFT



Airport Rent Study Comparison

Rowan County

Mid-Carolina Regional Airport

April 20, 2023



RENT STUDY CONCLUSIONS

Table 1: Hangar 1 – Hangar 35

| Rental Rate Comparison | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|-------------------------|------------|-----------|---------------------|------------|--------|-------------|--------------------------|------------|--------|--------------|----------------|--|
| Identification | Component | Door Basis | Size (SF) | County Current Rent | | | | AMCG Market Rent Opinion | | | | Percent Change | |
| | | | | Rent Type | P/U/MO | PSF/YR | Annual Rent | Rent Type | P/U/MO | PSF/YR | Annual Rent | | |
| Hangar 1 | Executive Hangar | Open | 1,580 | Improvement | \$174.00 | \$1.32 | \$2,088.00 | Improvement | \$421.33 | \$3.20 | \$5,056.00 | 142% | |
| Hangar 2 | | Open | 1,394 | Improvement | \$153.00 | \$1.32 | \$1,836.00 | Improvement | \$371.73 | \$3.20 | \$4,460.80 | 143% | |
| Hangar 3 | | Open | 1,394 | Improvement | \$153.00 | \$1.32 | \$1,836.00 | Improvement | \$371.73 | \$3.20 | \$4,460.80 | 143% | |
| Hangar 4 | | Open | 1,394 | Improvement | \$153.00 | \$1.32 | \$1,836.00 | Improvement | \$371.73 | \$3.20 | \$4,460.80 | 143% | |
| Hangar 5 | | Open | 1,836 | Improvement | \$201.00 | \$1.31 | \$2,412.00 | Improvement | \$489.60 | \$3.20 | \$5,875.20 | 144% | |
| Hangar 6 | | Open | 2,057 | Improvement | \$226.00 | \$1.32 | \$2,712.00 | Improvement | \$548.53 | \$3.20 | \$6,582.40 | 143% | |
| Hangar 7 | | Open | 1,638 | Improvement | \$181.00 | \$1.33 | \$2,172.00 | Improvement | \$436.80 | \$3.20 | \$5,241.60 | 141% | |
| Hangar 8 | | Open | 1,638 | Improvement | \$181.00 | \$1.33 | \$2,172.00 | Improvement | \$436.80 | \$3.20 | \$5,241.60 | 141% | |
| Hangar 9 | | Open | 1,804 | Improvement | \$198.00 | \$1.32 | \$2,376.00 | Improvement | \$481.07 | \$3.20 | \$5,772.80 | 143% | |
| Hangar 10 | | Open | 2,310 | Improvement | \$174.00 | \$0.90 | \$2,088.00 | Improvement | \$616.00 | \$3.20 | \$7,392.00 | 254% | |
| Hangar 11 | | Open | 2,783 | Improvement | \$305.00 | \$1.32 | \$3,660.00 | Improvement | \$742.13 | \$3.20 | \$8,905.60 | 143% | |
| Hangar 12a/12b | | Open | 2,539 | Improvement | \$278.00 | \$1.31 | \$3,336.00 | Improvement | \$677.07 | \$3.20 | \$8,124.80 | 144% | |
| Hangar 13a/13b | | Open | 2,530 | Improvement | \$278.00 | \$1.32 | \$3,336.00 | Improvement | \$674.67 | \$3.20 | \$8,096.00 | 143% | |
| Hangar 14a/14b | | Open | 2,530 | Improvement | \$278.00 | \$1.32 | \$3,336.00 | Improvement | \$674.67 | \$3.20 | \$8,096.00 | 143% | |
| Hangar 15 | | Open | 2,530 | Improvement | \$278.00 | \$1.32 | \$3,336.00 | Improvement | \$674.67 | \$3.20 | \$8,096.00 | 143% | |
| Hangar 16a/16b | | Open | 2,475 | Improvement | \$272.00 | \$1.32 | \$3,264.00 | Improvement | \$660.00 | \$3.20 | \$7,920.00 | 143% | |
| Hangar 17 | | Enclosed | 3,648 | Improvement | \$800.00 | \$2.63 | \$9,600.00 | Improvement | \$1,352.80 | \$4.45 | \$16,233.60 | 69% | |
