

## **About the National Priority Rating (NPR) as a means to evaluate Projects**

The National Priority Rating (NPR) is a relatively simple numerical model. FAA uses it as just one of several factors to prioritize airport development projects. The values generated by the model help categorize airport development in accordance with agency goals and give highest priority to safety, security, reconstruction, standards and capacity, in that order. The model relies on pre-defined values including:

- Airport size classification (one of six broad categories, based on enplaned passengers or number of based aircraft for the nonprimary airports);
- Purpose of the project (safety, security, reconstruction, standards and capacity);
- Facility type (e.g., runways, taxiways, aprons, terminals, new airports, etc.); and
- Project type (for which virtually all of the FAA's ARRA-funded grants were construction).

The model automatically applies the assigned values for each of these factors and generates a value for each proposed project, between 1 and 100, with a higher number indicating higher priority. The assigned values and formula are published in FAA Order 5100.39A ("Airports Capital Improvement Plan"), Appendix 4. See: [http://www.faa.gov/airports/resources/publications/orders/media/AIP\\_5100\\_39A.pdf](http://www.faa.gov/airports/resources/publications/orders/media/AIP_5100_39A.pdf)

For all of these and other reasons, it is critical to recognize that the NPR value does not reflect any other criteria, including the underlying justification for the project, existing conditions at the airport, levels of activity and growth trends, etc. Therefore, the NPR is only one factor, among many others, in the FAA's normal AIP Discretionary decision process.

Each year, the FAA establishes an NPR threshold for projects being considered for funding by the Airport Improvement Program (AIP). All projects at or above the NPR threshold are considered to be consistent with FAA goals and objectives, although the FAA also evaluates each individual project to ensure it is eligible and justified. Projects with an NPR below the threshold require additional documentation of the underlying justification.

From 2005 through 2009, this threshold has been 41. During that period, 82 percent of AIP funded projects had an NPR of 41 or above. The remaining 18 percent of projects fulfilled other important aspects of the AIP, and fully complied with applicable requirements.

However, simple mathematical models will never be a replacement for human judgment and cannot capture all of the relevant factors in funding decisions. Additional qualitative factors must be considered when ultimately deciding which projects will receive funding in a given fiscal year. The FAA has an established process for documenting additional information in support of such discretionary funding decisions.

There are many ways to justify funding for a project below the NPR threshold when looking at qualitative factors. For example, a project such as an airport access road generally has a low NPR. But the same project, if recommended by a Runway Safety Action Team to reduce vehicular crossings at a runway and therefore improve safety, would warrant funding. Special emphasis programs that focus Federal funding on projects, which address unique national needs such as improving aging terminals in small communities, or Voluntary Airport Low Emission (VALE) program projects, likewise warrant funding.

Examples of projects that may have a low NPR but could still be well justified for AIP funding could include:

- Runway Safety Action Team recommendations
- Part 139 recommendations
- Terminal replacement projects at a nonhub primary airports (for which Congress specifically established eligibility for AIP discretionary funding due to the unique challenges these airports face—see further discussion below)
- VALE projects
- Other special emphasis programs

Another prime example is the construction of replacement facilities or infrastructure. A project to rebuild an existing taxiway in a different location because the current location does not meet standards would typically be coded as a new taxiway, which would not account for the fact that the infrastructure already exists. Similarly, for an existing airport that does not meet current standards and cannot be improved in its current location due to geological or environmental constraints, it may well be more cost-beneficial to construct a new airport. At present, the existing model ranks such projects lower because they appear to represent new infrastructure (e.g., new capacity) rather than replacement capacity.

FAA Order 5100.39A was last updated in 2000 and will be revised in the next 1-2 years. Improvements to the model to better accommodate these types of anomalies will be considered; however, as stated previously, any mathematical model could not be expected to account for all of the relevant factors used to make funding decisions.

The Department of Transportation Office of Inspector General (OIG) has audited the FAA's priority system. In October 26, 2007, the OIG concluded "FAA's policies are effectively ensuring that the highest priority rated projects are funded in accordance with regulations. However, under Vision 100 FAA can fund—and is funding—lower priority rated projects (i.e., those rated fewer than 40)." The OIG also found that "FAA is meeting its strategic goal of funding projects that can enhance airport safety, security, and system capacity."<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> *Prioritization of Airport Improvement Program Funding*, Office of Inspector General Report AV-2008-002, issued October 26, 2007.

