

FAA POLICY AND PROCEDURES CONCERNING

THE USE OF AIRPORT REVENUE

NOTICE

RFP No. EO1741-07

ATTACHMENT K-2

provision for general promotional expenses.

Except as discussed above, the Final Policy does not limit the amounts of airport revenue that can be spent for all permitted promotional marketing and advertising activities. The FAA expects that expenditure of airport revenues for these purposes would be reasonable in relation to the airport's specific financial situation. Disproportionately high expenditures for these activities may cause a review of the expenditures on an *ad hoc* basis to verify that all expenditures actually qualify as legitimate airport costs. Examples of permissible and prohibited expenditures are included in the Final Policy itself.

b. Reimbursement of Past Contributions

The Proposed Policy permitted airport revenue to be used to reimburse a sponsor for past unreimbursed capital or operating costs of the airport. The Proposed Policy did not include a limit on how far back in time a sponsor could go to claim reimbursement, in accordance with the law in effect at the time. In addition, the Preamble noted that the FAA had not to date permitted a sponsor to claim reimbursement for more than the principal amount actually contributed to the airport. The FAA requested comment on whether the FAA should permit recoupment of interest or an inflationary adjustment or whether, in the case of contributed land, recoupment should be based on current land values.

Airport operators: ACI-NA/AAAE and a number of individual airport operators supported recoupment of interest or inflation adjustment on previous contributions or subsidies to the airport.

Air carriers: The ATA objected to the Proposed Policy and commented that recoupment should be subject to a number of requirements to prevent abuses.

The Final Policy: After the proposed policy was issued, Congress enacted legislation to limit the use of airport revenue for reimbursement of past contributions, and to limit claims for interest on past contributions. 49 U.S.C. §§ 47107(l)(5), 47107(p). The Final Policy incorporates these statutory provisions. Based on Congressional intent evidenced by the legislative history of these provisions, airport revenue may be used to reimburse a sponsor only for contributions or expenditures for a claim made after October 1, 1996, when the claim is made within six years of the contribution or expenditure. In addition, a sponsor may claim interest

only from the date the FAA determines that the sponsor is entitled to reimbursement, pursuant to section 47107(p). The FAA interprets these statutory provisions to apply to contributions or expenditures made before October 1, 1996, so long as the claim is made after that date.

If an airport is unable to generate sufficient funds to repay the airport owner or operator within six years, the Final Policy permits repayment over a longer period, with interest, if the contribution is structured and documented as an interest bearing loan to the airport when it is made. The interest rate charged to the airport should not exceed a rate that the sponsor received for other investments at the time of the contribution.

c. Donations of Airport Revenue to Charitable/Community Service Organizations

The Supplemental Proposed Policy addressed the use of airport property for public recreational purposes, and addressed the use of airport funds to support community activities and for participation in community events. The FAA proposed that the use of airport revenue for such donations would not be considered a cost of operating the airport, unless the expenditure is directly related to the operation of the airport. For example, expenditures to support participation in the airport's federally approved disadvantaged business enterprise program would be considered permissible as supporting a use directly related to the operation of the airport. In contrast, expenditures to support a sponsor's participation in a community parade would not be considered to be directly related to the operation of the airport.

Airport operators: ACI-NA/AAAE contended that the expenditure of airport revenue for community or charitable purposes is appropriate and should be recognized as legitimate. Airports, regardless of their size, type, and certification or lack thereof, are important members of their local communities and, therefore, must be able to maintain their prominent, highly visible roles in their respective communities. Airports are regarded by their communities as local business enterprises and, consequently, are expected to contribute to local non-profit charitable concerns in the same manner as other local business enterprises.

Individual airport operators generally supported the position of ACI-NA/AAAE, although some individual operators acknowledged that some limitation on the expenditures may be

appropriate. One suggested a *de minimis* standard; another proposed a "safe harbor" based on a percentage of the airport's total budget. Another urged that airport owners/operators be allowed leeway to make contributions of airport funds, in reasonable amounts and consistent with the local circumstances, and to use airport property for charitable purposes on the same basis.

Other airport operators commented that the Final Policy should give comparable treatment to the use of airport funds and airport property for community goodwill by recognizing the limited use of airport revenue to support charitable and community organizations as a legitimate operating cost of the airport.

Air carriers: Air carriers did not comment specifically on charitable contributions, although they commented extensively on the use of airport property for community or charitable purposes. Generally the air carriers suggested that use of airport property should be subject to strict conditions to avoid abuse.

Other commenters: An advocacy group in support of a particular airport commented that, in order for an airport to be as self-sustaining as possible, the use of each income dollar is critical, and that federally assisted airports must be fully responsive to the citizens of the community by providing information on the use of airport funds.

Final Policy: The Final Policy generally follows the approach of the Supplemental Notice. Airport funds may be used to support community activities, or community organizations, if the expenditures are directly and substantially related to the operation of the airport. In addition, the policy provides explicitly that where the amount of the contribution is minimal, the airport operator may consider the "directly and substantially related to air transportation" standard to be met if the contribution has the intangible benefit of enhancing the airport's acceptance in local communities impacted by the airport.

Expenditures that are directly and substantially related to the operation of the airport qualify inherently as operating costs of the airport. The FAA recognizes that contributions for community or charitable purposes can provide a direct benefit to the airport through enhanced community acceptance, but that benefit is intangible and not quantifiable. Where the amount of the contribution is minimal, the value of the benefit will not be questioned as long as there is a reasonable connection between the recipient organization and

the benefit of community acceptance for the airport.

However, if there is no clear relationship between the charitable or community expenditure and airport operations, the use of airport revenue may be an expenditure for the benefit of the community, rather than an operating cost of the airport. The different treatment of the use of airport funds (direct payments to charitable and community organizations) and the use of airport property (less than FMV leases for charitable or community purposes) is grounded in the applicable laws: the revenue-use requirement (section 47107(b)), which governs the use of airport funds, provides far less flexibility than the requirement for a self-sustaining rate structure (section 47107(a)(13)), which applies to the use of airport property.

Examples of permitted and prohibited expenditures are included in the Final Policy.

d. Use of Airport Revenue to Fund Mass Transit Airport Access Projects

The Supplemental Proposed Policy addressed in Part VII.C., the circumstances in which an airport sponsor could provide airport property at less than fair market value to a transit operator. The Supplemental Proposed Policy did not address the use of airport revenue to finance the construction of transit facilities. That issue, however, was raised in the comments.

Airport Operators: Two airport operators supported the use of airport revenue for the construction of transit facilities. One commenter stated that an airport should be permitted to use airport revenues and assets to provide mass transit service to on-airport commercial uses. Another commenter referred to the AIP Handbook, FAA Order 5100.38A § 555, which provides AIP project eligibility for rapid transit facilities.

