



# COUNCIL MINUTES

March 12, 2026

The City Council of the City of Mesa met in the Study Session room at City Hall, 20 East Main Street, on March 12, 2026, at 7:31 a.m.

## COUNCIL PRESENT

Mark Freeman  
Scott Somers  
Rich Adams  
Jennifer Duff  
Alicia Goforth  
Francisco Heredia  
Dorean Taylor

## COUNCIL ABSENT

None

## OFFICERS PRESENT

Scott Butler  
Holly Moseley  
Jim Smith

Mayor Freeman conducted a roll call.

1-a. Hear a presentation, discuss, and provide a recommendation on the proposed fees and charges for the Falcon Field department.

Falcon Field Airport Director Corinne Nystrom introduced Office of Management and Budget Assistant Director Sam Schultz and Jill Owen, attorney and partner with Snell & Wilmer, and displayed a PowerPoint presentation. **(See Attachment 1)**

City Attorney Jim Smith advised that the proposed Falcon Field fees and charges are strictly for financial sustainability, not for reducing noise, limiting flight traffic, or favoring/discriminating against any airport users. He emphasized that the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) rates and charges policy does not allow fees to be used for those purposes.

Mayor Freeman noted that Falcon Field operates as one of the City's enterprise funds, meaning its financial health must be reviewed annually. He thanked staff and specifically recognized Councilmember Goforth for leading analysis efforts related to the airport.

Mr. Schultz explained that Falcon Field, an enterprise fund, is expected to function as a self-sustaining fund, similar to a business, without additional contributions.

Ms. Nystrom reviewed the purpose statement and the primary sources of revenue for Falcon Field Airport that are not related to grants. She indicated that the airport's main revenue sources are ground lease rents and city-owned hangar/tie-down rentals. She emphasized that fuel flowage fees generate about \$340,000 annually, but the amount is not enough to fully support the airfield cost center. (See Pages 2 and 3 of Attachment 1)

In response to a question posed by Councilmember Goforth, Ms. Nystrom replied that fuel flowage fees are based on the amount of fuel that is delivered to the airport to be sold later.

Ms. Nystrom explained that FAA Grant Assurance #24 requires airports receiving federal or state capital improvement funds to maintain a fee and rental structure that keeps the airport as self-sustaining as possible. She noted that since 2006, the Airport Enterprise Fund has remained balanced due to several factors, including a one-time \$4.6 million land sale, along with conservative budgeting and spending practices; however, rising costs have forced the airport to defer maintenance and capital improvement projects, especially airfield and facility upkeep. (See Page 4 of Attachment 1)

Responding to a question from Councilmember Goforth, Ms. Nystrom provided examples of some of the projects that have been deferred due to lack of funds, such as signage improvements, landscaping along Falcon Drive, pavement maintenance, and repairs to city-owned hangars. She explained that many hangars date back to the 1980s and now show significant wear, including oxidized paint and exposed metal. She stressed that additional revenue is needed to preserve these assets.

Ms. Nystrom reviewed Falcon Field Airport's financial status, noting that currently the airport is self-sustaining, but current revenue levels will not support future needs. She indicated inflation and sharply rising capital improvement costs since 2021 have significantly reduced the amount of maintenance the airport can afford. She warned that without increased revenue, the airport will quickly fall behind on critical infrastructure upkeep. (See Page 5 of Attachment 1)

In response to a question from Councilmember Duff, Ms. Nystrom explained that after a financial review last year, the airport increased hangar and tie-down rents by 10% to enable coverage of their own costs. She noted that staff embarked on notifying tenants that recommended rate increases will be proposed over the next several years, if necessary, to become financially self-sustaining.

Ms. Nystrom presented a photo of Echo Ramp as an example of pavement conditions in serious need of repair. She cautioned that continued neglect will eventually require a full reconstruction. (See Page 6 of Attachment 1)

Responding to multiple questions from Councilmember Adams, Ms. Nystrom reported that the Echo Ramp has gone unmaintained for six or seven years due to lack of funding. She confirmed that if crack filling and seal coating are not performed every four to five years, the pavement will deteriorate to the point where a complete reconstruction is required, which is significantly more expensive. She added that at least one additional crack fill and seal coat treatment will be needed before federal or state grant funding may be requested.

