

**CITY OF PARK RAPIDS
AIRPORT COMMISSION**

SPECIAL MEETING

April 30, 2019, 9:00 A.M.

Airport Conference Room

Park Rapids, Minnesota

1. CALL TO ORDER: The April 30, 2019, Special Airport Commission Meeting was called to order at 10:00 a.m. by Chair Don Douglas.

2. ROLL CALL: Present: Commissioners Don Douglas, Dan Dyre, Thom Peterson, David R. Konshok and Scott Johnson. Staff present: John McKinney, John DeCoster and Andrew Mack. Absent: Councilmember Erika Randall, Scott Burlingame, Chris Fieldsend and Carmen L. Lockhart. Others Present: Matt Zitzow of TKDA, Ellis Jones, Jeff Voigt, Tom Hass and Robin Fish of Park Rapids Enterprise.

3. ADOPT AGENDA: A motion was made by Peterson, seconded by Dyre, and unanimously carried to adopt the Agenda as presented.

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – OCTOBER 22, 2018 REGULAR MEETING: A motion was made by Dyre, seconded by Peterson, and unanimously carried to approve the minutes of the October 22, 2018 Regular Meeting as presented.

5. ELECTION OF OFFICERS: A motion was made by Peterson, seconded by Dyre, and unanimously carried to nominate and elect Don Douglas as Chair and Dave Konshok as Vice Chair.

6. CITY ADMINISTRATOR UPDATE: McKinney said we have the maintenance contract

McKinney stated he is resigning as of the end of August.

7. FINANCIAL REPORT:

6A. 2018 Year End Preliminary Results: No information.

8. CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM AND HANGAR PROJECT UPDATE:

8A. 2019 Project Review: Zitzow stated relating to the 2019 project review we have two updates. In December of last year we submitted to MnDOT the grant preapplication package for a project that would include the extension of our taxi lanes to the west as well as the creation of a new taxiway connection back to alpha so the building area has two points of access as well as development sites for better circulation and additional developable sites. There are currently no developable sites remaining in the building area. That project was also envisioned to include the site prep that would enable

the future construction of a t-hangar although the t-hangar itself would not be part of that initial project. That would be a separate project down the line.

8B. Supplemental Funding Update: In parallel to that we also submitted in October of 2018 a supplemental authorization application to the FAA. The FAA was provided an additional one billion dollars discretionary gap funds to spend in addition to the normal program. Park Rapids, being identified as one of the types of airports that is a good candidate for that program. There has been a bill that Congress passed and that President Trump signed to include numerous categories for evaluation of criteria for an airport to get an award. That project was slated to include both the extension of the taxi lanes but then an additional element which was the creation of the cross-field taxi way to connect Runway 36 back to Alpha and eliminate the runway back taxiing that currently happens on Runway 18-36. The reason we submitted to the two applications at once is because the federal share of dollars that would be available for the full project would come at a much lower local investment than the traditional AIP funding. We wanted to see which program put us in the best position financially for the city to capture improvements at the lowest local cost.

Zitzow said let me talk about the supplemental appropriation for one more moment. The FAA's applications were due October 31st which we successfully met that deadline. The FAA has been in a process of evaluating all the applications nationally. Of the one billion dollars, there is \$800 million dollars yet unspent. As of the FAA's update last week at the MCOA Conference, nationally for that \$800 million dollars there was something in the magnitude of \$8 billion dollars in applied requests. So, you can see with the math there are more needs than supply in terms of the dollars. That being said though, the project has not been awarded or denied that additional funding. That process is still ongoing. The FAA can't tell us exactly when we would have an answer, they keep saying soon and have been saying soon for some time now.