Air carriers: Air carriers did not specifically discuss the use of airport revenue to finance transit facilities. However, as discussed below, they objected to providing airport property for transit facilities at nominal lease rates.

Other Commenters: Two commenters representing transit operator interests supported the expenditure of airport revenues to finance transit facilities. A transit operator stated that in order to create a better balance between transit and highway interests, transit facilities should be totally eligible expenses, paid for in the same manner as other road and parking enhancements. A transit trade association urged the FAA to take appropriate actions to ensure that

passenger fees and other airport revenues are widely eligible to fund a range of airport surface transportation modes, including public transportation.

The FAA also received extensive comments on providing airport property for use by transit providers at less than FMV rents. These comments are addressed separately below.

Final Policy: The Final Policy has been modified to provide guidance on the use of airport revenues to finance airport ground access projects. The Final Policy states that airport revenue may be used for the capital or operating costs of such a project if it can be considered an airport capital project, or is part of a facility owned or operated by the airport sponsor and directly and substantially related to air transportation of passengers or property, relying directly on the statutory language of § 47107(b).

As an example, the Final Policy summarizes the FAA's decision on the use of airport revenue to finance construction of the rail link between San Francisco International Airport and the Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) rail system extension running past the airport. In that decision, the FAA approved the use of airport revenues to pay for the actual costs incurred for structures and equipment associated with an airport terminal building station and a connector between the airport station and the BART line. The structures and equipment were located entirely on airport property, and were designed and intended exclusively for use of airport passengers. The BART extension was intended for the exclusive use of people travelling to or from the airport and included design features to discourage use by through passengers. Based on these considerations, the FAA determined that the possibility of incidental use by nonairport passengers did not preclude airport revenues from being used to finance 100 percent of the otherwise eligible cost items. For purposes of this analysis, the FAA considered "airport passengers" to include airport visitors and employees working at the airport.

4. Accounting Issues

a. Principles for Allocation of Indirect Costs

Based on the comments to the Proposed Policy, the FAA addressed the principles of indirect cost allocation in its Supplemental Notice. The Supplemental Notice made clear that the allocation of indirect costs is allowable under 49 USC § 47107(b), and that no particular method of cost allocation will be required, including

OMB Circular A-87. To ensure, however, that indirect costs are limited to allowable capital and operating costs, the FAA proposed to apply certain general principles and prohibitions to the allocation of costs. The Supplemental Notice did not limit significantly the development of local cost allocation methodologies, or interfere with the application of Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP) and other accounting industry recognized standards.

In the Supplemental Notice, the FAA stated that it would expect that a Federally approved cost allocation plan that complied with OMB Circular A-87 or other Federal guidance and was consistent with GAAP would be reasonable and transparent, and would generally meet the requirements of section 47107(b). However, the use of a Federally approved cost allocation plan does not rule out the possibility that a particular cost item allowable under that guidance would be in violation of the airport revenue retention requirement if allocated to the airport.

The Supplemental Notice also required specifically that indirect cost allocations be applied consistently across departments to the sponsoring government agency, and not unfairly burden the airport account. The general sponsor cost allocation plan could not result in an over-allocation to an enterprise fund. In addition, the sponsor would have to charge comparable users, such as enterprise accounts, for indirect costs on a comparable basis.

Lastly, the Supplemental Notice proposed to prohibit the allocation of general costs of the sponsoring government to the airport. However, this prohibition would not affect direct or indirect billing for actual services provided to the airport by local government.

Airport Operators: Generally, airport operators agreed with the proposal to acknowledge that the allocation of indirect costs as allowable under 49 USC § 47107(b), and to provide that no particular allocation methodology, including OMB Circular A-87, be required.

One airport operator requested the FAA to further clarify that it is not imposing on airport sponsors all of the specific elements of OMB Circular A-87. The operator was concerned that the statement in the Supplemental Notice that the FAA "believe[s] the specific principles identified by the OIG are an appropriate construction of the revenue retention requirement" may lead to confusion over whether adherence to OMB Circular A-87 is mandatory for

allocating costs to be paid by airport revenue.

Several airport operators were concerned that the FAA would not accept the allocation of costs in accordance with a Federally-approved cost allocation plan, but could review the plan to ensure that allocation of specific cost items meet the special revenue retention requirements. For example, one airport operator commented that the FAA's approach would impose on airport sponsors burdens and requirements in excess of the detailed requirements of OMB-Circular A-87, which are designed to ensure a reasonable and consistent cost allocation system. The airport proprietor proposed that such compliance with a federally-approved cost allocation plan be considered sufficient to satisfy the revenue retention requirement.

Another airport operator proposed that the FAA revise the policy to clarify that a specific cost, as opposed to a type of cost, cannot be treated as both a direct and an indirect cost. The airport operator offered as an example a city-owned and operated airport at which some police services are provided by officers assigned exclusively to the airport and other services are provided by general duty police officers. The commenter suggested that it should be permissible to charge the airport for the officers assigned exclusively to the airport as a direct cost and to charge for the general duty officers as an indirect cost allocation.

Additionally, this commenter proposed revising the policy to clarify that costs that are chargeable to one city department on a direct basis may be charged to other city departments on an indirect basis. The airport operator offered an example in which police are exclusively assigned to a city-owned airport, but are not exclusively assigned to other city departments. The commenter argued that it would be reasonable to charge the airport for police services as a direct cost, and to charge the other departments as an indirect cost allocation.

Several airport operators were also concerned that the supplemental policy implied that a local cost allocation plan must provide that all users for a service be billed equally. For example, ACI-NA and AAEE suggested that the requirement for consistent application should be interpreted to require the local government to go through the exercise of assessing indirect costs against all governmental departments, including those wholly funded by that governmental entity. Likewise, an airport operator requested that the FAA clarify that the supplemental policy

does not mean that an airport sponsor must actually bill all of its General Fund agencies for certain municipal costs in order to be able to charge such costs to its airports. All of those airport proprietors that expressed concern over this proposed policy generally commented that this issue was considered and rejected by the Department of Transportation in the Second Los Angeles International Airport Rates Proceeding, Docket OST-95-474. According to the airport proprietors, the DOT recognized that in many cases sponsor agency operations are paid from a common General Fund. Under those circumstances, it is illogical and unnecessary for one General Fund agency to bill another General Fund agency for municipal services.

One airport operator proposed that the word "equally" be removed from VII.B.4 of the proposed policy. The commenter urged that the FAA allow airport sponsors the flexibility to allocate costs to various users on a reasonable, equitable basis relative to the benefits received, even though specific users may sometimes be treated differently. Returning to its example of police services, the commenter suggested that if the sponsor chooses not to charge a housing authority for costs of a special police unit assigned to that authority, it should be of no concern to the FAA as long as those costs are not then charged to the airport.