In response to multiple questions posed by Councilmember Taylor, Ms. Nystrom explained that the pavement is heaving and the main cause of deterioration is weather-related expansion and not the weight of the aircraft.

Ms. Nystrom identified the approach to address the airport's funding shortfall and discussed the cost for ongoing pavement maintenance over the next eight years. She highlighted what the FAA and State grants cover regarding major capital improvements and ongoing pavement maintenance. (See Pages 7 and 8 of Attachment 1)

In response to multiple questions posed by Councilmember Goforth, Ms. Nystrom answered that a pavement reconstruction can last 15 to 20 years or longer if properly maintained. She indicated that after reconstruction, pavement conditions can exceed the FAA's minimum pavement condition index (PCI) threshold of 70, and with regular upkeep, the pavement lifespan could potentially extend to 30 years.

Ms. Nystrom explained that since costs have risen significantly, the airport began exploring a financial cost center approach in 2024, supported by the FAA, which divides the airport into sections with the goal of making each area self-sustaining. She said the Council approved the first step of this approach in 2025 by implementing an 8% fee increase for city-owned hangars and tie-downs to begin moving those areas toward financial self-sufficiency. She discussed the current proposed rate increases for the airport's hangars and tie-downs and described what the rate increases will cover. (See Pages 9 through 11 of Attachment 1)

Responding to a question from Councilmember Duff, Ms. Nystrom replied that the current cost for an open tie-down is \$55 per month.

In response to a question posed by Mayor Freeman, Ms. Nystrom answered that the City's fees are generally in line with rates at other airports.

Responding to multiple questions from Councilmember Taylor, Ms. Nystrom described the components of a well-maintained tie-down area. She emphasized that the tie-down system is designed to keep aircraft securely in place and prevent them from being blown across the runway during storms or high winds.

Ms. Nystrom stated that the Airfield Cost Center is expected to be the most difficult to make self-sustaining due to its limited revenue sources, relying mainly on fuel flowage fees, and listed its costly operational areas. She reported that the Airfield Cost Center is projected to cost approximately \$2.4 million this fiscal year, while expected revenue is only about \$374,300, creating a \$2 million shortfall. She indicated that after reviewing various options and comparing practices at other airports, staff recommended a gradual increase in the Avgas fuel flowage fee from \$0.14 to \$0.15 per gallon. She commented that this increase alone will not close the gap, and staff also proposed implementing landing fees as an additional revenue source to help reduce the deficit and move the airfield toward financial sustainability. (See Pages 12 and 13 of Attachment 1)

In response to a question posed by Mayor Freeman, Ms. Nystrom replied that the closest airports to Falcon Field for fuel would be Mesa Gateway, Chandler Municipal, and Scottsdale.

Responding to a question from Councilmember Adams, Ms. Nystrom confirmed that included in the \$2.4 million expenses for the Airfield Cost Center is the cost of a specialty fire apparatus along with six firefighters, who must be FAA certified as aircraft rescue firefighters with ongoing training requirements.

Mr. Schultz clarified that the fire truck was originally funded through a general obligation bond, and staffing levels were based on providing coverage during tower operating hours.

Ms. Nystrom added that the firefighters are stationed at the airport 24 hours a day to respond to incidents at any time. She noted that Falcon Field is a general aviation airport and is not required by the FAA to have aircraft rescue firefighting coverage, but the City Council chose to provide the service. She noted that last year, Falcon Field had 80 incidents at the airport.

City Manager Scott Butler commented that while the City is not required to provide the aircraft rescue firefighting service, the City values the service as critical for the safety of residents.

Responding to multiple questions from Vice Mayor Somers, Ms. Nystrom acknowledged that there is a risk of losing business if rates are increased too much. She emphasized that having fuel available is critical for those who choose to be at Falcon Field Airport. She stated that Falcon Field only has one full-service fixed base operator (FBO) and if we do not remain competitive, aircraft may go to other airports to refuel which could put the Falcon Field FBO out of business, resulting in even larger operational issues for Falcon Field.