Zitzow asked DeCoster if he has any insight about anything he has heard, but I'm hearing as early as tomorrow and as late as the middle of the summer? DeCoster stated he had a couple of off line conversations with the FAA folks and pretty much the same thing, they aren't committing anything. Of the \$200 million that has been awarded thus far, it has been awarded to 38 states and none has been awarded to an airport in Minnesota. It looks like politics is taking over pretty well, so they certainly aren't giving us any warm fuzzies that it's eminent but by the same token they are not saying no. DeCoster stated Zitzow took the initiative to reach out to Congressman Stauber as part of this, thinking you've got a Republican in a traditional Democratic district representing Park Rapids would be a good win for him being new and he has sent a letter of support to the FAA. Zitzow stated Char Christensen who is a Hubbard County Commissioner also has assisted with that effort. We had several conversations with Representative's Stauber's office and Representative Stauber agreed to have a phone call with Char and myself as well so we personally spoke to him and he did provide a letter of support for the project in support of our application to the FAA headquarters and that was submitted to FAA back on April 5th, 2019. Zitzow stated the idea here is that we are waiting to hear. It would be fantastic for the city and the region if those federal dollars came to support this project. I think that would be a win for the community and the region as well as a feather in the cap of Representative Stauber. He is on the house subcommittee for aviation. He spoke very

highly of aviation. He has a history and background of supporting aviation so this is a project that is on his radar and he did agree to provide any support that he could and he seems to be following through on that.

Zitzow commented, if we don't get that money, we've kind of put our taxi lane extension project in a holding pattern waiting to see how federal dollars fluff out of the supplemental. If that project is not awarded, we should know that in the next couple of months. Then the idea would be to take the smaller project which is just the extension of the taxi lanes and the preparation for the building area and take that through the budget process with the city through the fall and then gear up for that project next year if the city decided to pursue it and the council approved it. That's a long-winded explanation of two projects that are moving in parallel. I tried to keep it as brief as possible. Zitzow asked if there are there any questions?

DeCoster commented as a follow up, I know we had discussion at previous commission meetings about being able to have some developable sites some time this summer but with the supplement, which we were really hoping for, especially based on the fact the deadline was October, we were told it was going to be expeditious in the awards and it hasn't happened. We are not going to have the infrastructure in place in 2019 to do any additional development. That's when we came to the conclusion, as Zitzow suggested, that we go through the normal budgeting process if the supplemental does not come to fruition. So, it's disappointing that we weren't able to get the infrastructure in place for this year, but it's a big ticket that would cost the city a lot of money, hundreds of thousands of dollars if we try and do it on our own dime and I don't think the city has the financial appetite for that.

McKinney stated first of all you mentioned we get started with the fall for 2020, our budget process actually starts in August. Zitzow stated he understands. McKinney said we have to have our preliminary budget by September, so keep in mind that in some people's idea, the fall is October and that's too late. As far as anything else, we don't have a budget for any of our share if we don't do something to create it. It's in the Capital Improvements Project budget but that's a dream budget and isn't a funded budget.

Voigt asked so what's the difference, so instead of 2020 we forget that for the new area we're going to develop with that federal money, is that pretty much a no cost to the city? McKinney advised one was 100%. Voigt said so if we don't get that than it's going to be 90%-10%? Zitzow said correct, 90%-10% or 95%-5% depending on how the state's funding plays out but it looks like that the 95%-5% rate is still going to apply to projects moving forward and so what we've estimated in the past is that the local share for the extension of the building lanes and tying back to alpha and prepping all those sites in the ballpark of \$150,000 locally.

DeCoster said just a note on that, Cassandra Isackson, the head of MnDOT Aeronautics also gave a presentation at MCOA last week and she talked about the state budget for aeronautics. The governor's version is taking their budget up from roughly \$20 million to \$25 million. The senate budget of course is \$20 million plus \$23,000 and some odd dollars which she figures is a typo. Effectively, it is somewhere between \$20-\$25

million, that they have now and it is going to boil down to politics between the Democrats and the Republicans. We don't know where it's going to go.

Zitzow agreed that is a fair assessment, I don't see the pressure to move the number down but that being said, inflation kicks in and projects cost more every year too.

DeCoster stated to Voigt, the reason I said that is for the 5% state match, it's possible but not guaranteed depending on what happens. It's much more probable if they get a higher budget obviously. McKinney said if we don't get that, it's 10%. DeCoster agreed 10% local.