The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) placed specific legal requirements on FAA including meeting tight timeframes for distributing and expending funds, giving preference to projects that could be completed within 2 years, and ensuring that the expenditures supplemented and not supplant sponsor expenditures. The OIG found that FAA complied with these ARRA requirements.<sup>2</sup>

In order to focus ARRA funds on the highest priority projects, FAA set a goal to prioritize funding for those projects scoring an NPR of 62 or greater. This was an initial screening tool that FAA used to focus funding on the highest priority projects. It also served to provide a higher level of scrutiny to the project selection process by requiring a more detailed qualitative assessment and supporting documentation for projects that were below an NPR of 62. About 77 percent of the 372 ARRA projects received an NPR of 62 or higher. The remaining 23 percent of ARRA projects represent funding for other qualified projects such as renovation or replacement of aging infrastructure at smaller airports, new airport constructions, or safety enhancements at small airports.

### **Special Emphasis for Terminal Projects at Non-hub Primary Airports (27 Projects)**

Over the last 5 years, the FAA has identified a need to focus on the rehabilitation of terminal buildings at non-hub primary airports across the U.S. A number of terminal buildings were constructed over 50 years ago. These buildings can be in need of rehabilitation, may not meet current Americans with Disabilities Act standards, may have environmental issues such as asbestos, cannot accommodate increased passenger traffic, and/or cannot operate as efficiently with increased security requirements imposed after 9/11.

These airports typically do not have sufficient revenues to cover the high costs of rebuilding a terminal. Because of the volume of passenger boardings (typically less than 400,000 passenger enplanements per year), non-hub primary airports have fewer funding options compared to larger airports with more diverse funding streams. However, for those hundreds of thousands of passengers and the local community served by the terminal, these facilities are critical to the transportation and economic success in the region. Congress specifically recognized this and established eligibility to request AIP discretionary funding for terminal projects at this category of airports. Therefore, although terminal buildings generally carry a lower NPR than airside projects, the FAA had to consider the need to replace this infrastructure to support the thousands of passengers that use these facilities each year.

Identifying funding for these terminal projects within the normal AIP process has been a challenge, due to the cost of the facilities and the number of projects competing for AIP funds. ARRA provided a timely and much needed opportunity for the nation's economy and the FAA believes these type of terminal projects were exactly what was intended

---

<sup>2</sup> *FAA Fulfilled Most ARRA Requirements in Awarding Airport Grants*, Office of Inspector General, Report AV-2011-053, issued February 17, 2011.

with the legislation. Funding through ARRA enabled projects to proceed that otherwise might have waited several more years for AIP funds. Moreover, terminal projects provide work for a wider number of trades than most other airport construction projects, including a broader range of engineers, electricians, plumbers, carpenters, concrete masons, welders, etc. These new buildings can create lasting economic benefits to the communities they serve. The airport owner can potentially increase airport revenue through airline and concessions lease agreements and increased passenger numbers by providing a more efficient and updated passenger experience.

For these reasons, the FAA deemed non-hub primary airport terminal projects as a high priority special emphasis program, and granted them a higher priority based on these qualitative factors, as allowed for in our process. As a result, 27 projects with NPRs below 41 were funded as part of this special emphasis program through ARRA. These projects include terminal improvements, rehabilitation, and expansion. A list of the projects funded, with NPRs and jobs data, is provided below. (See Table A).

### **Projects Selected for ARRA funding with NPR less than 62 but greater than 40 (54 Projects)**

Congress directed the FAA to use the normal AIP discretionary process for distributing ARRA funds, so the FAA could have used the typical NPR threshold, which is usually in the low 40's. However, the ARRA legislation also wanted federal agencies to provide a higher level of scrutiny to projects. In order to focus funds on projects that met the requirements of the ARRA legislation and were consistent with FAA's goals and priorities, the FAA raised the typical NPR threshold. For ARRA, the FAA focused on the highest priority projects, and consequently set the NPR threshold at 62 or greater. The intent was to focus on the highest priority projects. It also served to provide a higher level of scrutiny to the project selection process by requiring a more detailed qualitative assessment for projects that were below an NPR of 62, which would normally not be required unless a project was below a 41.

This did not preclude the FAA from considering projects that were below an NPR of 62 that met the ARRA requirements, such as being "shovel-ready". Many of the projects that fell within the 41 to 61 NPR range were for safety or to meet FAA design standards projects at smaller airports. Many projects were located in rural areas or regions with recognized significant economic distress. A list of the projects funded, with NPRs and jobs data, is provided below. (See Table B).