In response to multiple questions from Councilmember Goforth, Ms. Nystrom replied that there are other general aviation airports that are fuel providers and collect more revenue from fuel; however, Falcon Field Airport does not generate a large amount of revenue from fuel, and incurs operating costs related to staffing and fuel tanks to comply with all environmental requirements.

Responding to multiple questions posed by Mayor Freeman, Ms. Nystrom explained that doubling the fuel flowage fees to generate more revenue would likely be unreasonable since the FBO would need to pass the added cost onto customers. She confirmed that Falcon's fuel prices remain competitive, and their FBO closely monitors nearby airport prices and intentionally keeps fuel one to two cents lower than competitors to attract people to Falcon Field.

In response to a question from Councilmember Goforth, Mr. Schultz replied that even if the airport doubled its current fuel flowage fee revenue from about \$374,000 to roughly \$750,000, it would still not generate enough money for the airport to be financially self-sustaining.

Councilmember Taylor commented that it is financially unwise to rely on a single source of revenue and depending only on fuel fees creates risk. She noted if fuel sales were disrupted, the airport would lose a major source of income, so revenue should come from multiple streams.

Ms. Nystrom reviewed the methodology and factors considered for determining the proposed landing fees to make the cost center financially self-sustaining. She pointed out that since there is no standard landing fee model for general aviation airports, Falcon Field had to create a structure that best fits its own needs without driving customers away. (See Page 14 of Attachment 1)

Vice Mayor Somers commented that Mesa Gateway is not a general aviation airport, but rather a regional airport with different types of operations.

Ms. Nystrom highlighted the proposed landing fees for Council consideration and explained the proposed landing fee exemptions. She mentioned that Falcon Field currently has approximately 877 based aircraft. (See Pages 15 through 17 of Attachment 1)

Discussion ensued regarding exempt classifications, specifically those related to firefighter rescue aircraft, aircraft being sold under contract, and other types of tenants at Falcon Field.

Ms. Nystrom provided an overview of the financial forecast without the implementation of increased rent, hangars, tie-downs, and landing fees. She reported that without the increase in fees, Falcon Field's ending fund balance would decline sharply, and by Fiscal Year (FY) 28/29 the airport would no longer be operating as financially self-sustaining, due to rising capital improvements costs, grant projects, and pavement maintenance. She compared a financial

forecast if the fees are approved by Council that shows the airport would avoid a deficit and maintain a healthy reserve balance, while still complying with FAA guidance against excessive surplus funds. (See Pages 18 and 19 of Attachment 1)

In response to a question from Councilmember Adams, Mr. Schultz explained that the City uses the Western Consumer Price Index (CPI) for inflation assumptions in the forecast. He emphasized that costs have risen significantly from about \$800,000 to approximately \$1.4 million annually.

Responding to multiple questions posed by Councilmember Duff, Ms. Nystrom said that the line items for project costs on the financial spreadsheets reflect airport-funded costs only based on the maintenance and CIP and exclude outside funds on both financial spreadsheets.

In response to multiple questions posed by Councilmember Duff, Ms. Nystrom explained that the airport's goal is to maintain at least \$2.5 million in ending fund balance. She noted that fees and charges will be reviewed on an annual basis to determine if fees can remain the same or need to be increased.

Responding to a question from Councilmember Taylor, Mr. Schultz defined the term for "transfer out," on the financial spreadsheets, represents Falcon Field's contributions towards savings for retiree medical benefits. He added that the contributions are made into the reserve fund.

Discussion ensued regarding public outreach efforts and feedback, the impact of deferring projects, the City's philosophy towards enterprise funds, and the management of collecting landing fees.

In response to multiple questions from Mayor Freeman, Ms. Owen explained that the FAA requires airfield fees to be fair and reasonable and not unjustly discriminatory, as well as supported by the rate base. She mentioned that during previous discussions, the FAA did not express concerns and recognized that comparing fees among general aviation airports is difficult as each airport is unique. She clarified that if fees are challenged, the FAA would conduct an independent review with comparisons across the country.