Zitzow said just to summarize the next steps for the building area, taxi lane extensions the next step will be to continue to monitor the supplemental probation status. If and when we would be offered an award under that scenario, I think we would immediately evaluate that as a commission to council. So that's part one, part two is to work with city staff on exploring the smaller project and bringing that forward to the evaluation process for future budget. Zitzow asked McKinney is the right timing for that July? What's the earliest you would like to see me submit information in support of the scope of that project? McKinney said the sooner the better, we won't be processing until July. McKinney explained then we have the finance committee that meets and goes over the broad concepts and the department heads prepare their requests. That's all going on in July and early August and then we have a meeting to finalize the report to the council and then they have a shot at it usually the first meeting in September. McKinney said that's a preliminary budget that isn't really adopted until December which can be less but it can't be more.

Zitzow was asked if we are awarded those supplemental funds, is there a time line because it's coming from the government, we have an allotted amount of time? Zitzow responded that's a great question. Typically, when you submit a traditional AIP application whether it's entitlement funding or discretionary funding we have to have engineering costs and a final design and bids in hand so you basically have to have all of your project costs known exactly in order to get a grant from the FAA and MnDOT. Because there was something of a probation to enable projects they don't have to be put under a supplemental. The shelf life of those funds is three years and so we are not expected to front the cost of design. Fortunately, environmental is clear, all of the areas that would be disturbed by the project have already previously been evaluated for NEPA findings through the Environmental Protection Agency as part of the Runway 18-36 paving years ago so we don't have an environmental footprint which is great. What it does mean is that we would have three years to finish the design, get bids in hand and finish the construction, which is very doable. I think it is realistic that we would finish the project on that timeline. Good question.

Mack stated he thinks it would be appropriate to discuss from the Chair of the committee sending a letter of thanks to Congressman Stauber's office for his effort in writing that letter to the FAA. I suggest a good show of political support for his efforts and he may be a champion for the community moving forward. McKinney added also send a letter to Char, she's been very helpful setting up for that arrangement to begin with, and giving us a heads up that the grant was coming before that. Zitzow stated very much so.

DeCoster said he and Zitzow will draft the letter and get it to the Chair for his signature. Chair Douglas said that sounds great.

8C. Arrivals/Departures Building Assessment Report: Zitzow explained when we met last as a commission the comment was made or questions were brought forth relative to this structure itself, the arrival/departure building. We've had numerous conversations previously, but exploring in more detail what would be the options for rehabilitation of this building, possibly some repurposing of some of the floor spaces and some general updates relative to code, energy efficiency, etc. At that time Mr. McKinney directed that TKDA would start the process for an architectural evaluation of the building. I think the intent of that was to say we don't really know what type of project we have, let's first get some ideas on the table as it's hard to evaluate something without just a baseline understanding of what the structure is and what are some of the project scope elements that can be considered. In March of 2019, a staff architect, Jay Wiederholt of TKDA and myself did tour the building and we appreciated the help from city staff and Voigt your staff took us on a tour of the building, the areas used by the FBO, by the public, etc. We took a nice tour. Wiederholt took notes. Mack and I are working on getting plans. Zitzow asked Mack for an update? Mack said he will resort to Dave Konshok because I searched for plans and can't find them. Konshok stated Hammers Construction has the plans and they are very good about getting them and we had this conversation the end of last week but anything you need, get from Hammers Construction.

Zitzow said at the time Wiederholt took a tour of the site and started to put together a preliminary assessment for the work which is a brief document that overviews the structure as it is now and not so much the specific recommendations, but more so the process by which the city would go through to evaluate and then seek funding for the process. So, it's basically kind of a roadmap document. That document is still in process and I hope to have something for city staff review first in the next four or so weeks and then something that could be shared more widely and discuss whether or not it's a project we intend to actually take into a process of scoping and design. Zitzow asked if there are any questions? McKinney commented there is no funding that has been set up for that so as you come to some considerations of that document when it's available, it still has to go to the council and there are no appropriations, and I don't think there is anything in the CIP. Zitzow advised we had carried forward projects in the CIP for the building, yes. McKinney advised so in the future it's on the list and on the radar but it hasn't landed yet.