### **Replacement Airport Projects Selected for ARRA funding with NPR less than 41 (3 Projects)**

In three cases, the FAA approved new airport projects that scored below the standard discretionary priority threshold of 41. These projects were selected based on their benefit to surrounding communities, the fact that they were "shovel ready," and that they support FAA's goals to improve safety. These projects were selected using the standard process

established by the FAA when selecting projects for AIP discretionary funding as required by ARRA. After careful consideration, the following projects were approved:

**Rosebud Sioux Tribal Airport (SUO)**

New Airport Project (replacement)

Grant Number 3-46-0082-003-2009

Award Date: 6/12/2009

National Priority Rating 40

ARRA Funding: \$4,146,891

Number of Jobs funded by ARRA<sup>3</sup>: 27,434 job hours, (Rank 62/372)

Status: Complete

The old Mission Sioux airport was located on the Rosebud Sioux Indian Reservation near Mission, South Dakota, and had a 60' x 3200' runway that was in poor condition. It was used primarily by air ambulances and medical aircraft to support the Rosebud Indian Health Service Hospital, providing emergency medical transportation to hospitals located 175-250 miles away. Because of numerous environmental issues and its location, the former airport could not be improved to meet minimum FAA runway design standards, and could not fully support the aircraft category B-II air ambulances, the principal users of the airport.

Moreover, the old airport was 20 minutes from the hospital. When weather conditions or runway conditions prevented the air ambulances from landing, patients had to be transported by ground ambulance to the nearest adequate airport, Valentine, NE—a distance of 70 miles—which can cause critical delays in providing emergency health care. The new airport is adjacent to the Rosebud Indian Health Service Hospital, and supports B-II air ambulances (King Air) used by the medical transport companies.

The project, partially funded by ARRA, relocated the airport through the construction of a 75' x 4400' runway with lighting, taxiway, apron, wildlife fence, and access road. The purpose of the project was to provide the existing airport users a facility, which meets the minimum FAA runway design standards. The ARRA project provided the necessary earthwork and site preparation to accommodate a new airport. This project involved the movement of approximately one million cubic yards of earth, installation of drainage systems, and construction of an access road. Another project funded by the Airport Improvement Program completed the paving of the runway, taxiway and apron.

From an economic perspective, this project also provided major economic benefits to the economy of one of the poorest Native American reservations in the country. In addition to the indirect economic benefits from this major construction project, there are significant direct benefits as a large portion of the project provided employment to a large number of Native American personnel.

---

<sup>3</sup> As Reported by grant recipients to the FAA, April 2011

Building a new airport was the preferred alternative to improving and expanding the existing airport. If it had been feasible for the FAA to spend the same amount of money to rehabilitate and expand the existing pavement, the project would have been assigned a national priority rating of 45. The NPR calculation automatically assigns a lower value to the construction of a new airport compared to the improvement of an existing facility. Therefore, the project was assigned an NPR of 40. The factors above, plus the additional benefits to the operators and the community for building a new airport, led the FAA to conclude that the project was well justified for investment of ARRA funding.

### **Akiachak Airport (Z13)**

New Airport Project (replacement)

Grant Number 3-02-0461-001-2009

Award Date: 6/12/2009

National Priority Rating 40

ARRA Funding: \$ 13,953,325

Number of Jobs funded by ARRA<sup>4</sup>: 71,463 job hours, (Rank 10/372)

Status: Complete

The Alaska native village of Akiachak is located on the west bank of the Kuskokwim River in the Yukon-Kuskokwim Delta (western coastal Alaska). It is approximately 18 miles northeast of Bethel. Akiachak is a traditional Yup'ik Eskimo community, a federally recognized tribe maintaining a subsistence lifestyle. Commercial fishing is an important income source. Air transportation is the primary mode of transportation and is used year-round to connect the community to other communities within the region.

The existing Akiachak (Z13) runway is an unlit 1,649' x 40' gravel runway and in very poor condition. The existing runway dimensions do not meet current design standards for a community-class airport, safety areas are inadequate for existing and anticipated aviation use, and there is limited aircraft parking areas (apron). Flights at the airport support passenger traffic, medical services, school activities, and mail/cargo distribution. Air transportation is the only reliable means of year-round transportation available to the residents of Akiachak. Further, Akiachak is a scheduled stop for a carrier transporting mail under contract to the U.S. Postal Service, and the airport must be adequate to satisfy the needs of the USPS. The existing airport location is physically constrained, thereby precluding the rehabilitation and expansion of the existing surfaces.

