

**CITY OF PARK RAPIDS**  
**AIRPORT COMMISSION**  
SPECIAL MEETING  
**October 20, 2015, 2:00 P.M.**  
Airport Conference Room  
Park Rapids, Minnesota

1  
2       **1. CALL TO ORDER:** The October 20, 2015, Special Airport Commission Meeting  
3 was called to order at 2:00 p.m. by Chair Don Douglas.

4  
5       **2. ROLL CALL:** Present: Commissioners Donald Douglas, Dan Dyre, Scott  
6 Johnson, and David R. Konshok. Staff present: John McKinney, Scott Burlingame, Ryan  
7 Mathisrud, Chris Fieldsend and Carmen L. Lockhart. Absent: Thom Peterson and  
8 Councilmember Erika Randall. Others Present: John DeCoster, Matt Zitzow, Jeff Voigt and  
9 Tom Hass.

10  
11       **3. ADOPT AGENDA:** A motion was made by Konshok, seconded by Dyre, and  
12 unanimously carried to adopt the Agenda as presented.

13  
14       **4. APPROVE MINUTES OF JULY 1, 2015 REGULAR MEETING:** A motion was  
15 made by Dyre, seconded by Johnson, and unanimously carried to approve the  
16 minutes of the July 1, 2015 Regular Meeting as presented.

17  
18       **5. FINANCIAL REPORT – John DeCoster, Trillion Aviation:**

19  
20       **5a. 2015 Year to Date Performance:** DeCoster distributed a financial report in  
21 a new format with the actual budget and the actual expenses and then the third quarter  
22 breakdown to give a snapshot and asked for any questions or comments. The top half of  
23 the page is the revenues and the bottom half is the expenses. We try to keep things  
24 broken down enough so it is fairly transparent.

25  
26       McKinney commented the annual budget is for the whole year. DeCoster said  
27 correct and what we will do for next year is have a cumulative first, second and third  
28 quarter and the reason we thought that was important was because obviously there is  
29 some seasonality to our expenses with runways and maintenance and heating and cooling  
30 and all the things that we have to deal with regarding the facilities so this being the first  
31 quarter that I've implemented this I just started with third quarter this year. We will also in  
32 the future make sure these get out with the packets beforehand.

33  
34       **5b. Update on 2015 CIP; 7a 2016 CIP & 7b 2016 Apron Replacement:**  
35 DeCoster introduced Matt Zitzow from TKDA who joined the company in June and has a  
36 lot of background with smaller general aviation airports as well as worked at airports in  
37 Minneapolis so he has good exposure with 3M and their needs and demands. TKDA had  
38 some turn over in staff and decided to reshuffle the deck and match resources with their  
39 client base and we were fortunate to be handed Matt Zitzow so he has been working with  
40 us now for the last couple of months and making the transition with John Peterson but

1 John will still be involved with regard to the backroom stuff but Matt will be the face of  
2 TKDA for Park Rapids.

3  
4 Zitzow thanked DeCoster for the introduction and stated he joined TKDA in June  
5 and prior to that was working in municipal engineering and also airport design and  
6 engineering for about the last twelve years or so. Zitzow said he is excited to help Park  
7 Rapids and has experience in fields from local grass strips all the way up to commercial  
8 service airports so hopefully I can assist you in the projects that you have coming up and  
9 the needs you have.

10  
11 When DeCoster offered me the opportunity to come up today and sit down and  
12 meet with you, I jumped on that opportunity right away. You can see that in the agenda  
13 there are a couple of items and they are not meant to be an exhaustive exploration of all  
14 things engineering here at Park Rapids but does want conversation related to what's in the  
15 agenda so feel free to stop me if you have a question or something to add and we will  
16 discuss anything you would like to discuss at this time.