| Hangar 18 | | Enclosed | 3,648 | Improvement | \$725.00 | \$2.38 | \$8,700.00 | Improvement | \$1,428.80 | \$4.70 | \$17,145.60 | 97% | |
| Hangar 19 | | Enclosed | 3,648 | Improvement | \$1,363.00 | \$4.48 | \$16,356.00 | Improvement | \$1,428.80 | \$4.70 | \$17,145.60 | 91% | |
| Hangar 20 | | Open | 3,648 | Improvement | \$750.00 | \$2.47 | \$9,000.00 | Improvement | \$1,428.80 | \$4.70 | \$17,145.60 | 91% | |
| Hangar 21 | | Open | 1,280 | Improvement | \$142.00 | \$1.33 | \$1,704.00 | Improvement | \$362.67 | \$3.40 | \$4,352.00 | 155% | |
| Hangar 22 | | Open | 1,280 | Improvement | \$142.00 | \$1.33 | \$1,704.00 | Improvement | \$362.67 | \$3.40 | \$4,352.00 | 155% | |
| Hangar 23 | | Open | 1,280 | Improvement | \$142.00 | \$1.33 | \$1,704.00 | Improvement | \$362.67 | \$3.40 | \$4,352.00 | 155% | |
| Hangar 24 | | Open | 1,280 | Improvement | \$142.00 | \$1.33 | \$1,704.00 | Improvement | \$362.67 | \$3.40 | \$4,352.00 | 155% | |
| Hangar 25 | | Open | 1,280 | Improvement | \$142.00 | \$1.33 | \$1,704.00 | Improvement | \$362.67 | \$3.40 | \$4,352.00 | 155% | |
| Hangar 26 | | Open | 1,280 | Improvement | \$142.00 | \$1.33 | \$1,704.00 | Improvement | \$362.67 | \$3.40 | \$4,352.00 | 155% | |
| Hangar 27 | | Open | 1,280 | Improvement | \$142.00 | \$1.33 | \$1,704.00 | Improvement | \$362.67 | \$3.40 | \$4,352.00 | 155% | |
| Hangar 28 (Boss Aviation) | Community Hangar Office | Enclosed | 6,800 | Improvement | | | | Improvement | \$3,456.67 | \$6.10 | | | |
| | Shop/Storage | | 950 | Improvement | \$2,373.93 | \$3.08 | \$28,487.16 | Improvement | \$542.29 | \$6.85 | \$54,887.50 | 93% | |
| Hangar 29 (Food Lion) | Community Hangar Office | Enclosed | 1,500 | Improvement | | | | Improvement | \$4,666.67 | \$5.60 | | | |
| | | | 10,000 | Improvement | N/A | N/A | N/A | Improvement | \$2,905.00 | \$8.30 | \$90,860.00 | N/A | |
| Hangar 30 | Improved Land | N/A | 4,200 | Land | | | | Land | N/A | | | | |
| Hangar 31 | Improved Land | N/A | 5,875 | Land | \$105.38 | \$0.22 | \$1,264.56 | Land | N/A | \$0.35 | \$2,056.17 | 63% | |
| Hangar 33 (Heli-1 Corporation) | Community Hangar Office | Enclosed | 8,408 | Land | \$150.82 | \$0.22 | \$1,809.84 | Land | N/A | \$0.35 | \$2,942.80 | 63% | |
| | | | 15,000 | Improvement | \$1,751.00 | \$1.09 | \$21,012.00 | Improvement | \$5,375.00 | \$4.30 | \$102,300.00 | 387% | |
| Hangar 34 (Retail) | Community Hangar Office | Enclosed | 4,200 | Improvement | | | | Improvement | \$3,150.00 | \$9.00 | | | |
| | | | 15,000 | Improvement | \$1,453.88 | \$1.15 | \$17,446.56 | Improvement | \$5,375.00 | \$4.30 | \$65,580.00 | 276% | |
| | | | 120 | Improvement | | | | Improvement | \$90.00 | \$9.00 | | | |
| Hangar 35 (SouthTec) | Community Hangar Office | Enclosed | 6,000 | Land | | | | Land | \$3,150.00 | \$6.30 | | | |
| | Shop/Storage | Enclosed | 3,600 | Land | \$333.11 | \$0.27 | \$3,997.32 | Improvement | \$2,490.00 | \$8.30 | \$92,500.00 | N/A | |
| | | | 1,600 | Land | | | | Land | \$613.33 | \$4.60 | | | |
| | | | 3,600 | Land | | | | Land | \$1,455.00 | \$4.85 | | | |