ARRA provided funds to initiate the construction (phase 1). The overall final project scope-of-work includes construction of a new runway, new aircraft parking apron (with stub taxiway), new snow removal equipment building, and new airport/runway lighting.

Although the construction of a new airport has an NPR score of 40, this was a replacement airport project, with a very high priority for both the residents of Akiachak and the State of Alaska. A comprehensive Master Plan study had evaluated all available alternatives, including limited rehabilitation in the existing location and a number of

---

<sup>4</sup> As Reported by grant recipients to the FAA, April 2011

other relocation alternatives to meet FAA standards and avoid or minimize impacts to the environment.

If it had been feasible to rehabilitate and expand the existing pavement, the project would have been assigned a national priority rating of 45. The NPR calculation automatically assigns a lower value to the construction of a new airport compared to the improvement of an existing facility.

The funding of this project also directly supported an FAA Flight Plan goal –to reduce the number of fatal accidents in general aviation. FAA targeted the funding of 20 substandard general aviation airports through 2010. Funding this project directly supported that goal.

In Alaska, the aviation system is primarily made up of a large number of small rural airports supported by a much smaller number of regional type airports. The 2000 census population of Akiachak is 585.

The above factors led the FAA to conclude that the project was well justified for investment of ARRA funding.

#### **Ouzinkie Airport (4K5)**

New Airport Project (replacement)

Grant Number 3-02-0480-001-2009

Award Date: 6/11/2009

National Priority Rating 40

ARRA Funding: \$ 14,707,949

Number of Jobs funded by ARRA<sup>5</sup>: 70,882 job hours, 34.1 FTE (Rank 12/372)

Status: Complete

The community of Ouzinkie is located near Kodiak Island on Spruce Island within the Kodiak Island Borough, Alaska. It is approximately 265 air miles southwest of Anchorage. Air transportation is the primary mode of transportation and is used year-round to connect the community to other communities within the region. A federally-recognized tribe is located in the community -- the Native Village of Ouzinkie; Kodiak Island Inter-Tribal Council. The population of the community consists of 87.6% Alaska Native or part Native.

The existing Ozawkie airport has a 2,085' x 80' gravel runway that is in very poor condition. The existing runway dimensions do not meet FAA design requirements for the current aircraft fleet mix and will not be able to accommodate the current and future demands for passengers, mail service, and supplies. Because of the physical constraints associated with the existing runway location, such as terrain and its proximity to water, the existing airport cannot be improved to meet these FAA standards. The new Ouzinkie airport is located 1.7 miles to the north. The overall final project scope-of-work includes:

---

<sup>5</sup> As Reported by grant recipients to the FAA, April 2011

construction of a new runway, new aircraft parking apron (with stub taxiway), new primary community airport access road, and new airport/runway lighting.

Air transportation is the only reliable means of transportation available to the residents of Ouzinkie. Although the construction of a new airport has an NPR score of 40, the project has a very high priority for both the residents of Ouzinkie and the State of Alaska. A comprehensive Master Plan study had evaluated all available alternatives, including limited rehabilitation in the existing location and a number of other relocation alternatives to meet FAA standards and avoid or minimize impacts to the environment.

If it had been feasible to rehabilitate and expand the existing pavement, the project would have been assigned a national priority rating of 45. The NPR calculation automatically assigns a lower value to the construction of a new airport compared to the improvement of an existing facility.

Further, Ouzinkie is a scheduled stop for a carrier transporting mail under contract to the U.S. Postal Service, and the airport must be adequate to satisfy the needs of the USPS.

In Alaska, the aviation system is primarily made up of a large number of small rural airports supported by a much smaller number of regional type airports. At the 2000 Census, the population of Ouzinkie was 225.

The above factors led the FAA to conclude that the project was well justified for investment of ARRA funding.