17  
18 Zitzow stated it's a good time of year to talk about the CIP. In your packet the first  
19 two exhibits Exhibits A & B. Zitzow explained the CIP is a planning tool and some of you  
20 have interfaced with the CIP at the airport before and some of you may not have. A little  
21 description of the logic of what the CIP is and what it's meant to be. It really is a planning  
22 tool. It is not a contract so in other words projects that are listed on your CIP does not  
23 mean you have to complete those projects in that order or at all. If you don't see a project  
24 in your CIP, again this isn't a contract and doesn't mean those projects don't exist or  
25 haven't been talked about or maybe don't need to be talked about. Furthermore, it's also  
26 not a laundry list, so the CIP is not meant to be an exhaustive list of every possible thing  
27 that we can imagine at Park Rapids Airport, it's somewhere in between. So really what it is  
28 is a planning tool if you can think of it not only are we getting the projects right in other  
29 words are the projects the right projects to be talking about, are they in generally the right  
30 order and then there is the financial piece. Airport improvement projects sometimes cost  
31 big dollars and by big dollars a million dollars plus in some cases and sometimes there are  
32 smaller projects as well. But the planning tool and planning power of the CIP is that it is a  
33 document that you can use locally to start talking about your local match and making sure  
34 you can support the projects you want to pursue. It is also a planning tool for your  
35 agencies, being MnDOT Aeronautics and the FAA. They provide a lion's share of the  
36 funding in most cases so they also rely on this document to make sure that their grant  
37 priorities are in the right order, that they see your projects coming and that they can  
38 prioritize your projects correctly as they fit you into the larger state and national system.  
39 These are not projects that happen in a vacuum, those dollars can allocated here but they  
40 can also be allocated down the street or downstream in other states. Another comment  
41 before we maybe talk about some of the projects specifically is, the CIP can really be  
42 thought of in two levels. There are the projects in the next 1 to 3 to 5 years and those are  
43 projects that are pretty serious. Projects that are really on the doorstep of going to council  
44 for local match approval and maybe you're even in the process of designing those  
45 projects. Projects that are in the back half of the CIP, 5, 10, 15 or 20 years out that again  
46 feeds that planning purpose so not only do we as a local sponsor of Park Rapids see those  
47 bigger projects that are coming maybe keeping our airfield up to snuff and performing

1 properly but really the state and the fed individuals are looking at those projects in that 5,  
2 10, 15, 20 year window and saying let's get prepared for some of these bigger projects and  
3 make sure that the projects make sense and that they are in the right order.  
4

5 Zitzow inquired if there are any questions or comments. DeCoster noted that this  
6 discussion **combines item 5b and 7 a & b on the agenda.**  
7

8 Zitzow stated we don't necessarily need to go line by line but does want to stress  
9 the CIP list program report can really address a bunch of different types of projects, not  
10 only do you have airfield projects, you have what the civil engineer considers the glorious  
11 projects which are runways, taxiways, nav aids but you also have the real functional  
12 elements that keep the airport serviceable to your users. You might have fuel systems  
13 projects on there, facilities projects such as hangars the A/D building etc., you might have  
14 security and perimeter control type projects – fencing, drainage and there also might be  
15 development of new hangars, new pavements, new taxi lanes, etc. so really all those  
16 things fit onto a CIP in theory and equipment does as well. Certain pieces of equipment  
17 both in terms of mowers and blowers both for keeping the grass short and the snow piles  
18 where they belong, the state and federal governments do participate in elements of those  
19 types of projects as well. In order to get grant participation generally you need to have your  
20 project on your CIP. There are emergency funds available on occasion but typically the  
21 state and federal government are looking for you to prioritize the projects and make sure  
22 that you've done all the work ahead of time and then that leads it's way nicely into getting  
23 grants offered your way for those other funds that are available. Now going from that  
24 corresponds nicely with the first pile of projects and again the projects in the 1 to 3, to 5  
25 year range are the projects that are coming or potentially coming. Projects that are on the  
26 docket for maybe the next year or two are really serious because those are the projects  
27 that in terms of interacting with the city administration making sure that the funding is  
28 available those are the projects that are immediately important to the budget in the next  
29 couple year cycle from the city council standpoint.  
30