Another airport operator argued that each of its proprietary departments are unique and governed by different City Charter provisions; that they make different uses of city services; and have different financial arrangements with the sponsor's general fund. This commenter argued that treating the departments the same for cost allocation purposes because the departments are enterprise funds would, therefore, serve no valid purpose.

Several airport operators disagreed with FAA's proposed policy to prohibit the indirect cost allocation of general costs of government. Several commenters stated that the proposed policy would reverse longstanding practice at many airports and could be inconsistent with federally-approved cost allocation plans, which provide for the allocation of a share of indirect costs of various local government functions. One airport operator argued that there is no statutory basis for prohibiting the allocation of general costs of government, other than costs for particular identified services.

Finally, one airport operator commented that the proposed policy does not sufficiently clarify the

appropriate allocations for fire and police stations that do not serve the airport exclusively. The airport operator proposed that policy explicitly permit a sponsor to allocate costs based on the intended purpose and value of the station to the airport, not its actual use. The airport operator argues that a more flexible approach could better implement the applicable statutory provision that prohibits "direct payments or indirect payments, other than payments reflecting the value of services and facilities provided to the airport."

Airlines: ATA supports the proposed policy clarification that no particular cost allocation methodology for indirect costs is preferred.

The Final Policy: The Final Policy reflects a different and simplified approach to indirect cost allocation that is intended to facilitate development of permissible cost allocation plans and the review of those plans in the single audit process. The Final Policy specifies that the cost allocation plans must be consistent with Attachment A of OMB Circular A-87. Attachment A sets forth general principles for developing cost allocation plans. Those principles are essentially a restatement of the principles proposed in the Supplemental Policy. By referring to Attachment A, the Final Policy establishes a standard that is well understood by airport cost accountants and by airport operators' independent auditors. The Final Policy does not require compliance with the other attachments to OMB Circular A-87, which include more rigid requirements and defines categories of grant recipient costs that are eligible and ineligible for reimbursement with Federal grant funds.

The Final Policy continues to specify that the costs allocated must themselves be eligible for expenditure of airport revenue under section 47107(b). Attachment A to OMB Circular A-87 provides principles for cost allocation methodologies. The cost items that may be charged to airport revenue are determined by the requirements of section 47107(b). Therefore, sponsors, and the FAA, cannot rely solely on compliance with OMB Circular A-87 to assure that the costs items charged to the airport in a Federally approved cost allocation plan are consistent with section 47107(b).

The Final Policy continues to specify that the airport must not be charged directly and indirectly for the same costs. The FAA is not persuaded that the example of police services offered by an airport sponsor requires a modification of this requirement. This

provision is not intended to preclude both the direct and indirect billing in the situation cited by the commenter—where police services are provided to the airport on both an exclusive-use and a shared-use basis. In the cited example, it would be preferable to bill for police exclusively assigned to the Airport on a direct cost basis. It would be impossible, however, to bill for the shared-use police without engaging in some form of indirect cost allocation. The FAA did not intend the supplemental policy to preclude treatment of police services as both direct and indirect costs in these circumstances, only to preclude double billing on both a direct and indirect basis, for the same police costs.

Similarly, with respect to the second example of police services where the airport receives exclusive-use police services and other sponsor departments receive shared-use police services, the FAA did not intend the Supplemental Notice to preclude disparate billing methodologies. Inherent in Attachment A is that comparable units of a sponsoring government making comparable uses of the sponsor's services should have costs allocated and billed in a comparable fashion. The clarification noted above should address this situation as well. In the second example cited, the FAA would consider the sponsor departments receiving shared-use police services not to be comparable to the airport receiving exclusive use police services.

The Final Policy also provides that the allocation plan must not burden the airport with a disproportionate share of allocated costs, and requires that all comparable units of the airport owner or operator be billed for indirect costs billed to the airport. The FAA is unwilling to accept the suggestion that comparable users of a service may sometimes be treated differently for billing purposes, so long as the costs attributed to one unit of government are not then charged to the airport. The FAA believes that such practices would result in an unfair burden being placed upon the airport simply because of the airport's ability to pay.

This provision, however, is not intended to require a sponsor's General Fund activities to bill other General Fund activities for indirect costs that are properly allocable to those activities, if the airport is billed. The policy is clear that comparable billing for services is required only for comparable users.

Enterprise funds need not be treated as comparable to units of a sponsoring government financed from the sponsor's general fund, and comparable billing between enterprise funds and other units of government is not required.

While the FAA may presume that enterprise funds are comparable to each other, an airport sponsor is free to demonstrate that particular enterprise funds are sufficiently different in material ways—such as the way they consume sponsor services or their overall financial relationships with the sponsor—to justify different practices in charging for indirect costs. The Final Policy does not further define comparability because decisions on comparability will depend on the specific circumstances of a sponsor. The Final Policy also explicitly permits the allocation of general costs of government and central services costs to the airport, if the cost allocation plans meets the Final Policy's requirements. As specified in the Final Policy, however, the allocation of these costs to the airport may require special scrutiny to assure that the airport is not being burdened with a disproportionate share of the allocated costs.

In addition, the FAA continues to recognize that use of airport revenue to pay some expenses not normally considered to be allowable pursuant to OMB Circular A-87, such as fire and police services, is consistent with the revenue retention requirement. If such costs are allocated as an indirect cost in accordance with the Final Policy, they will be considered by the FAA as acceptable charges.

The Final Policy is modified to permit the allocation of certain categories of a sponsor's general cost of government as an indirect charge to the airport. Such charges include indirect expenses of the Office of Governor of a State, State legislatures, offices of mayors, county supervisors, city councils, etc. An airport owner's or operator's central service costs may also be allocated to the airport. The Final Policy specifies that allocation of these categories of costs to the airport may require special scrutiny to assure that the airport is not being burdened with a disproportionate share of the costs.

The FAA proposed to prohibit the allocation of all general costs to the airport on the grounds that the payment of such costs with airport revenue would be inconsistent with the purpose of the revenue use restriction—to avoid subsidy of general sponsor governmental activity. It is clear from the comments that airports routinely pay for a share of the general costs the legislative and executive branches of the governmental unit of which the airport is a part under cost allocation plans prepared in accordance with GAAP. Further, the comments demonstrate that the payment of legislative and executive branch costs by airport revenue can be

justified as a cost of the airport because the legislative and executive branches have direct, tangible oversight and control responsibilities for the airport, and their activities provide direct benefits to the airport, such as in the areas of funding, capital development, and marketing.