Responding to multiple questions posed by Councilmember Duff, Mr. Schultz discussed how the revenues and expenses will be tracked for each cost center within its activity, and where funds will be deposited to ensure that activities are self-sustaining. He confirmed that this structure will allow the City to evaluate over time what is working and where adjustments may be needed.

In response to multiple questions from Councilmember Taylor, Ms. Nystrom stated that the airport would hire a third-party company to handle fee collections, accounting and collection enforcement, since the City lacks the software and staffing capacity to manage the process internally. She added that this practice is common in many airports and emphasized that the third-party company costs are factored into the Airfield Cost Center projections based on estimates from similar airports.

Councilmember Goforth thanked Ms. Nystrom and staff for their work and emphasized that discussions about Falcon Field's financial sustainability have been ongoing since at least 2023. She supported the cost-center approach, stating that airport users, not the general public, should pay for the costs of the specific services and the cost to maintain those areas. She added that while she had previously preferred a faster move toward full cost recovery, the Council chose gradual increases to allow users time to adjust. She noted strong public support for this self-sustaining model and stressed that fees will be reviewed annually for necessity and adequacy

and highlighted that all hangars and tie-downs are currently occupied with a waiting list in place. She said that her residents appreciate the City's philosophy of a self-sustaining asset. She suggested that the Council move forward with the staff proposal to a vote of the Council on March 23, 2026.

Mr. Smith reassured the Council that the proposed landing fee has been extensively reviewed by a full team and complies with FAA regulations. He pointed out that although the fee may be somewhat higher than other general aviation airports, many municipalities subsidize their airports despite the fact that the FAA has a regulation on being self-sustaining. He emphasized that the City is prepared to defend the fee if challenged, and highlighted that Ms. Owen was brought in to provide an independent legal review.

Councilmember Taylor thanked staff for taking the time to carefully evaluate the proposal and involve outside experts, stressing that the City is acting in the best interest of the public and working to prevent taxpayers from bearing future costs.

Ms. Nystrom added that Falcon Field is at a critical turning point and remains an important economic asset to the City. She stated that the need to keep the airport well-maintained, customer-service focused, and attractive to businesses and tenants will require changes moving forward.

Mayor Freeman stated if the proposed fees and charges are approved by City Council, they will be effective May 1, 2026.

Mayor Freeman thanked staff for the presentation.

1-b. Appointments to various boards and committees.

It was moved by Councilmember Adams, seconded by Councilmember Duff, that the Council concur with the Mayor's recommendations and the appointments be confirmed. **(See Attachment 2)**

Upon tabulation of votes, it showed:

AYES – Freeman–Somers–Adams–Duff–Goforth–Heredia–Taylor  
NAYS – None

Carried unanimously.

2. Current events summary including meetings and conferences attended.

Mayor Freeman and Councilmembers highlighted the events, meetings, and conferences recently attended.

3. Scheduling of meetings.

City Manager Scott Butler stated that the schedule of meetings is as follows:

Thursday, March 19, 2026, 7:30 a.m. – Community and Cultural Development Committee meeting

4. Adjournment.

Without objection, the Study Session adjourned at 9:13 a.m.

---

MARK FREEMAN, MAYOR

ATTEST:

---

HOLLY MOSELEY, CITY CLERK

I hereby certify that the foregoing minutes are a true and correct copy of the minutes of the Study Session of the City Council of Mesa, Arizona, held on the 12<sup>th</sup> day of March 2026. I further certify that the meeting was duly called and held and that a quorum was present.

---

HOLLY MOSELEY, CITY CLERK

lr  
(Attachments – 1)

# Falcon Field Airport Update

Corinne Nystrom, A.A.E.  
Airport Director

March 5, 2026



## on Field Airport Purpose Statement



Falcon Field Airport exists to:

- Operate a safe, reliable and well-maintained airfield
- Provide customer-centered aviation
- Foster positive community relationships
- Drive a sustainable aviation ecosystem, fuel capital investment, and expand premiere workforce opportunities
- Realize the City's vision of a safe, fiscally responsible, quality development and thriving community of jobs and prosperity.