RENT STUDY CONCLUSIONS

Table 2: Hangar 40 – Hangar 69

| Rental Rate Comparison | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------|------------------|------------|-----------|---------------------|----------|--------|--------------------------|-------------|----------|----------------|------------|-------------|--|
| Identification | Component | Door Basis | Size (SF) | County Current Rent | | | AMCG Market Rent Opinion | | | Percent Change | | | |
| | | | | Rent Type | P/U/MO | PSF/YR | Annual Rent | Rent Type | P/U/MO | | PSF/YR | Annual Rent | |
| Hangar 40 | Medium T-Hangar | Enclosed | 1,085 | Improvement | \$279.00 | \$2.67 | \$3,348.00 | Improvement | \$345.00 | \$3.82 | \$4,883.60 | 46% | |
| Hangar 41 | T-Hangar Storage | 169 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Hangar 42 | Medium T-Hangar | Enclosed | 1,085 | Improvement | \$263.00 | \$2.91 | \$3,156.00 | Improvement | \$345.00 | \$3.82 | \$4,140.00 | 31% | |
| Hangar 43 | Medium T-Hangar | Enclosed | 1,085 | Improvement | \$263.00 | \$2.91 | \$3,156.00 | Improvement | \$345.00 | \$3.82 | \$4,140.00 | 31% | |
| Hangar 44 | Medium T-Hangar | Enclosed | 1,085 | Improvement | \$263.00 | \$2.91 | \$3,156.00 | Improvement | \$345.00 | \$3.82 | \$4,140.00 | 31% | |
| Hangar 45 | Medium T-Hangar | Enclosed | 391 | Improvement | \$289.00 | \$2.35 | \$3,468.00 | Improvement | \$345.00 | \$3.82 | \$5,860.40 | 69% | |
| Hangar 46 | T-Hangar Storage | 169 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Hangar 47 | Medium T-Hangar | Enclosed | 1,085 | Improvement | \$279.00 | \$2.67 | \$3,348.00 | Improvement | \$345.00 | \$3.82 | \$4,883.60 | 46% | |
| Hangar 48 | Medium T-Hangar | Enclosed | 1,085 | Improvement | \$263.00 | \$2.91 | \$3,156.00 | Improvement | \$345.00 | \$3.82 | \$4,140.00 | 31% | |
| Hangar 49 | Medium T-Hangar | Enclosed | 1,085 | Improvement | \$263.00 | \$2.91 | \$3,156.00 | Improvement | \$345.00 | \$3.82 | \$4,140.00 | 31% | |
| Hangar 50 | Medium T-Hangar | Enclosed | 391 | Improvement | \$302.50 | \$2.46 | \$3,630.00 | Improvement | \$345.00 | \$3.82 | \$5,860.40 | 61% | |
| Hangar 51 | T-Hangar Storage | 169 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Hangar 52 | Medium T-Hangar | Enclosed | 1,085 | Land | \$10.00 | \$0.10 | \$120.00 | Improvement | \$345.00 | \$3.82 | \$4,883.60 | N/A | |
| Hangar 53 | Medium T-Hangar | Enclosed | 1,085 | Improvement | \$263.00 | \$2.91 | \$3,156.00 | Improvement | \$345.00 | \$3.82 | \$4,140.00 | 31% | |
| Hangar 54 | Medium T-Hangar | Enclosed | 1,085 | Improvement | \$263.00 | \$2.91 | \$3,156.00 | Improvement | \$345.00 | \$3.82 | \$4,140.00 | 31% | |
| Hangar 55 | Medium T-Hangar | Enclosed | 391 | Improvement | \$289.00 | \$2.35 | \$3,468.00 | Improvement | \$345.00 | \$3.82 | \$5,860.40 | 69% | |
| Hangar 56 | T-Hangar Storage | 169 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Hangar 57 | Medium T-Hangar | Enclosed | 1,085 | Improvement | \$279.00 | \$2.67 | \$3,348.00 | Improvement | \$345.00 | \$3.82 | \$4,883.60 | 46% | |
| Hangar 58 | Medium T-Hangar | Enclosed | 1,085 | Improvement | \$263.00 | \$2.91 | \$3,156.00 | Improvement | \$345.00 | \$3.82 | \$4,140.00 | 31% | |