In addition, under the Final Policy, the costs of shared-use facilities must be allocated to all users of the facility, even if the original purpose of constructing the facility was to provide exclusive use or benefit to the airport. While a sponsor-owned facility may have originally been established for the benefit of the airport, the FAA believes that the purpose of the facility can change from time to time based on local circumstances and that allocation of costs should be based on current purpose, as well as use. The FAA may consider a number of factors in determining current purpose, including current use, design and functionality.

b. Standard of Documentation for the Reimbursement of Cost of Services and Contributions to Government Entities

In its administration of airport agreements, the FAA is not normally concerned with the internal management or accounting procedures used by airport owners. As a matter of policy and procedure, the FAA has consistently required that reimbursement of capital and operating costs of an airport made by a government entity must be clearly supportable and documented.

Neither the Proposed Policy nor the Supplemental Notice explicitly discussed a standard of documentation that must be achieved for a sponsor to claim reimbursement for services and/or contributions it provided to the airport. However, events subsequent to the issuance of both documents indicate a need for FAA to provide specific guidance on the standard of documentation that will support the expenditure of airport revenues.

In the examination of a possible diversion of airport revenue by the City of Los Angeles at Los Angeles International, Ontario, Van Nuys and Palmdale Airports (FAA Docket No. 16-01-96), the FAA reviewed the underlying documentation which the City of Los Angeles offered to support the payment of approximately \$31 million in airport revenue to the Los Angeles' general fund as the reimbursement of sponsor contributions and services provided to the airport. In the Director's Determination dated March 17, 1997, the FAA stated its standard of documentation to justify such reimbursements. Accordingly, the

FAA is including that standard in the Final Policy.

The Final Policy requires that reimbursements for capital and operating costs of the airport made by a government entity, both direct and indirect, be supported by adequate documentary evidence. Adequate documentation consists of underlying accounting records and corroborating evidence, such as invoices, vouchers and cost allocation plans, to support all payments of airport revenues to other government entities. If this underlying accounting data is not available, the Final Policy allows reimbursement to a government entity based on audited financial statements, if such statements clearly identify the expenses as having been incurred for airport purposes consistent with the Final Policy statement. In addition, the Final Policy provides that budget estimates are not a sufficient basis for reimbursement of government entities. Budget estimates are just that—estimates of projected expenditures, not records of actual expenditures. Therefore, budget estimates cannot be relied on as documentary evidence to show that the funds claimed for reimbursement were actually expended for the benefit of the airport.

Indirect cost allocation plans, however, may use budget estimates to establish pre-determined indirect cost allocation rates. Such estimated rates must, however, be adjusted to actual expenses in the subsequent accounting period.

5. Prohibited Uses of Airport Revenue

a. Impact Fees/Contingency Fees

The Proposed Policy prohibited the payment of impact fees assessed by a non-sponsoring governmental body that the airport sponsor is not obligated to pay or that exceed such fees assessed against commercial or other governmental entities. The Supplemental Notice did not modify this provision. The term "impact fees" was not defined in the Proposed Policy.

Airport operators: One Florida airport sponsor stated that impact fees should be allowable to either a sponsoring or non-sponsoring governmental body. Another commented that the language referring to a "non-sponsoring" governmental body was vague and confusing. Within the state of Florida, impact fees are typically administered by a non-sponsoring government body. It was stated that the wording did not seem to prohibit impact fee payments when assessed by a "sponsoring" agency, or impact fees that an airport sponsor is obligated to pay.

The Final Policy: For clarity, the Final Policy is modified to delete the reference to "non-sponsoring" governmental body and to delete the reference to fees the sponsor is not obligated to pay. In addition, the FAA is adding a statement that in appropriate circumstances, airport revenue may be used to reimburse a governmental body for expenditures that the imposing government will incur as a result of on-airport development, based on actual expenses incurred.

The effect of the deletions is to broaden the prohibition to all impact fees, within the meaning of the term used in the policy statement. As such, the deletions are consistent with the statutory prohibition on payment of airport revenues that do not reflect the value of services or facilities actually provided to the airport. Until a governmental unit undertakes the activity for which the impact fee is intended to compensate, it is impossible to know with certainty whether the impact fee is an accurate reflection of the cost of the activity attributable to the airport or its value to the airport, or even that the activity will occur. This situation is true regardless of both the status of the governmental unit as airport sponsor and the status of the fee as discretionary. The FAA understands that many local laws or regulations authorizing impact fees do not require the fees to be spent to mitigate or accommodate the results of the airport action that triggers the fee. The FAA has no basis for assuring the payment of impact fees would be consistent with the purpose of section 47107(b)—to prevent an airport sponsor who received Federal assistance from using airport revenues for expenditures unrelated to the airports.

The broader prohibition is consistent with applicable FAA policies. Longstanding FAA policy has permitted a sponsor to claim reimbursement from airport revenue only for "clearly supportable and documented charges, * * * supported by documented evidence." FAA Order 5190.6A, par. 4-20.a(2)(c)(ii). An impact fee assessed before the imposing government incurred any expenses to accommodate airport growth would not meet this standard.

In addition, a standard of documentation required by the Final Policy applies to all expenditures of airport revenues subject to section 47107(b), including impact fee payments. That standard requires that expenditures of airport revenues be supported by data on the actual costs incurred for the benefit of the airport, not by budget or other estimates, which

impact fees essentially are. The Final Policy will allow submission of those assessed fees resulting from the proposed development when the amount of the fees become fully quantifiable, as provided for in Section IV of the Final Policy, following implementation by the imposing government of the mitigation measures for which the impact fee is assessed. At that time, the FAA can best determine whether the fees assessed against airport revenue satisfy the requirements of section 47107(b) and this policy. In unusual circumstances, the FAA may permit a prepayment of estimated impact fees at the commencement of a mitigation project, if the funds are necessary to permit the mitigation project to go forward, so long as there is a reconciliation process that assures the airport is reimbursed for any overpayments, based on actual project costs, plus interest.

However, the Final Policy does take into account the potential that an airport operator may be required by state or local law to finance the costs of mitigating the impact of certain airport development projects undertaken by the airport sponsor. Therefore, where airport development causes a government agency to take an action, such as constructing a new highway interchange in the vicinity of the airport, airport revenues may be used equal to the prorated share of the cost. In all cases, the action must be shown to be necessitated by the airport development. In the case of infrastructure projects, such impact mitigation must also be located in the vicinity of the airport. This proximity requirement is not being applied to all mitigation measures because some mitigation measures—especially certain environmental mitigation measures—may not occur in the vicinity of the airport.

The Final Policy also acknowledges the possibility that an airport operator may be bound by local or state law to use airport revenue to pay an impact fee that is prohibited by this policy. The Final Policy states that the FAA will consider any such local circumstances in determining appropriate corrective action.

b. Subsidy of Air Carriers

As discussed in Section V "Permitted Uses," the Supplemental Notice acknowledged the fact that Congress, in the 1994 FAA Authorization Act, effectively authorized the use of airport revenue for promotion of the airport by expressly prohibiting "use of airport revenues for general economic development, marketing, and

promotional activities unrelated to airports or airport systems." At the same time, that statutory provision also limited the scope of acceptable promotional activity.