## Primary Sources of Airport Revenue



### Primary Sources of Airport Revenue - Current (Non-Grant)

- Ground Lease Rent
- City-Owned Hangar, Tiedown, Storage Room Rent
- Fuel Flowage Fees
- City-Owned Itinerant Aircraft Tiedowns
- Rental Car Concession Fees
- Miscellaneous: Gate Access Cards, Ground Lease Transaction Fees, Hangar/Tiedown Transfer Fees

## Need to Be Financially Self-Sustaining



- FAA Grant Assurance #24 – Maintain a fee & rental structure for facilities & services which will make the airport as self-sustaining as possible
- Since 2006, Airport Enterprise Fund has had a balanced budget due to:
  - One-time \$4.6 million net proceeds from sale of land in 2006
  - Revenues collected from tenants and users
  - Conservative budgeting and spending practices
  - Deferred capital improvement projects
  - Deferred maintenance on airfield pavement & City-owned facilities

## on Field's Current Financial Picture



Looking forward, the Airport Enterprise Fund is not financially sustainable due to:

- General inflation
- Beginning in 2020, capital improvement costs began increasing substantially and continue to increase

Result:

- Paying more and getting less
- Gradually falling behind on required maintenance & repair, including airfield pavement & City-owned facilities maintenance

# o Ramp – February 2026



# Options Already Taken to Address the Approaching Pavement Condition



- Cut back on non-grant capital improvement projects
- Taking the “Band-Aid Approach” to maintain pavements – we repair the pavement in the worst condition with what money we have to work with
- Eventually complete re-construction of pavements will be needed if Pavement Condition Index (PCI) falls below 50
- Estimated cost for on-going pavement maintenance is \$5.75 million/year (\$46 million over next 8 years) to bring all airport pavements to the FAA’s recommended 70 PCI.

## Federal & State Grants Be Used to Cover Costs?



- FAA & State grants help with some of the capital improvements and pavement reconstruction, but the FAA will not pay for ongoing pavement maintenance (i.e. crack fill/seal coat)
- State has some funds available for pavement maintenance, but they determine which airports get these funds, when, and the area of pavement for which funds will be spent (usually runways/taxiways)
- Several necessary Airport capital improvements rank too low on the FAA's and ADOT's lists to receive funding, such as pavement reconstruction in the City-owned hangar areas

## Cost Center Analysis Timeline



- In 2024, conversations began to convert to the Cost Center Approach
  - City-Owned Hangars/Tiedowns
  - Airfield
  - Ground Leases
- Each Cost Center should be financially self-sustaining
- August 2025 – City-Owned Hangars/Tiedowns – 8% rent increase approved

# Proposed Fee Increase



## City-Owned Hangars

- Ongoing pavement maintenance costs
  - Complete cane bolt installation on all hangars – 3 more years
  - Place funds in capital reserve to re-paint the hangars to extend their lives – approximately \$ 2 million
- Recommendation: 10% rental rate increase

# Proposed Fee Increase



## City-Owned Tiedowns

- Currently charging 55% of what is needed to be financially self-sustaining

### Recommendation:

- 23% rental rate increase for open tiedowns
- 11% rental rate increase for covered tiedowns

## Airfield Cost Center



- Airfield Cost Center
  - Pavement maintenance (runways/taxiways, non-exclusive ramps)
  - Airfield lighting
  - Aircraft landing aids (PAPIS/REILS)
  - Safety areas
  - Utilities
  - Perimeter fence/gates
  - Aircraft rescue firefighting services
  - Terminal building/Airport maintenance facility
  - Airport personnel
  - Airfield equipment
  - Airport's portion of FAA & State grant projects

## Airfield Cost Center Costs



- Estimated FY2025-26 Airfield Cost Center Cost: \$2,410,432
- Estimated FY2025-26 Airfield Cost Center Revenues: \$374,300
- Airfield Cost Center Without Landing Fees
  - Estimated Shortfall: \$2,036,132
- Recommendation:
  - Increase avgas fuel flowage fee from \$.14 to \$.15 per gallon
  - Landing fees