| Hangar 59 | Medium T-Hangar | Enclosed | 1,085 | Improvement | \$263.00 | \$2.91 | \$3,156.00 | Improvement | \$345.00 | \$3.82 | \$4,140.00 | 31% | |
| Hangar 60 | Medium T-Hangar | Enclosed | 1,085 | Land | \$10.00 | \$0.08 | \$120.00 | Improvement | \$345.00 | \$3.82 | \$5,860.40 | N/A | |
| Hangar 61 | T-Hangar Storage | 391 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Hangar 62 | Large T-Hangar | Enclosed | 1,452 | Improvement | \$315.00 | \$2.24 | \$3,780.00 | Improvement | \$460.00 | \$3.80 | \$6,545.20 | 73% | |
| Hangar 63 | Large T-Hangar | Enclosed | 1,452 | Improvement | \$289.00 | \$2.39 | \$3,468.00 | Improvement | \$85.43 | \$4.40 | \$5,520.00 | 59% | |
| Hangar 64 | Large T-Hangar | Enclosed | 1,452 | Improvement | \$289.00 | \$2.39 | \$3,468.00 | Improvement | \$460.00 | \$3.80 | \$5,520.00 | 59% | |
| Hangar 65 | Large T-Hangar | Enclosed | 1,452 | Improvement | \$289.00 | \$2.39 | \$3,468.00 | Improvement | \$460.00 | \$3.80 | \$5,520.00 | 59% | |
| Hangar 66 | Large T-Hangar | Enclosed | 1,452 | Improvement | \$342.00 | \$2.08 | \$4,104.00 | Improvement | \$460.00 | \$3.80 | \$7,821.20 | 91% | |
| Hangar 67 | Large T-Hangar | Enclosed | 523 | Improvement | \$191.77 | \$4.40 | \$3,800.00 | Improvement | \$460.00 | \$3.80 | \$7,821.20 | 91% | |
| Hangar 68 | Large T-Hangar | Enclosed | 1,452 | Improvement | \$315.00 | \$2.24 | \$3,780.00 | Improvement | \$85.43 | \$4.40 | \$6,545.20 | 73% | |
| Hangar 69 | Large T-Hangar | Enclosed | 1,452 | Improvement | \$289.00 | \$2.39 | \$3,468.00 | Improvement | \$460.00 | \$3.80 | \$5,520.00 | 59% | |
| Hangar 70 | Large T-Hangar | Enclosed | 1,476 | Improvement | \$289.00 | \$2.39 | \$3,468.00 | Improvement | \$460.00 | \$3.80 | \$5,520.00 | 59% | |
| Hangar 71 | Large T-Hangar | Enclosed | 1,476 | Improvement | \$289.00 | \$2.39 | \$3,468.00 | Improvement | \$460.00 | \$3.80 | \$5,520.00 | 59% | |
| Hangar 72 | Large T-Hangar | Enclosed | 1,476 | Improvement | \$289.00 | \$2.39 | \$3,468.00 | Improvement | \$460.00 | \$3.80 | \$5,520.00 | 59% | |
| Hangar 73 | Large T-Hangar | Enclosed | 1,476 | Improvement | \$289.00 | \$2.39 | \$3,468.00 | Improvement | \$460.00 | \$3.80 | \$5,520.00 | 59% | |
| Hangar 74 | Large T-Hangar | Enclosed | 1,476 | Improvement | \$289.00 | \$2.39 | \$3,468.00 | Improvement | \$460.00 | \$3.80 | \$5,520.00 | 59% | |
| Hangar 75 | Large T-Hangar | Enclosed | 1,476 | Improvement | \$289.00 | \$2.39 | \$3,468.00 | Improvement | \$460.00 | \$3.80 | \$5,520.00 | 59% | |
| Hangar 76 | Large T-Hangar | Enclosed | 1,476 | Improvement | \$289.00 | \$2.39 | \$3,468.00 | Improvement | \$460.00 | \$3.80 | \$5,520.00 | 59% | |
| Hangar 77 | Large T-Hangar | Enclosed | 1,476 | Improvement | \$289.00 | \$2.39 | \$3,468.00 | Improvement | \$460.00 | \$3.80 | \$5,520.00 | 59% | |
| Hangar 78 | Large T-Hangar | Enclosed | 1,476 | Improvement | \$289.00 | \$2.39 | \$3,468.00 | Improvement | \$460.00 | \$3.80 | \$5,520.00 | 59% | |
| Hangar 79 | Large T-Hangar | Enclosed | 1,476 | Improvement | \$289.00 | \$2.39 | \$3,468.00 | Improvement | \$460.00 | \$3.80 | \$5,520.00 | 59% | |