**Table A: Special Emphasis Terminal Projects Funded by ARRA**

Region	ADO	State	LocID	Grant Number	Site Name	Project Description	Project Amount	NPR	Work Hours*
CE	ACE	IA	ALO	3-19-0094-036-2009	Waterloo Regional	Improve Terminal Building	\$ 93,939	35	288
NM	SEA	ID	PIH	3-16-0028-030-2009	Pocatello Regional	Expand Terminal Building	\$ 1,850,000	31	33,612
EA	BEC	WV	CRW	3-54-0003-043-2009	Yeager	Improve Terminal Building	\$ 4,975,306	35	19,047
GL	MSP	MN	DLH	3-27-0024-046-2009	Duluth International	Construct Terminal Building	\$ 5,329,578	38	34,426
SO	JAN	MS	MEI	3-28-0050-025-2009	Key Field	Rehabilitate Terminal Building	\$ 2,009,429	35	19,851
EA	BEC	WV	LWB	3-54-0012-026-2009	Greenbrier Valley	Improve Terminal Building	\$ 2,366,940	35	11,637
GL	BIS	ND	GFK	3-38-0022-035-2009	Grand Forks International	Construct Terminal Building	\$ 4,459,615	38	22,715
GL	BIS	SD	PIR	3-46-0044-026-2009	Pierre Regional	Construct Terminal Building	\$ 876,043	38	6,847
SO	ATL	NC	AVL	3-37-0005-035-2009	Asheville Regional	Improve Terminal Building	\$ 7,785,598	35	71,027
GL	CHI	IL	RFD	3-17-0088-054-2009	Chicago/Rockford International	Expand Terminal Building	\$ 1,073,040	31	2,716
GL	DET	MI	*MIB	3-26-SBGP-063-2009	Gogebic-Iron County	Improve Terminal Building	\$ 200,000	33	1,257
GL	MSP	MN	STC	3-27-0095-021-2009	St. Cloud Regional	Improve Terminal Building	\$ 777,721	35	515
SO	ATL	NC	PGV	3-37-0028-032-2009	Pitt-Greenville	Improve Terminal Building	\$ 7,900,120	35	55,196
NM	DEN	UT	+06V	3-49-0060-011-2009	New	Construct Terminal Building	\$ 3,497,000	43	4,800
GL	CHI	IL	PIA	3-17-0080-050-2009	Greater Peoria Regional	Construct Terminal Building	\$ 6,363,000	47	37,654
SO	JAN	AL	MOB	3-01-0051-046-2009	Mobile Regional	Improve Terminal Building	\$ 1,141,070	35	4,530
SO	JAN	MS	TUP	3-28-0070-032-2009	Tupelo Regional	Rehabilitate Terminal Building	\$ 569,354	35	5,470
SO	ORL	FL	PIE	3-12-0075-035-2009	St Petersburg-Clearwater International	Rehabilitate Terminal Building	\$ 1,287,220	35	12,042
SO	ORL	FL	PIE	3-12-0075-035-2009	St Petersburg-Clearwater International	Rehabilitate Terminal Building	\$ 3,644,660	35	34,095
WP	SFO	CA	STS	3-06-0241-041-2010	Charles M. Schulz - Sonoma County	Rehabilitate Terminal Building	\$ 332,666	35	1,785
WP	HNL	AS	PPG	3-60-0001-041-2009	Pago Pago International	Improve Terminal Building	\$ 2,127,500	35	46,049
SW	LANM	LA	MLU	3-22-0033-026-2009	Monroe Regional	Construct Terminal Building	\$ 10,000,000	47	157,520
GL	DET	MI	MBS	3-26-0083-044-2010	MBS International	Construct Terminal Building	\$ 3,397,000	38	7,185
WP	SFO	CA	STS	3-06-0241-037-2009	Charles M. Schulz - Sonoma County	Rehabilitate Terminal Building	\$ 1,935,884	35	18,829
EA	BEC	WV	CRW	3-54-0003-048-2010	Yeager	Improve Terminal Building	\$ 2,589,000	35	6,875
GL	DET	MI	MBS	3-26-0083-040-2009	MBS International	Construct Terminal Building	\$ 11,603,000	38	43,604
CE	ACE	IA	SUX	3-19-0085-038-2009	Sioux Gateway/Col. Bud Day Field	Rehabilitate Terminal Building	\$ 3,965,686	35	36,324