In the Supplemental Notice, the FAA proposed new policy language that more clearly addressed the kinds of promotional and marketing activities that are and are not legitimate operating costs of the airport under 47107(b). In the Supplemental Notice, Section VIII(I), the FAA proposed that "[d]irect subsidy of air carrier operations" is a prohibited use of airport revenue because it is not considered a cost of operating the airport. The FAA drew a distinction between methods of encouraging new service. Supplemental Notice proposed to allow the use of airport revenue to encourage passengers to use the airport through promotional activities, including cooperative promotional activities with airlines and to allow airport operators to enhance the viability of new service through fee incentives, on the one hand. As noted, the FAA proposed to prohibit the use of airport revenue to simply buy increased use of the airport by paying an air carrier to operate aircraft, on the other. The FAA considered the former activities to be a permitted expenditure for the promotion and marketing of the airport and the latter to be a prohibited expenditure for general economic development. The FAA explained in the preamble to the Supplemental Notice that neither promotional activities nor promotional fee discounts would be considered a prohibited direct subsidy of airline operations. 61 FR at 66738.

Airport operators: In their comments on the Supplemental Notice, ACI-NA/AAAE state that, generally, an expenditure or activity should not be considered revenue diversion if there is a reasonable expectation that such an expenditure or activity will benefit the airport. Furthermore, they note that the law does not single out direct air carrier subsidy or fee waivers for more stringent scrutiny than other marketing activities. This argument in favor of the reasonable business judgement of the airport management should be applied to the use of airport revenue for promotion and marketing not unrelated to the airport, including direct air carrier subsidies and fee waivers. ACI/AAAE stated "both forms of financial assistance should be permitted, if an airport has a reasonable expectation that the subsidy will benefit the airport and the subsidy or discount is made available on a non-discriminatory basis."

ACI/AAAE further stated that there is no real distinction between direct

subsidy and fee waivers, as well as none between direct subsidy and the residual airport costing methodologies, making the distinction in the policy illogical. They predicted that the proposed policy is likely to promote detrimental effects, including eliminating air service to some small airports, increasing congestion at dominant hubs at the expense of medium-sized airports, reducing potential competition and raising fares.

Several individual airport operators concurred with the ACI-NA/AAAE position. One operator commented that any subsidies should be permitted, as long as the airport remains self-sustaining and the subsidies are not included in airline costs in calculating landing fees, terminal rents and other user charges.

Another airport operator, the LNAA, which is engaged as a party in a 14 CFR Part 13 investigation regarding its former air carrier subsidy program, commented that there is no real difference between an airport making a direct subsidy to an air carrier or waiving fees.

Two airport operators expressed different views. One operator agreed that airport revenues should not be used to subsidize new air carrier service because the practice of subsidization could lead to destructive competition for air service among airports. Another airport operator stated that it "does not currently engage in nor does it contemplate any form of direct subsidy to air carriers in exchange for air service." This operator considers the Supplemental Notice to provide adequate flexibility to airport operators to foster and promote air service development.

Air carriers: The ATA strongly opposed the assertion that direct subsidies of airline operations with airport revenue may be considered to be operating costs of the airport and would extend the prohibition to indirect subsidies. They argued that the distinction in the proposed policy that allows fee waivers under certain circumstances, but prohibits direct subsidy is illogical. Both result in revenue diversion, whether the beneficiary is "a start up carrier, a new entrant in a market, or an existing carrier at an airport." The ATA further commented, in connection with joint marketing endeavors, that the permissible "promotional period" should be defined, as should the scope of permissible marketing activities.

The Final Policy: The FAA has clarified the policy provision on the direct subsidy of air carriers with airport revenue; however, the prohibition

remains, as does the distinction between direct subsidy and the waiving of fees and the joint promotion of new service. The FAA has applied the test of section 47107(b) to determine to what extent various kinds and amounts of promotional and marketing activities can be considered legitimate operating costs of the airport.

In pursuit of uniformity, the FAA has integrated references to the section on the permitted uses of airport revenue, as well as to the section on self-sustainability, to assist airport operators in pursuing reasonable strategies to promote the airport and provide incentives to encourage new air service. Among other things, marketing of air service to the airport, and expenditures to promote the airport to potential air service providers can be treated as operating costs of the airport. Of course, support for marketing of air service to the airport must be provided consistently with grant assurances prohibiting unjust discrimination.

The setting of fees is a recognized management task, based on a number of considerations, including the airport management's assessment of the services needed by airport consumers, and the airport management's assessment of the financial arrangements necessary to secure that service. The FAA has consistently maintained that fee waivers or discounts involving no expenditure of airport funds raise issues of compliance with the self-sustaining rate structure requirement, not the revenue-use requirement. The Final Policy therefore, permits fee waivers and discounts during a promotional period. The waiver or discount must be offered to all users that are willing to provide the type and level of new service that qualifies for the promotional period. The Policy limits the fee waiver or discount to promotional periods because of the requirement that the airport maintain a self-sustaining airport rate structure. In addition, indefinite fee waivers or discounts could raise questions of compliance with grant assurances prohibiting unjust discrimination. The Final Policy does not define a permitted promotional period. There is too much variation in the circumstances of individual airports throughout the country to permit adoption of a single national definition of a suitable promotional period.

In contrast, the direct payment of subsidies to airline involves the expenditure of airport funds and hence raises questions under the revenue-use requirements. The FAA continues to believe that the costs of operating aircraft, or payments to air carriers to

operate certain flights, are not reasonably considered an operating cost of an airport. In addition, payment of subsidy for air service can be viewed as general regional economic development and promotion, rather than airport promotion. Use of airport revenue for these purposes is expressly prohibited under the terms of the 1994 FAA Authorization Act. The Final Policy does not preclude a sponsor from using funds other than airport revenue to pay airline subsidies for new service, and it does not preclude other community organizations—such as chambers of commerce or regional economic development agencies—from funding a program to support new air service. Therefore, the Final Policy maintains the distinction between direct subsidy of air carriers and the waiving of fees, and prohibits the former.

6. Policies Regarding the Requirement for a Self-Sustaining Rate Structure

As noted in the summary, the Final Policy contains a separate section on the requirement that an airport maintain a rate structure that makes the airport as self-sustaining as possible under the circumstances at the airport, to provide more comprehensive guidance in a single document. The 1994 FAA Authorization Act directed the FAA to adopt policies and procedures to assure compliance with both the revenue uses and self-sustaining airport rate structure requirement. The general guidance repeats the guidance appearing in the Department of Transportation Policy Statement Regarding Airport Rates and Charges, 61 FR 31994 (June 21, 1996). The Final Policy interprets the basic requirement and addresses exceptions to the basic rule for leases of airport property at nominal or less-than fair market value (FMV) to specific categories of users.