| Hangar 80 | Large T-Hangar | Enclosed | 1,476 | Improvement | \$289.00 | \$2.39 | \$3,468.00 | Improvement | \$460.00 | \$3.80 | \$5,520.00 | 59% | |
| Hangar 81 | Large T-Hangar | Enclosed | 1,476 | Improvement | \$289.00 | \$2.39 | \$3,468.00 | Improvement | \$460.00 | \$3.80 | \$5,520.00 | 59% | |
| Hangar 82 | Large T-Hangar | Enclosed | 1,476 | Improvement | \$289.00 | \$2.39 | \$3,468.00 | Improvement | \$460.00 | \$3.80 | \$5,520.00 | 59% | |
| Hangar 83 | Large T-Hangar | Enclosed | 1,476 | Improvement | \$289.00 | \$2.39 | \$3,468.00 | Improvement | \$460.00 | \$3.80 | \$5,520.00 | 59% | |
| Hangar 84 | Large T-Hangar | Enclosed | 1,476 | Improvement | \$289.00 | \$2.39 | \$3,468.00 | Improvement | \$460.00 | \$3.80 | \$5,520.00 | 59% | |
| Hangar 85 | Large T-Hangar | Enclosed | 1,476 | Improvement | \$289.00 | \$2.39 | \$3,468.00 | Improvement | \$460.00 | \$3.80 | \$5,520.00 | 59% | |
| Hangar 86 | Large T-Hangar | Enclosed | 1,476 | Improvement | \$289.00 | \$2.39 | \$3,468.00 | Improvement | \$460.00 | \$3.80 | \$5,520.00 | 59% | |
| Hangar 87 | Large T-Hangar | Enclosed | 1,476 | Improvement | \$289.00 | \$2.39 | \$3,468.00 | Improvement | \$460.00 | \$3.80 | \$5,520.00 | 59% | |
| Hangar 88 | Large T-Hangar | Enclosed | 1,476 | Improvement | \$289.00 | \$2.39 | \$3,468.00 | Improvement | \$460.00 | \$3.80 | \$5,520.00 | 59% | |
| Hangar 89 | Large T-Hangar | Enclosed | 1,476 | Improvement | \$289.00 | \$2.39 | \$3,468.00 | Improvement | \$460.00 | \$3.80 | \$5,520.00 | 59% | |
| Hangar 90 | Large T-Hangar | Enclosed | 1,476 | Improvement | \$289.00 | \$2.39 | \$3,468.00 | Improvement | \$460.00 | \$3.80 | \$5,520.00 | 59% | |
| Hangar 91 | Large T-Hangar | Enclosed | 1,476 | Improvement | \$289.00 | \$2.39 | \$3,468.00 | Improvement | \$460.00 | \$3.80 | \$5,520.00 | 59% | |
| Hangar 92 | Large T-Hangar | Enclosed | 1,476 | Improvement | \$289.00 | \$2.39 | \$3,468.00 | Improvement | \$460.00 | \$3.80 | \$5,520.00 | 59% | |
| Hangar 93 | Large T-Hangar | Enclosed | 1,476 | Improvement | \$289.00 | \$2.39 | \$3,468.00 | Improvement | \$460.00 | \$3.80 | \$5,520.00 | 59% | |
| Hangar 94 | Large T-Hangar | Enclosed | 1,476 | Improvement | \$289.00 | \$2.39 | \$3,468.00 | Improvement | \$460.00 | \$3.80 | \$5,520.00 | 59% | |
| Hangar 95 | Large T-Hangar | Enclosed | 1,476 | Improvement | \$289.00 | \$2.39 | \$3,468.00 | Improvement | \$460.00 | \$3.80 | \$5,520.00 | 59% | |
| Hangar 96 | Large T-Hangar | Enclosed | 1,476 | Improvement | \$289.00 | \$2.39 | \$3,468.00 | Improvement | \$460.00 | \$3.80 | \$5,520.00 | 59% | |
| Hangar 97 | Large T-Hangar | Enclosed | 1,476 | Improvement | \$289.00 | \$2.39 | \$3,468.00 | Improvement | \$460.00 | \$3.80 | \$5,520.00 | 59% | |
| Hangar 98 | Large T-Hangar | Enclosed | 1,476 | Improvement | \$289.00 | \$2.39 | \$3,468.00 | Improvement | \$460.00 | \$3.80 | \$5,520.00 | 59% | |
| Hangar 99 | Large T-Hangar | Enclosed | 1,476 | Improvement | \$289.00 | \$2.39 | \$3,468.00 | Improvement | \$460.00 | \$3.80 | \$5,520.00 | 59% | |
| Hangar 100 | Large T-Hangar | Enclosed | 1,476 | Improvement | \$289.00 | \$2.39 | \$3,468.00 | Improvement | \$460.00 | \$3.80 | \$5,520.00 | 59% | |