**Table B: Projects with NPRs between 41 and 61, Funded by ARRA**

Region	ADO	State	LocID	Grant Num	Site Name	Project Description	Project Amount	NPR	Work Hours*
AL	AAL	AK	AKN	3-02-0148-011-2009	King Salmon	Rehabilitate Apron	\$ 8,454,220.00	60	24,095
AL	AAL	AK	ENA	3-02-0142-043-2009	Kenai Municipal	Rehabilitate Apron	\$ 2,843,003.00	60	14,579
CE	ACE	MO	RCM	3-29-SBGP-038-2009	Skyhaven	Construct Apron	\$ 1,735,983.00	43	4,632
CE	ACE	MO	CGI	3-29-SBGP-039-2009	Cape Girardeau Regional	Rehabilitate Apron	\$ 1,429,065.00	60	7,883
CE	ACE	MO	FYG	3-29-SBGP-040-2009	Washington Regional	Rehabilitate Apron	\$ 432,156.00	58	2,947
CE	ACE	MO	SGF	3-29-0077-038-2009	Springfield-Branson National	Construct Taxiway	\$ 14,074,756.00	49	87,611
EA	BEC	WV	CKB	3-54-0005-032-2009	North Central West Virginia	Rehabilitate Emergency Generator	\$ 807,699.00	45	520
EA	BEC	WV	HTS	3-54-0010-039-2009	Tri-State/Milton J. Ferguson Field	Rehabilitate Apron	\$ 1,304,013.00	60	3,801
EA	BEC	WV	I18	3-54-0023-016-2009	Jackson County	Rehabilitate Apron	\$ 590,623.00	58	2,950
EA	BEC	WV	MRB	3-54-0014-025-2009	Eastern WV Regional/Shepherd Field	Construct Taxiway	\$ 716,307.00	49	2,987
EA	BEC	WV	W22	3-54-0039-021-2009	Upshur County Regional	Rehabilitate Apron	\$ 752,461.00	58	3,101
EA	HAR	NJ	26N	3-34-0029-013-2009	Ocean City Municipal	Improve Airport Drainage	\$ 2,179,503.00	42	9,343
EA	WAS	VA	*VAS	3-51-0000-006-2009	Commonwealth of Virginia	Acquire Mobile Aircraft Rescue & Fire Fighting Training Facility	\$ 2,500,000.00	44	10,753
EA	HAR	DE	33N	3-10-0001-012-2009	Delaware Airpark	Construct Runway	\$ 909,806.00	50	10,190
GL	CHI	IL	C73	3-17-SBGP-083-2009	Dixon Municipal-Charles R. Walgreen Field	Rehabilitate Apron	\$ 926,360.00	60	2,904
GL	CHI	IL	ORD	3-17-0022-104-2009	Chicago O'Hare International	Noise Mitigation Measures for Public Buildings	\$ 5,000,000.00	46	22,879
GL	CHI	IL	SPI	3-17-0096-050-2009	Abraham Lincoln Capital	Rehabilitate Apron	\$ 2,179,551.00	60	7,380
GL	DET	OH	UNI	3-39-0006-015-2009	Ohio University Snyder Field	Improve Runway Safety Area	\$ 2,095,141.00	47	15,809
GL	DET	OH	FDY	3-39-0034-019-2009	Findlay	Construct Taxiway	\$ 4,802,484.00	47	15,038
NE	ANE	CT	DXR	3-09-0006-032-2009	Danbury Municipal	Conduct Obstruction Evaluation Study	\$ 350,000.00	58	3,513
GL	MSP	MN	AEL	3-27-0003-010-2009	Albert Lea Municipal	Construct Runway	\$ 2,853,619.00	50	18,314
GL	MSP	MN	BJI	3-27-0010-020-2009	Bemidji Regional	Rehabilitate Apron	\$ 504,762.00	60	2,729
GL	MSP	MN	BRD	3-27-0014-032-2009	Brainerd Lakes Regional	Rehabilitate Apron	\$ 907,610.00	60	3,455
GL	MSP	MN	FCM	3-27-0061-011-2009	Flying Cloud	Construct Taxiway	\$ 2,419,657.00	50	18,162
GL	MSP	WI	MSN	3-55-0036-043-2009	Dane County Regional-Truax Field	Construct Taxiway	\$ 3,676,008.00	49	16,801
NE	ANE	NH	EEN	3-33-SBGP-006-2009	Dillant-Hopkins	Rehabilitate Apron	\$ 1,298,500.00	60	6,845
NE	ANE	ME	PQI	3-23-0039-028-2009	Northern Maine Regional Airport at Presque Isle	Extend Taxiway	\$ 2,614,505.00	45	14,274