Each federally assisted airport owner/operator is required by statute and grant assurance to have an airport fee and rental structure that will make the airport as self-sustaining as possible under the particular airport circumstances, in order to minimize the airport's reliance on Federal funds and local tax revenues. The FAA has generally interpreted the self-sustaining assurance to require airport sponsors to charge FMV commercial rates for nonaeronautical uses of airport property. However, in the case of aeronautical uses, user charges are also subject to the standard of reasonableness. In applying the two standards together for aeronautical property, the FAA has considered it acceptable for an airport operator to charge fees to aeronautical users that are

less than FMV, but more than nominal charges. The FAA defines "aeronautical use" as any activity which involves, makes possible, or is required for the operation of aircraft, or which contributes to or is required for the safety of such operations. Policy Statement Regarding Airport Fees, Statement of Applicability, 61 FR at 32017.

Many entities lease airport property for aeronautical and nonaeronautical uses at nominal lease rates. The FAA has determined that nominal leases to many of these entities is consistent with the requirement to maintain a self-sustaining airport rate structure. The Final Policy provides specific guidance regarding nominal leases for six categories of users. This guidance is discussed below.

a. Use of Property at Less Than FMV for Community/Charitable/Recreational Use

Airport operators: The ACI-NA/AAAE agree with the general conclusion that use of airport property for community and charitable purposes at less than FMV should be permissible. However, they argued that the criteria listed in the Supplemental Notice are too narrow. Other criteria should be considered, and an airport should be required to provide no more than one justification. The ACI-NA/AAAE specifically mentioned aeronautical higher education institutions and not-for-profit air and space museums as additional permitted uses, based on H.R. Rep. 104-714, 104th Cong. 2nd Sess. at 39 (1996) reprinted in 1996 USCC.A.N. 3676.

Individual airport operators also requested more flexibility in various forms. One operator suggested that the Supplemental Notice establishes an unnecessary two-part test which many community uses of airport property will fail to satisfy. Another operator argued that such airport property use should not be limited to temporary arrangements, e.g., parks and baseball fields, which indicates that only uses that allow property to be returned rather quickly to the airport inventory would be permitted.

In contrast, another airport operator suggested that, in order to place less burden on the airport operator, such uses should be limited in scope and that the below-market value amount that an airport operator could charge for such usage should be established as some percentage of the appraised value of the property.

Air carriers: The ATA agrees in principle with the concept of limited use of airport property for certain specified community purposes at less

than FMV. However, ATA stated that the Supplemental Notice lacks specificity and that its application would consequently be inconsistent with the self-sustaining and revenue-use requirements. The ATA proposed to narrow the first element of the standard to permit contribution of property if the property is put to a general public use desired by the local community and the use does not adversely affect the capacity, safety or operations of the airport. The ATA would narrow the second test by permitting the use of property that is expected to generate no more than minimal revenue, which the ATA would define as minimal revenue equal to or less than 20 percent of revenue that could be earned by similar airport property in commercial or air carrier use. When the property could be expected to earn more than this defined minimal amount, the ATA would permit less than FMV rental if the revenue earned by the community use approximates the revenue that would otherwise be generated.

The ATA would also require that the community use be subject to periodic review and renewed justification and that the airport proprietor retain absolute discretion to reclaim the property for airport use.

Other commenters: A member of the United States House of Representatives expressed concern that the policy, if adopted as proposed, does not provide sufficient flexibility to airport operators to be good neighbors within their community. This commenter suggested that in rural areas, requiring community organizations to pay FMV could reduce airport revenue as paying community organizations are forced off of the airport by higher rents and no new tenants are found.

Final Policy: The Final Policy generally permits below-FMV-rental of airport property for community uses, but generally limits the uses to property that is not potentially capable of producing substantial income and not needed for aeronautical use. Consistent with the suggestions of the ATA, the permitted community uses of such property will be limited to those that are compatible with the safe and efficient operation of the airport and which are for general local use. In addition, the community use should not preclude reuse of the property for airport purposes, if the airport operator determines that such reuse will provide greater benefits to the airport than the continued community use. Leases to private, non-profit organizations generally will be required to be at market rates unless the sponsor can demonstrate a "community goodwill"

purpose to the lease, or can demonstrate a benefit to aviation and the airport, as discussed below.

While the Final Policy states that property provided for community use at no charge should be expected to produce no more than minimal revenue, we are not adopting a definition of minimal. For property that is capable of generating more than minimal revenue, a sponsor could charge less than FMV rental rates for community use, if the revenue earned from the community use approximates that revenue that could otherwise be generated. Providing such property for community use at no charge would not be appropriate.

The FAA has determined that this approach to community use strikes an appropriate balance between the needs of the airport to be a good neighbor and the Federal requirements on the use of airport revenue and property. This formulation provides substantial flexibility to airport operators. At the same time, the self-sustaining requirement and the policy goal of the revenue-use requirement justify some limitation on local discretion in this area.

The requirement that community use not preclude reversion to airport use is based on both the self-sustaining requirement and the airport sponsor's basic AIP obligation to operate a grant-obligated airport as an airport.

Under the Final Policy, the lease of airport property to a unit of the sponsoring government for nonaeronautical use at less than fair market value is considered a prohibited revenue diversion unless one of the specific exceptions permitting below-market rental rates applies. If a sponsor's use of airport property qualifies as community use, and the other requirements for community-use leases are satisfied, the FAA would not object to a lease at less than fair market value. Qualified uses could include park or recreational uses or other public service functions. However, such use would be subject to special scrutiny to ensure that the requirements for below-FMV community use is satisfied. The community use provision of the Final Policy does not apply to airport property used by a department or subsidiary agency of the sponsoring government seeking an alternative site for the sponsor's general governmental purposes at less-than-commercial value. For example, a city cannot claim the community use exception for a nominal value lease of airport property for a municipal vehicle maintenance garage. Such usage, while beneficial to the taxpaying citizens of the sponsoring government, would be difficult to justify

as benefiting the airport by improving the airport's acceptance in the community.

b. Not for Profit Aviation Museums

The DOT OIG has cited instances in which an aviation museum at a federally assisted airport is leasing airport property at less than a fair market rental rate. In clarifying the revenue diversion prohibitions recommended for inclusion in the FAA Authorization Act of 1996, the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee urged the FAA to take a flexible approach to the lease of airport property at below-market rates to not-for-profit air and space museums located on airport property. H.R. Rep. No. 104-714, 104th Cong. 2nd Sess. at 39 (1996) reprinted in 1996 U.S.C.C.A.N. 3676 (House Report). The Committee recommended that this type of rental arrangement should not be considered revenue diversion because of the contribution that such museums make to the understanding and support of aviation.