Voigt asked if it is federal money that we can't use for that? Zitzow said yes, typically federal dollars do not apply to a structure or project of this type. MnDOT dollars typically do, but that being said MnDOT dollars have to compete against other projects so the whole process by which MnDOT evaluates and scores and ranks projects, AD buildings typically have a hard time competing because they are not safety related in the same way a runway is or a navigational aide is. Cassandra has continued to share the message that MnDOT is aware that we have an aging AD building infrastructure across the whole state as many airports have aging AD buildings. I think MnDOT is concerned that their model of ranking projects doesn't adequately address buildings. They talked about introducing new rules and those types of things to address that.

Konshok mentioned the AD building was state - local at about \$440,000 and there was a two-thirds, one third. In the past the trouble has always been getting any federal money for buildings as they have been low on priority.

Voigt said the fact is we just need to prepare, if we have a plan, estimated costs, and we're ready, then there is a good possibility we could get funding. If we're not ready, we're not going to get it. Zitzow said exactly right, in this initial document, again to reinforce what McKinney mentioned, the initial study document is really more so a frame work through which to think about the building and to think about creating that plan. Something that the council then can be presented in the future date so that the council starts that familiarity with why this structure is important, what are some of it's deficiencies, what are some of its pros and cons, if you will and then how would we move forward with a plan to keep the building serviceable for many years to come. That's really what that initial step is, it's certainly not in design and we're not trying to back you into making decisions on what you should do, but to provide you a map.

Konshok said we are considered a poor sister of Marshall and Marshall got theirs. We have the same kind of aircraft and use, they have Schwans, where we have 3M and they fly the same kind of aircraft, but they're a richer sister. I've talked to them down there and they've done an airline class terminal for arrival/departure. But the big daddy financially there was Schawns.

Mack asked if an angle would be through the Federal Disabilities Act, I just happen to notice this is a public meeting and I'm temporarily disabled and it is challenging to get up the stairs here for me. Zitzow said certainly access is one of the primary things that come up over and over again in conversations about the building is updating the restrooms, possibly re-envisioning some of the allocation of the first floor in terms of the balance between lounge, office, breakroom etc. On this level it's really about accessibility and trying to come up with ways to potentially make this space more viable for revenue generation. This is a relatively large room that could be utilized possibly as a public meeting space but it's not attractive due to its lack of accessibility so that's one of the issues that has certainly been talked about and it could trigger certain funding mechanisms.

9. DEPARTMENTAL REPORTS:

9A. Business Services:

(i) Timing on promoting new development: DeCoster said as I mentioned earlier the probability due to the supplemental funding delay or even the inability of doing anything in this construction season for providing additional developable sites is not going to happen. Again, we mentioned when we were here for the tour of the AD building we met at City Hall and talked about some of the issues we had with that. We do have a demand and hopefully we can keep those folks interested but there's nothing we can do about it because it's going to be a significant investment to do the infrastructure for the next wave, so we will just have to go from there.

(ii) FAA Lease: DeCoster stated he is working with the FAA on a lease right now for their instrument building. Obviously, it is a nonrevenue thing for the FAA. We just got a copy of their template they would like to use so I will get turned in.

DeCoster stated regarding the MCOA Conference, you've heard snippets about it, Ziztow covered the supplemental, we talked about the state budget, and Konshok and Jones were there to talk about it. It was very well attended I thought. Good discussions from FAA folks and fortunately I had quite a bit of time with the FAA folks off line and got some insight from them on what they are looking at and I think everything we've been following at the direction of TKDA is spot on. The safety and airfield do take priority but I did talk to them a little bit about the AD building here and again, they see the need, it's just a matter of where's the money and everybody's hitting them up for the same thing. It was a good conference and half the conference is what happens when you're not listening to presentations, it's the sidebar conversations. DeCoster asked if Konshok or Jones had any additional comments?

Konshok said it was Jones' first conference. Konshok commented on being hopeful and optimistic for future funding for the AD building even if it is from a private source like Marshall airport received.

DeCoster said two additional items – Voigt's building is new, 280 ft. and has gotten the attention of others in the state. You're on the radar. I talked to a number of other airports and they had heard about Voigt's building here and actually were asking a lot of questions about it. Every other airport that I talked to, they are not in the same situation we are, they've got a lot of vacant land that's ready to be developed but they have no takers. We have the opposite problem. We have takers but we don't have the land ready yet. Voigt's building is being recognized around the state as being wow, private investment, pretty interesting. Voigt stated Brainerd wants me to build one over there now too.