# Landing Fee Methodology



- Methodology Used:
  - 1) Determined amount of revenue needed to make the Airfield Cost Center financially self-sustaining
  - 2) FAA requires that fees must be reasonable and not unjustly discriminatory
    - General aviation landing fees charged at other airports
  - 3) Account for 10% reduction in aircraft landings (some customers may choose to use other airports)

## Proposed Landing Fees



- Based Fixed Wing Aircraft
  - ≤ 6,000 lbs. MLW \$20.35
  - > 6,000 lbs. MLW \$3.40/1,000 lbs.
- Itinerant Fixed Wing Aircraft
  - ≤ 6,000 lbs. MLW \$24.35
  - >6,000 lbs. MLW \$4.10/1,000 lbs.
- Based Rotorcraft, Drones, & eVTOL \$12.60
- Itinerant Rotorcraft, Drones, & eVTOL \$17.60

## Proposed Landing Fee Exemptions



- Based aircraft – first 10 landings per month
- Rotorcraft, drones, eVTOL landing on exclusive use ramps
- Declared emergency landings (FAA Alert I, II, or III)
- All but one rotorcraft landing during continuous training & testing session in fixed location or while moving in the training/testing traffic pattern or while moving between training/testing ramp and a private ramp
- Aircraft owned by government agencies (federal, state, local, political subdivisions, federally-approved foreign governments)

## Proposed Landing Fee Exemptions



- Aircraft under contract for sale to a government agency (certain restrictions apply)
- Aircraft owned by based tenants as part of production flight testing prior to delivery to end-use customer
- Flights conducted in support of government functions (public safety, search & rescue, disaster response, infrastructure protection, & emergency operations)
- Special events sponsored by the City of Mesa
- Flights for medical purposes (transporting patients, blood, or organs) & animal rescue purposes

# Financial Forecast If Fees Remain the Same



Current	FY 24/25 Actuals	FY 25/26 Adopted Budget	FY 25/26 Projection	FY 26/27 Forecast	FY 27/28 Forecast	FY 28/29 Forecast	FY 29/30 Forecast	FY 30/31 Forecast
<b>Estimated Beginning Fund Balance</b>	<b>\$5,618,408</b>		<b>\$6,114,171</b>	<b>\$3,311,308</b>	<b>\$2,165,422</b>	<b>\$1,087,929</b>	<b>(\$645,545)</b>	<b>(\$2,194,068)</b>
Revenues	\$5,644,978	\$6,642,571	\$6,938,274	\$5,878,628	\$6,014,117	\$6,143,907	\$6,276,530	\$6,418,223
<b>Total Revenues</b>	<b>\$5,644,978</b>	<b>\$6,642,571</b>	<b>\$6,938,274</b>	<b>\$5,878,628</b>	<b>\$6,014,117</b>	<b>\$6,143,907</b>	<b>\$6,276,530</b>	<b>\$6,418,223</b>
<b>Appropriations/Expenses</b>								
Operating Costs	\$2,258,619	\$2,523,000	\$2,620,905	\$2,607,610	\$2,657,980	\$2,708,406	\$2,760,206	\$2,814,353
Other Department Direct Costs	\$1,277,526	\$1,190,619	\$1,156,567	\$943,063	\$977,285	\$992,131	\$1,146,680	\$1,061,587
Other Department Indirect Costs	\$792,256	\$1,056,640	\$1,089,178	\$1,065,871	\$1,140,591	\$1,176,910	\$1,210,271	\$1,263,628
<b>Total Operating Costs</b>	<b>\$4,328,401</b>	<b>\$4,770,259</b>	<b>\$4,866,650</b>	<b>\$4,616,544</b>	<b>\$4,775,856</b>	<b>\$4,877,447</b>	<b>\$5,117,157</b>	<b>\$5,139,567</b>
Project Costs	\$807,536	\$4,860,211	\$4,859,758	\$2,393,241	\$2,297,343	\$2,977,841	\$2,682,121	\$2,791,199
Transfers Out	\$13,276	\$14,729	\$14,729	\$14,729	\$18,411	\$22,093	\$25,776	\$25,776
<b>Total Project Costs and Transfers Out</b>	<b>\$820,813</b>	<b>\$4,874,940</b>	<b>\$4,874,487</b>	<b>\$2,407,970</b>	<b>\$2,315,754</b>	<b>\$2,999,935</b>	<b>\$2,707,896</b>	<b>\$2,816,974</b>
<b>Total Expenses</b>	<b>\$5,149,214</b>	<b>\$9,645,199</b>	<b>\$9,741,137</b>	<b>\$7,024,514</b>	<b>\$7,091,609</b>	<b>\$7,877,382</b>	<b>\$7,825,053</b>	<b>\$7,956,542</b>
<b>Net Uses and Sources</b>	<b>\$495,764</b>	<b>(\$3,002,628)</b>	<b>(\$2,802,863)</b>	<b>(\$1,145,886)</b>	<b>(\$1,077,492)</b>	<b>(\$1,733,475)</b>	<b>(\$1,548,523)</b>	<b>(\$1,538,319)</b>
<b>Ending Fund Balance</b>	<b>\$6,114,171</b>		<b>\$3,311,308</b>	<b>\$2,165,422</b>	<b>\$1,087,929</b>	<b>(\$645,545)</b>	<b>(\$2,194,068)</b>	<b>(\$3,732,387)</b>