One airport operator commented that long-term, less-than-market value rental arrangements, particularly for leaseholds encompassing permanent facilities, should be permitted when such arrangements serve a clear and valuable aviation-related purpose. This comment could include aviation museums.

One operator of a not-for-profit aviation museum urged the FAA to permit nominal rate leases. This operator stated that a FMV-based lease for its museum property would double its current operating budget.

The Final Policy: The Final Policy permits airport operators to charge reduced rental rates and fees, including nominal rates, to not-for-profit aviation museums, to the extent that the reduction is reasonably justified by the tangible and intangible benefits to the airport or civil aviation. This provision recognizes the potential for aviation museums to provide benefits to the airport by stimulating understanding and support of aviation, consistent with the suggestion contained in the House Report, U.S.C.C.A.N. 3676. Benefits to the airport may include any in-kind services provided to the airport and airport users by the aviation museum. The limitation to not-for-profit museums is consistent with the requirement for a self-sustaining airport rate structure, because there is no reason to give for-profit aviation museums preferential treatment over other commercial aeronautical activities. All for-profit aeronautical activities provide some benefit to the airport, by making it more

attractive for potential airport users. If this benefit were a sufficient reason to permit reduced rental rates to commercial aviation businesses on a routine basis, the requirement for a self-sustaining airport rate structure would be virtually unenforceable.

The Final Policy permits but does not require below-market rental rates, including nominal rates. The airport operator is free to treat a qualified aviation museum as it would any other aeronautical activity in setting rental rates and other fees to be paid by the museum.

c. Aeronautical Higher Education Programs

The DOT OIG has cited instances in which aeronautical secondary and post-secondary education programs at federally assisted airports are leasing airport property at less than a fair market rental rate.

In the House Report, 1996 U.S.C.C.A.N. 3676, the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee also urged the FAA to take a flexible approach to aeronautical higher education programs located on airports. The Committee recognized that some federally obligated airports have leased property to non-profit, accredited collegiate aviation programs, and that facilitating these programs will help build a base of support for airport operations by giving students, who will be the future users of the national airspace system, easy access to aviation facilities.

The Final Policy: The Final Policy permits reduced rental rates, including nominal rates, to not-for-profit aeronautical secondary and post-secondary education programs conducted by accredited educational institutions, to the extent that the reduction is justified by tangible or intangible benefits to the airport or to civil aviation. This treatment is justified for the same reason that reduced rental rates and fees to certain aviation museums are permitted. Again, the benefits may include in-kind services provided to the airport and airport users. As with aviation museums, the educational institution and education program must be not-for-profit. For-profit aviation education, such as flight-training, is a standard commercial aeronautical activity at many airports. Permitting reduced rental rates and fees to for-profit aviation education programs would seriously undermine compliance with the self-sustaining requirement and could raise questions of compliance with the grant assurances prohibiting unjust discrimination.

The Final Policy permits but does not require below-market rental rates, including nominal rates. The airport operator is free to treat a qualified not-for-profit aeronautical education program as it would any other aeronautical activity in setting rental rates and other fees to be paid by the education program.

d. Civil Air Patrol Leases

Reduced-rental leases, including nominal leases, to the Civil Air Patrol/United States Air Force Auxiliary (CAP) at a number of airports have also been criticized in OIG audits. As a result of this criticism, some airport operators have been seeking higher rents from the CAP when leases have come up for renewal.

In its comments, the CAP contends that the current standard airport industry practice of permitting CAP use of airport property for a nominal rent confers substantial benefits to the airport and, in general, to the aviation community. The CAP, therefore, requests that a policy be adopted which would formally permit CAP units to continue to occupy facilities on federally obligated airports at a nominal rent, whether under formal lease arrangements, or otherwise, at the discretion of the airport owner/operator.

The Final Policy: The Final Policy permits reduced rental rates and fees to CAP units operating at the airport, in recognition of the benefits to the airport and benefits to aviation similar to those provided by not-for-profit aviation museums and aeronautical secondary education programs. As with other not-for-profit-aviation entities, the reduction must be reasonably justified by benefits to the airport or to civil aviation. In-kind services to the airport and airport users may be considered in determining the benefits that the CAP unit provides. In addition, this treatment of the CAP, which has been conferred with the status of an auxiliary to the United States Air Force, is not identical to the treatment provided to military units in the Final Policy, as discussed below, but is consistent with that treatment.

The reduced rental rates and fees are available only to those CAP units operating aircraft at the airport. For CAP units without aircraft, a presence at the airport is not critical. The airport operator can accommodate those CAP units with property that is not subject to Federal requirements on maintaining a self-sustaining rate structure, without compromising the effectiveness of the CAP units. Of course, if such units provide in-kind services that benefit the airport, the value of those services may be recognized as an offset to FMV rates.

The Final Policy permits but does not require nominal rental rates. The airport operator is free to treat a qualified not-for-profit aeronautical CAP lease as it would any other aeronautical activity in setting rental rates and other fees to be paid by the education program.

e. Police/Firefighting Units Operating Aircraft at the Airport

Many airports host police or fire-fighting units operating aircraft (often helicopters). The OIG has frequently criticized reduced rate or no-cost leases to these units of government as inconsistent with the self-sustaining and revenue-use requirements.

The Final Policy requires the airport operator to charge reasonable rental rates and fees to these units of government. In effect, these units of government must be treated the same as other aeronautical tenants of the airport. This treatment is consistent with the policy's general approach toward dealings between units of government—fees should be set at the level that would be produced by arm's-length bargaining. The treatment is also justified because police and fire-fighting aircraft units provide benefits to the community as a whole, and not necessarily to the airport. However, as with other police and fire-fighting units located at an airport, the policy does allow rental payments to be offset to reflect the value of services actually provided to the airport by the police and fire-fighting aircraft units.

f. Use of Property by Military Units

The US Air Force Reserve and the Air National Guard both have numerous flying units located on federally obligated, public-use airports. The majority of these aircraft-operating units are located on leased property at civilian airports established on former military airport land transferred by the US Government to the airport owner/operator under the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, or under other statutes authorizing the conveyance of surplus Federal property for use as a public airport. Frequently, the favorable lease terms were contemplated in connection with the transfer of the former military property and may have been incorporated in property conveyance documents as obligations of the civilian airport sponsor. As with other reduced-rate leases, these arrangements have been criticized in individual OIG audits.