Voigt commented along that subject, every week I'm getting somebody coming and asking about t-hangar rentals. They say they're on the list and I ask where are you at on the list and they say I don't know. I have a suggestion that as an Airport Commission with that list that you be the ones that are doing it. I know Brumbaugh has it and is doing so many other things but no one else knows what is going on with it. I think the Airport Commission should be the one in charge of that list and that way we can vet them as a group of who the new potential client is and make sure they get put in the right hangar for what they have for an aircraft because customers come to me bitching they can't get their airplane out of the hangar so we have to deal with that and stop and help them get it out. I get a fair amount of that. Voigt stated he has told them they shouldn't be in a hangar that doesn't fit in their hangar properly. If the commission as a group could evaluate the list and see who's on it and vet these people out and get them in the right position, I think we would be better off, I really do. McKinney said I would think that would be a move forward for the commission to review the list, but I have no history of success in a group of people administering a project. Douglas said that should really be the airport manager's job – assigning t-hangars. McKinney said part of the problem with the feedback you're getting about Brumbaugh is she can't tell them any different answer than you can give them until

we get more spaces. Now, the point you raised that I think was a valid one, do we have the right people in the right spots? There was further discussion concerning knowing what aircraft fits in what hangar, the need for more hangars, and preparing a report from DeCoster and McKinney on how to proceed.

Dyre asked if someone was to go to the industrial park and buy a lot and build a hangar in there could you get access to the airport, is there any way to do that? Mack said according to the Master Plan there's future development area that's slated for additional hangar space but based up the actual industrial development land area, that's not tentatively slated for future airport development and it is slated for industrial type development. Mack said that's the official plan, so land slated for future airport development and future hangar development is where that's planned to occur. Mack pointed out areas for future development, road improvements and commented on costs.

Dyre commented it would be so much easier, you could buy a lot, build a hangar yourself in no time and be done with it. DeCoster said the only time I've actually seen that endorsed by the FAA was at two locations, one in Duluth for Sirius to build an assembly plant without taxi way access and it's off a new gate they go through. It's production stuff and it didn't need to be on the airport so they got a plan with the FAA to do that. The second is in Amarillo, Texas where there's a Bell Helicopter plant off airport, again, it's primarily assembly and manufacturing the helicopters. For private hangars just for traditional hangar use it's been discouraged by the FAA, it's only been available when you have a manufacturing operation. Dyre said that's what I figured but just thought I would throw it out there.

DeCoster said Voigt raised some good points and we will come up with a plan on that. Voigt said there are a couple bigger t-hangars we have and there's potential that one of them could become available but that type of hangar is one of the only hangars that could fit a bigger airplane in it so do you rent that to somebody who's got a Champ? Brumbaugh wouldn't know that and that's where I think having some interaction or if we could have a deal on paper that we will rent it to you but if we have somebody that has a need for the larger hangar then we have to move them out or something. That way at least it's rented.

DeCoster said one thing Voigt said and I want to follow up on is there might be some uses that are not aeronautical happening in the hangars and I would suspect that may be the case, I've not viewed them personally. It does happen and if we go down that road we will need enforcement and it turns into an absolute tough love discussion. If we end up going through this process and I think Voigt has raised a good point, it's something that airports tend to avoid because it does get very confrontational when you have to tell someone they can't lease a hangar because they are using it for RV storage. Dyre said we went through everything about two years ago. DeCoster said if it happens, we will need the commission's support and of course it's in the minimum standards so the policy is there but may need some support to enforce it. McKinney stated there again, Brumbaugh isn't set up to do that, that's not her job, the only thing she does is she has a list based on who and the time they signed up and I assume that at the time that was put together those were all the similar shapes and sizes with some facing north and some to the south but