# Financial Forecast If Landing Fees & Other Fee Adjustments are Approved



Total Fiscal Impact = \$2,894,770

Proposed	FY 24/25 Actuals	FY 25/26 Adopted Budget	FY 25/26 Projection	FY 26/27 Forecast	FY 27/28 Forecast	FY 28/29 Forecast	FY 29/30 Forecast	FY 30/31 Forecast
<b>Estimated Beginning Fund Balance</b>	\$5,618,408		\$6,114,171	\$3,311,308	\$3,819,866	\$4,324,080	\$4,097,543	\$3,977,131
<b>Revenues</b>	\$5,644,978	\$6,642,571	\$6,938,274	\$8,773,398	\$8,908,887	\$9,038,677	\$9,171,300	\$9,312,993
<b>Total Revenues</b>	\$5,644,978	\$6,642,571	\$6,938,274	\$8,773,398	\$8,908,887	\$9,038,677	\$9,171,300	\$9,312,993
<b>Appropriations/Expenses</b>								
Operating Costs	\$2,258,619	\$2,523,000	\$2,620,905	\$2,607,610	\$2,657,980	\$2,708,406	\$2,760,206	\$2,814,353
Other Department Direct Costs	\$1,277,526	\$1,190,619	\$1,156,567	\$759,571	\$789,500	\$800,235	\$950,582	\$860,993
Other Department Indirect Costs	\$792,256	\$1,056,640	\$1,089,178	\$1,065,871	\$1,140,591	\$1,176,910	\$1,210,271	\$1,263,628
<b>Total Operating Costs</b>	\$4,328,401	\$4,770,259	\$4,866,650	\$4,433,052	\$4,588,070	\$4,685,551	\$4,921,059	\$4,938,974
Project Costs	\$807,536	\$4,860,211	\$4,859,758	\$3,817,059	\$3,798,191	\$4,557,570	\$4,344,877	\$4,543,056
Transfers Out	\$13,276	\$14,729	\$14,729	\$14,729	\$18,411	\$22,093	\$25,776	\$25,776
<b>Total Project Costs and Transfers Out</b>	\$820,813	\$4,874,940	\$4,874,487	\$3,831,788	\$3,816,603	\$4,579,664	\$4,370,652	\$4,568,831
<b>Total Expenses</b>	\$5,149,214	\$9,645,199	\$9,741,137	\$8,264,840	\$8,404,673	\$9,265,215	\$9,291,711	\$9,507,805
<b>Net Uses and Sources</b>	\$495,764	(\$3,002,628)	(\$2,802,863)	\$508,558	\$504,214	(\$226,538)	(\$120,411)	(\$194,812)
<b>Ending Fund Balance</b>	\$6,114,171		\$3,311,308	\$3,819,866	\$4,324,080	\$4,097,543	\$3,977,131	\$3,782,319

## Steps

- City Council to consider proposed Fees and Charges amendments on **March 23, 2026**
- If approved by City Council, the Fees and Charges will be effective **May 1, 2026**

Thank you

Questions?

