

Nampa Airport Master Plan

HANGAR ALTERNATIVES | PROS & CONS

Alternative	Short Description	Pros	Cons
Terminal T-1	<p>Construct a new large hangar for short-term storage of aircraft. This new building would also house the restaurant and airport administration.</p> <p>In the long-term, a second large hangar could be added if need arose.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides room for several business class aircraft to over-night at the airport to get out of the weather and gives the FBO expanded flight-line exposure. Allows for the restaurant to expand and grow. As wells allows airport administration to relocate closer to flight activity and upgrade the facilities for meetings. In the future, if needed, room would be protected for another large over-night storage hangar, less the administration and restaurant. By clearing the area, would allow access to the museum with larger warbirds for display and fly-ins. Lease of the facilities to a private entity would provide a significant revenue source for the sustainability of the airport. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This alternative would disrupt the center part of the airport during construction, including the main fueling area. The construction of the facilities would not be federally eligible, and funding would need to come from the Sponsor or other sources.
Terminal T-2 (Preferred)	<p>Construct a new large hangar for short-term storage of aircraft. This new building would also house the restaurant and airport administration.</p> <p>In the long-term an addition could be added if need arose.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides room for several business class aircraft to over-night at the airport to get out of the weather and gives the FBO expanded flight-line exposure. Allows for the restaurant to expand and grow. Allows airport administration to relocate closer to flight activity and upgrade the facilities for meetings. Would have less long-term financial exposure. By clearing the area, would allow access to the museum with larger warbirds for display and fly-ins. Lease of the facilities to a private entity would provide a significant revenue source for the sustainability of the airport. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This alternative would disrupt the center part of the airport during construction, including the main fueling area. The construction of the facilities would not be federally eligible, and funding would need to come from the Sponsor or other sources.
Central Area C-1	Executive-sized hangars in a north/south facing layout	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This layout would be easy to construct in four distinct phases to allow for controlled cost exposure. Doors aligned generally north/south are not as exposed to the wind (as prevailing in Nampa). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> North facing hangars are prone to developing snow and ice accumulations in winter months.
Central Area C-2 (Preferred)	Executive-sized hangars in an east/west facing layout	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This layout would be easy to construct to connect to existing taxiway connectors. Doors aligned generally east/west are not prone to developing snow and ice accumulations in winter months. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> East/west facing hangars are exposed to Nampa's prevailing winds.
East Area E-1	Highest density of individual private hangars in an east/west row configuration; with north/south facing hangar doors.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most number of individual hangars for lease/rent of all E-alternatives. Good auto access to hangar backs (keeping vehicles off active pavements). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Long taxi lanes that may lead to travel conflict if two or more aircraft try to use the travel lane at the same time. North facing hangars are prone to developing snow and ice accumulations in winter months.
East Area E-2	Highest density of individual private hangars in a north/south column configuration; with east/west facing hangar doors.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most number of individual hangars for lease/rent with east/west facing doors of all E-alternatives. Good auto access to hangar backs (keeping vehicles off active pavements). Easy to construct in hangar groups as need arises. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shorter taxi lanes than E-1, but still only one direction and may allow for conflict with opposite direction traffic.
East Area E-3	North/south columns of private-sized hangars with east/west facing hangar doors. Taxi lane access paths on north and south sides.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Easy to construct in hangar groups as need arises. Two separate access paths avoid bi-directional conflict. East/West doors. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Least number of rentable hangars /spots. Poor auto access to hangars; all would need to cross active taxiway(s).
East Area E-4 (Preferred)	<p>North/south columns of private-sized hangars with east/west facing hangar doors. Taxi lane access paths on north and south sides.</p> <p>Similar layout to Alternative E-3 but shown with a varied mix of hangar types.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Easy to construct in hangar groups as need arises. Two separate access paths avoid bi-directional conflict. East/West doors. Mix of common-wall T-Hangar and box-hangars allows for overall higher density of rentals and choices for users. Common-walls hangars generally are the least expensive to build and may result in lower rent. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Poor auto access to hangars; all would need to cross active taxiway(s). Would mean planning to determine which 'style' should be built next. Harder to pre-plan utilities.