other than that it's either their name came up on the list and do you want it or don't you? In the meantime, there hasn't been that much turnover so people that are on the list haven't seen any movement but that's not because we're letting some people jump ahead of them, it's just that they're not available. I assure you she would welcome you guys taking that over and dealing with all those issues, but to follow up, the commission's got to get on board. You've got to keep your City Council advised as to what you're doing because they don't call you, they call the council and they've got a buy into what we're proposing. There again, you need to fight through the concept or the perception that it's a good ole boys system out here and you guys have been doing it long enough that you've got your foot in the door and you can do whatever you want and nobody else gets in which is something that we've got enough on the books to deal with that. I think the question raised is, I hate to use the term enforcement but compliance is a better word for our policies on those units and make sure we're doing that. I think that's the airport manager's job but we will come back with something on that.

Douglas asked if we need a motion on that? McKinney advised maybe a motion to refer it back to the staff and we will come back at the next meeting. Peterson commented as far as the amount of work load for Brumbaugh on that list, I wouldn't think it's a huge amount because there isn't any turnover, there's not much movement.

A comment was made about getting them to pay their rent. Peterson agreed. McKinney said also getting notices out for rent, renewal of the rent, sometimes we've got people that the question is do we rent the hangar to the person that owns the airplane or to the airplane so that when a guy sells his airplane that's had a hangar, does the hangar go with the airplane and those kinds of issues she has to deal with. DeCoster said we adopted a policy on tenures last year with that discussion so we will have to write that back up and if we're going to change that we're not going to change the commission.

Voigt said I guess I would just like to see that list, I've never seen the list, I've been here for 20 years and I've never seen a list. The reason why is I really don't need to see it but I seriously get approached about every week by somebody and I have to say call Brumbaugh. At least if I had an idea of what the list amounted to I could say well there are at least three guys ahead you. I probably know who they are and know what they've got for airplanes or if they don't have airplanes and just want to buy an airplane and are on the list and don't even have an airplane, maybe there's some chances that the guy in fourth place is going to be moved up.

Hass said maybe the southern facing hangars would be priced different than the north facing ones? DeCoster said I think we did that. McKinney said we talked about it but doesn't remember how it turned out. DeCoster said we've got two different pricing tiers but I think we did that but I will verify that. There was further discussion concerning the size and prices of hangars and north and south facing hangars as well as seasonal people.

Peterson said maybe there is a mechanical way of putting heat tape or something on the south facing hangars to make them useable. Voigt said they need to shovel them out right away and some don't do that. There was discussion about snow removal.

DeCoster said they will evaluate it and come back with some good points and there was some good feedback raised. Voigt added I think also having the group evaluate it, it takes away that thought of the good ole boy club and only one person administering it. Voigt said if he took care of it himself, everyone would think that I'm giving special treatment but if the council does it, I don't know.

A motion was made by Douglas, seconded by Dyre and unanimously carried to refer hangar rental assessment and allotment to staff for review and recommendations.

DeCoster commented Cassandra Isackson also gave a presentation on the MnDOT Aeronautic staffing and they have 23 people since the conference last year and she's projecting that by 2021 or 2023 they will have turned over staff to the tune of 98%, including her. She has been there seven years and probably the longest aeronautics person we've had for quite some time which is usually a stepping stone within the Department of Transportation. She's really kind of latched onto it. Frankly she's our friend on the board of this administrative state, always trying to do new and innovative stuff but with change also comes some hiccups so we will just keep working and her motivation is correct. I think they're trying to get good people. They're challenging some of the traditional processes. She was talking about how at school they've always done it that way and the new people are coming in and saying why? So, they might find some people who go a little bit off to the right pretty far but she has been trying to keep it somewhere in the middle. I think with the turn over issue, we will watch and keep educating them as we rotate people through Park Rapids on our characteristics here, we're not just another general aviation airport. We have pretty unique needs here and keep them abreast of what's going on.

McKinney commented he would like to thank Ellis Jones for sacrificing at great personal cost of going down to the meetings every month, I appreciate it. He is invited to come to these meetings, so thank you.