The Final Policy: The Final Policy provides that leasing of airport property at nominal lease rates to military units with aeronautical missions is not inconsistent with the requirement for a

self-sustaining rate structure. The Department of Defense (DOD) has a substantial investment in facilities and infrastructure at these locations, and its operating budgets are based on the existence of these leases. Moving those facilities upon expiration of a lease or the payment of FMV rent for facilities to support military aeronautical activities required for national defense and public safety would be beyond the capability of the DOD without additional legislation and enlargement of the DOD operating budget. In all of the enactments on the self-sustaining rate structure requirement and use of airport revenue and the accompanying legislative history, the FAA can find no indication that Congress intended the airport revenue requirements to be applied in a way to disrupt the United States' defense capabilities or add significantly to the cost of maintaining those capabilities. Moreover, Congress specifically charged the FAA, in 49 U.S.C. § 47103, with developing a national plan of integrated airport systems (NPIAS) to meet, among other things, the country's national defense needs. Inclusion in the NPIAS is a prerequisite for eligibility for AIP funding. Thus, Congress clearly contemplated a military presence at civil airports. Therefore, the FAA will not construe the requirement for a self-sustaining airport rate structure to prohibit nominal leases to military units operating aircraft at an airport.

The Final Policy permits but does not require nominal rental rates. The airport operator is free to treat a qualified military unit as it would any other aeronautical activity in setting rental rates and other fees to be paid by the military unit.

7. Lease of Airport Property at Less Than FMV for Mass Transit Access to Airports

The Supplemental Notice proposed that airport property could be made available at less than fair rental value for public transit terminals, rights-of-way, and related facilities, without being considered in violation of the requirements governing airport finances, under certain conditions. The transit system would have to be publicly owned and operated (or privately operated by contract on behalf of the public owner) and the transit facilities directly related to the transportation of air passengers and airport visitors and employees to and from the airport. Twenty-one responses addressed this issue.

Airport commenters: The airport operators concur with the principle of making airport land available for mass

transit at rates below fair market value. ACI-NA/AAAE stated that the determination to use airport property for a transit terminal, transit right-of-way, or related facilities at less than fair rental value is consistent with the grant assurance requiring airports to be self-sustaining.

Air carriers: The ATA asserted that FAA has exceeded its statutory authority in the proposal. ATA's considers transit facilities to be like commercial business enterprises, because they occupy airport property and charge their customers for their services. ATA also stressed that airport transit facilities are non-aeronautical facilities which are not "directly and substantially related to the air transportation of passengers or property."

Other commenters: Transit operators, including a transit operator trade association generally supported the position in the Supplemental Notice.

Another commenter stated that making airport property available at less than fair market rental value or making airport revenue available for transit facilities equates to the airport paying a hidden taxation. This commenter argued that it was not the intention of Congress, when it passed the AAIA, to have grant funds used to subsidize, either directly or indirectly, any activity that provides no benefit to air travel.

The Final Policy: The Final Policy incorporates the provision proposed in the Supplemental Notice, with a technical correction to include transit facilities use for the transportation of property to or from the airport. The FAA does not consider public transit terminals to be the equivalent of commercial business enterprises. Rather, they are more like public and airport roadways providing ground access to the airport. Generally speaking, the FAA does not construe the self-sustaining assurance to require an airport owner or operator to charge for roadways and roadway rights-of-way at FMV.

Moreover, even though publicly-owned transit systems charge passengers for their services, they generally operate at a loss and are subsidized by general taxpayer revenue. Charging fair market value for on airport facilities would thus burden general taxpayers with the costs of providing facilities used exclusively by transit passengers visiting the airport. Therefore, a requirement to charge FMV would not further the purpose of the self-sustaining assurance—to avoid burdening local taxpayers with the cost of operating the airport system.

a. Private Transit

ACI-NA/AAAE and four airport operators commented that private transit operators should have treatment equal to public transit operators. They argued that the concepts of public-private partnerships, and privatization of transportation facilities, may be realities in the not-too-distant future. Moreover, private ownership would not detract in the least from the functions identified in the Notice for these facilities, such as bringing passengers to and from the airport. They also noted that the language in the AIP Handbook (Order 5100.38A, Section 6) does not specifically exclude private operators. The language states transit facilities will be allowable provided they will primarily serve the airport.

One state Department of Transportation also urged that reduced rental rates should be offered to privately-owned and operated transit systems on the same basis as publicly-owned systems.

Final Policy: The Final Policy retains some distinctions between privately and publicly owned systems. In general, privately-owned systems are more analogous to other ground transportation providers—private taxis and limousine services, rental car companies—and even private parking lot operators. These entities are commercial enterprises that operate for profit and are a significant source of revenue for the airport. Most importantly, they are not supported by general taxpayer funds, and charging FMV would not raise questions of burdening local taxpayers with the cost of the airport.

However, the FAA is aware that, in many communities with no publicly-owned bus systems or very limited systems, privately-owned bus systems fulfill the role of providing public transit services to the airport. Accordingly, the FAA is revising the Final Policy to permit an airport operator to provide airport property at less than FMV rates to privately-owned systems in these limited circumstances.

b. Airport Passengers

Nine airport commenters addressed the proposed requirement that transit facilities be directly related to the transportation of air passengers and airport visitors and employees to and from the airport to qualify for less-than-FMV rentals. The commenters argue that the provision is too narrow by restricting the transit service to air-passengers and airport visitors and employees. One airport operator states that airport sponsors must have the

flexibility to build airport transit systems that principally serve airport passengers, employees and other users but which may also secondarily transport some nonairport users. Two airport operators with general-use rail transit systems planned or operating on or near their airports argue that the airport benefits from improved ground access, reduced traffic congestion and improved air quality of general use systems and that rent-free property should, therefore, be provided to general use systems.

Final Policy: The Final Policy incorporates the language of the Supplemental Notice. That language does not preclude any use of transit facilities constructed on airport property by nonairport passengers if the property is to be leased at less-than-FMV. The requirement that the facilities be "directly related" to the airport does not equate to a requirement that the facilities be "exclusively used" for airport purposes. However, if the intended use of a facility is not exclusive airport use, some rental charge may be necessary to reflect the benefits provided to the general public. The determination on whether the facilities are "directly related" will be made on a case-by-case basis.

It appears that some of the concern about this issue was generated by the language in the preamble, which referred to transit facilities "necessary for the transportation of air passengers, airport visitors and airport employees to and from the airport." The preamble offered a maintenance/repair facility as an example of facilities that would not qualify. The FAA is not convinced that the benefits to the airport of having such facilities on the airport is sufficient to justify less-than-FMV rental rates. However, as noted, the FAA does not construe the policy language "facilities directly related the transportation of [airport passengers]" to require that the facilities be used exclusively by airport passengers.

8. Military Base Conversions Issues

In its comments to the Proposed Policy, one airport operator argued that using airport revenue to assist in development of revenue-generating properties on former military bases that are converted to civil airports should not be considered a prohibited use of revenue.

In addition, ACI-NA/AAAE state that a base closure and conversion to civilian use often results in the existence of significant recreational facilities on property owned by an airport. In regard to these facilities on converted military bases, ACI/AAAE stated, "[a] leasing