NE	ANE	ME	PWM	3-23-0038-066-2009	Portland International Jetport	Rehabilitate Apron	\$ 2,136,139.00	60	10,533
NM	DEN	CO	ASE	3-08-0003-039-2009	Aspen-Pitkin County/Sardy Field	Rehabilitate Apron	\$ 3,525,180.00	60	18,564
NM	DEN	CO	DRO	3-08-0019-035-2009	Durango-La Plata County	Rehabilitate Apron	\$ 1,840,815.00	60	9,489
NM	DEN	CO	GJT	3-08-0027-039-2009	Grand Junction Regional	Rehabilitate Apron	\$ 9,212,457.00	60	33,336
NM	DEN	UT	SLC	3-49-0033-092-2009	Salt Lake City International	Construct Taxiway	\$ 8,930,651.00	61	53,545
NM	SEA	WA	2S8	3-53-0087-008-2009	Wilbur	Extend Taxiway	\$ 871,394.00	42	3,691
NM	SEA	WA	BLI	3-53-0005-042-2009	Bellingham International	Rehabilitate Apron	\$ 1,366,512.00	60	5,468
NM	SEA	WA	GEG	3-53-0072-042-2009	Spokane International	Rehabilitate Apron	\$ 7,961,974.00	60	56,295
NM	SEA	OR	OTH	3-41-0041-030-2009	Southwest Oregon Regional	Construct Taxiway	\$ 1,294,076.00	59	5,900
GL	DET	OH	CLE	3-39-0023-090-2009	Cleveland-Hopkins International	Construct Taxiway	\$ 9,819,261.00	50	38,417
NM	SEA	WA	PSC	3-53-0046-033-2009	Tri-Cities	Rehabilitate Apron	\$ 3,225,418.00	60	9,283
SO	ATL	GA	FFC	3-13-SBGP-002-2009	Peachtree City-Falcon Field	Construct Apron	\$ 2,064,198.00	46	6,076
SO	ATL	GA	AMG	3-13-SBGP-002-2009	Bacon County	Construct Taxiway	\$ 734,000.00	46	6,612
SO	ATL	GA	15J	3-13-SBGP-002-2009	Cook County	Construct Taxiway	\$ 686,898.00	47	4,522
SO	ATL	GA	SSI	3-13-SBGP-002-2009	Malcolm McKinnon	Rehabilitate Apron	\$ 5,846,000.00	60	39,590
GL	DET	OH	CLE	3-39-0023-091-2009	Cleveland-Hopkins International	Construct Apron	\$ 4,864,162.00	46	20,110
SO	ATL	SC	MYR	3-45-0065-043-2009	Myrtle Beach International	Construct Apron	\$ 3,233,602.00	54	19,382
SO	MEM	KY	210	3-21-0033-019-2009	Madisonville Municipal	Rehabilitate Apron	\$ 1,156,858.00	58	3,139
SO	MEM	TN	CHA	3-47-0009-047-2009	Lovell Field	Construct Apron	\$ 2,748,235.00	54	12,790
SO	MEM	KY	I39	3-21-0066-012-2009	Madison	Extend Taxiway	\$ 2,349,490.00	44	10,140
SO	MEM	KY	LEX	3-21-0028-049-2009	Blue Grass	Construct Aircraft Rescue & Fire Fighting Training Facility	\$ 1,000,000.00	47	3,986
SO	MEM	KY	OWB	3-21-0042-039-2009	Owensboro-Daviess County	Rehabilitate Apron	\$ 2,315,248.00	60	10,466
SO	ORL	FL	GNV	3-12-0028-029-2009	Gainesville Regional	Rehabilitate Apron	\$ 2,290,100.00	60	9,765
SO	ORL	FL	LEE	3-12-0042-019-2009	Leesburg International	Extend Runway	\$ 3,795,922.00	56	15,600
SO	ATL	GA	ATL	3-13-0008-090-2009	Hartsfield - Jackson Atlanta International	Construct Apron	\$ 13,977,695.00	56	132,175
WP	SFO	CA	SJC	3-06-0226-075-2009	Norman Y. Mineta San Jose International	Construct Taxiway	\$ 5,178,291.00	50	19,173
SO	ATL	GA	ATL	3-13-0008-099-2010	Hartsfield - Jackson Atlanta International	Construct Apron	\$ 1,022,305.00	56	6,383

\*Work Hours represents the total number of hours logged by workers on the jobsite in support of the ARRA funded project. These hours are reported by grant recipients to the FAA, as of April 2011. Induced jobs as a result of these projects are not included in the totals.