Jones advised being in aviation I've used thousands of airports but I've operated none so it's been a real learning process. The first couple meetings was learning who's who and things like that but generally the meetings go the first one third or half is having the FAA explain what kind of financing is going on. The other one third is the state MnDOT usually Cassandra filling in about state legislation and state politicians and then you've got some other little stuff. A couple items of interest is kind of like preaching to the choir, but Silver Bay airport they shut that down and that has been a big conversation at the MCOA meetings. They harp on there's a community that looked at their 95%-5% funding and having to come up with a few thousand dollars to asphalt a runway and the community says no, we don't want to spend the \$5,000, so they lose the airport. They don't see the advantages they have with the airport spending the \$5,000 and having the airport for future benefits. There's another one, some engineering entity put together this report card for Minnesota Infrastructure and they gave aviation a B and everybody else is bridges, dams are C, C- and there's a D+ in here. To the MCOA Board these airport people their careful that the city councils, county commissioners are all going to go, why are we giving airports money, they've got a B, we need to help the other stuff. The argument is and I think you would all agree, you can't have potholes in runways, you can't allow that so you've got to

spend the money to keep the aviation B or better. Jones said he will pass the report around. Jones said he's enjoyed it and there are some really sharp people out there running airports in Minnesota, us included. Voigt commented on Silver Bay saying now the state and feds are going back after them and they have to pay back hundreds of thousands of dollars if they don't get the airport back open as it was dedicated funds and they can't just close that airport.

Jones said the person from Willmar explained what they've gone through the last 20 years or so. They actually abandoned the previous airport and it shut down, it was too close to the population of the city and they have a new airport just a few miles away. A lot of the things you are talking about is really similar sounding to what they were going through. You've got the city council, one of the issues was who's going to do the toilets and who's going to pump the gas and they contracted out to two entities - the existing crew and a new one which was a conglomerate of aircraft owners that were based there were going to put together a LLC or whatever to take on that business.

McKinney stated he wanted to thank Jones for going down there and his new blood and new vision for what we're doing.

Mack said on this report on ASCE, we will email out to the commission the airport segment in here.

Mack said he owns a house in Silver Bay and they did develop cute little yard signs for save our airport.

9B. Field Services: Zitzow said Burlingame contacted him and stated there weren't any issues to report at this time.

9C. Facility Maintenance Services: Zitzow stated Fieldsend did not contact him. McKinney advised Fieldsend had some surgery and has had post surgery followup in Fargo so he couldn't be here today but he didn't have anything to report.

McKinney commented one thing that came up since our last meeting, you were talking about those north facing hangars, one of the problems is not everybody shovels them out and they can't open the door and when they do, they rip the thing off the bottom so I think it would be a timely thing for us to talk about at the same time.

Voigt advised a couple guys have actually put that heat tape in the rubber and then plug it in and it keeps the rubber from freezing down and ripping off. Voigt stated it's probably \$60. Mack said sounds like a minor add on to the lease payment having to put it on all those units.

9D. Planning and Zoning: Zitzow asked Mack if he had any items, otherwise he does. Mack said go right ahead. Zitzow said he has one update. As you remember we went through a Master Plan and ALP process over the last couple of years and those documents were submitted to FAA back in March of 2018. They did provide response and comment to that albeit mostly minor so our staff is finishing up minor revisions to those

documents and then what would happen here is some time early this summer we will try to get on the council agenda in June or July to brief the council for final adoption. That would be the last step of that process and then you would have a formally approved ALP and Master Plan. Zitzow stated there won't be a whole lot new to report other than it's a final document.

Mack asked if the document is calling for any further changes in code, airport zoning? Zitzow said no, the airport zoning that is currently on the books accounts for the future extension of the runways albeit that would be in the future but I don't think there were any suggested changes to the zoning.

Voigt asked if anyone went down to the Minnesota Pilots? Peterson said it was great. Voigt asked how was the setup there, facility wise. Peterson said it was in Buffalo Lake, KFCE, it was a good facility I thought. Voigt said his thought was is seeing if Park Rapids could make a run at hosting that event. There was further discussion about the event.

There was discussion about the next meeting date.

10. ADJOURNMENT: A motion was made by Dyre, seconded by Peterson, and unanimously carried to adjourn the meeting at 11:04 a.m.

Don Douglas, Chairperson

Carmen L. Lockhart
Planning/Administrative Assistant