RENT STUDY CONCLUSIONS


Table 3: Land, Apron, and Vehicle Parking

| Identification | Component | Door Basis | Size (SF) | Rental Rate Comparison | | | | | | AMCG Market Rent Opinion | | | | Percent Change | |
|----------------------------|-----------------|--|-----------|------------------------|-------|--------|-------------|-----------------|-------|--------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|----------------|--|
| | | | | Rent Type | PU/MO | PSF/YR | Annual Rent | Rent Type | PU/MO | PSF/YR | Annual Rent | Annual Rent | Annual Rent | | |
| Area A | | Up to 49,000 50,000 to 249,999 250,000 to 1,000,000 1,000,000 and greater | | N/A | | | | | N/A | | | | | N/A | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Area B Area C | Improved Land | Up to 49,000 50,000 to 249,999 250,000 to 1,000,000 1,000,000 and greater | | N/A | | | | Improved Land | N/A | | | | | N/A | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Area D | | Up to 49,000 50,000 to 249,999 250,000 to 1,000,000 1,000,000 and greater | | N/A | | | | | N/A | | | | | N/A | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Area A Area B Area C | Asphalt Apron | Up to 99,999 100,000 and greater | | N/A | | | | Asphalt Apron | N/A | | | | | N/A | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| N/A | Vehicle Parking | Up to 99,999 100,000 and greater | | N/A | | | | Vehicle Parking | N/A | | | | | N/A | |



AERONAUTICAL FEE SCHEDULE

VII. AERONAUTICAL FEE SCHEDULE

|  | | Mid-Carolina Regional Airport Aeronautical Fee Schedule Calendar Year 2023 | | |
|---|--|---|--|----------|
| TYPE OF FEE | | FEE | | |
| Fuel Flowage Fee | | | | |
| | County Retail Fueling | | | \$0.20 |
| | Non-Commercial Self-Fueling | | | \$0.20 |
| Transient Aircraft Handling Fee | | | | |
| All Transient Aircraft (waived with fuel purchase) | | | | |
| | Single-Engine Piston | | | \$35.00 |
| | Multi-Engine Piston | | | \$35.00 |
| | Turboprop | | | \$200.00 |
| | Jet | | | \$35.00 |
| | Helicopter | | | \$35.00 |
| Aircraft Parking Fee | | | | |
| Aircraft Type | | Daily (4 to 12 hours)* | Overnight (more than 12 hours per day) | Monthly |
| | Single-Engine Piston | \$15.00 | \$20.00 | \$120.00 |
| | Multi-Engine Piston | \$19.00 | \$25.00 | \$150.00 |
| | Jet Turboprop* | \$38.00 | \$50.00 | \$300.00 |
| | Helicopter jet | \$19.00 | \$25.00 | \$150.00 |
| | other Helicopter | \$19.00 | \$25.00 | \$150.00 |
| Aeronautical Permit Fee | | | | |
| | Aircraft Maintenance Operator | | | \$750.00 |
| | Avionics or Instrument Maintenance Operator | | | \$750.00 |
| | Aircraft Rental or Flight Training Operator | | | \$750.00 |
| | Aircraft Charter or Aircraft Management Operator | | | \$750.00 |
| | Aircraft Sales Operator | | | \$750.00 |
| | Other Commercial Aeronautical Activities | | | \$750.00 |
| | Temporary Specialized Aviation Service Operator | | | \$750.00 |
| | Self-Fueling Permittee | | | \$750.00 |

* Aircraft parking less than 4 hours not charged an Aircraft Parking Fee