31 Zitzow explained the city fiscal year a/k/a the calendar year is a little different than  
32 the federal fiscal year and the state fiscal year is even a little different all together as well.  
33 The state fiscal year begins on July 1<sup>st</sup>. The federal fiscal year starts on October 1<sup>st</sup>  
34 whereas the city budget year starts on January 1<sup>st</sup>. As you look at this project, generally  
35 when we talk about the CIP people can use whatever year they like but for the time being  
36 shall we stay in calendar year so we all think about what year the construction may  
37 happen, that might be the easiest year to think about it and that's the third column listed  
38 calendar year. I wanted to give you a brief conceptual overview of what the projects look  
39 like potentially in the next couple of years. For some time the city has been planning and is  
40 under contract already for certain elements relating to two projects and those are  
41 highlighted in gray on your list. There is currently a contract underway for the Airport  
42 Master Plan Update and we will talk a little bit more about that as we get along here. In  
43 terms of airfield physical improvements TKDA is currently under contract to start the  
44 programming and design for the taxiway mill overlay project and that also includes portions  
45 of the apron out here mill overlay as well. You can see that is highlighted on the map so  
46 this orange color which is the GA apron which is planned for mill overlay next year and  
47 also taxiway Alpha now in light of space, taxiway Alpha is listed here for full length so the

1 graphic only addresses the portion of the field that is east of 18-36 but the budget and the  
2 project design is intended to really go full length okay so that's mill overlay of the taxiway  
3 project as well. I want to talk a little bit more about that project but let's stay on the few  
4 years plan routine. Those projects were funded in grants that were already issued in  
5 federal fiscal year 2015 so those grants were already issued for those projects, the design  
6 and the master plan update are underway. Now construction would happen next year so  
7 another grant application will go in, once we have a bid in hand, we know what the project  
8 costs on the street, those costs as well as construction administration go back to the state  
9 and federal governments to get that construction grant issued in calendar 2016. So there  
10 is kind of a two phase approach. That's not always how it's been done in the past as in the  
11 past the grants were typically these monster grants that happen from day one concept all  
12 the way through construction, that might be a thing of the past, especially on larger  
13 projects. The lead time on getting all the submittals into the FAA are getting lengthier and  
14 they are encouraging people to really look at projects in a design and then construction  
15 two phase approach. It probably doesn't affect cost that much but it does affect timeline.  
16 We also have a project listed for equipment, there is a mower listed, the existing mower  
17 used on the field needs to be replaced. We have taken a request to the state, now the  
18 feds don't participate in mowers but the state does so the federal government is out of the  
19 game but you can see the pro-rata we estimate we are somewhere in the \$16,000 range  
20 for that piece of equipment. Twenty percent of that comes from local funds and 80%  
21 comes from the state, we have sent in a request and the state is looking at their coffers as  
22 projects come in at the end of their construction cycle and we have listed it as an  
23 emergency spending because the equipment we have is essentially DOA and they are  
24 sympathetic to that response and we've given them the paperwork they need so with any  
25 luck, we are hoping to get that grant cut loose even yet in the next say month or two,  
26 before the end of the calendar year this year so that would be completed here relatively  
27 quickly.

28  
29 DeCoster suggested Zitzow mention the correspondence that was received from  
30 the state about the processing and it came with a recommendation. Zitzow asked specific  
31 to the mower? DeCoster said yes. Zitzow explained when we first sent in the request for  
32 the mower, it's been on the CIP for some time all of the projects are prioritized state wide,  
33 things like nav aids and runway pavements rank very high and then all the way on down to  
34 wind cones, important but they don't rank very high because again the state has a formula  
35 by which they rank. Equipment doesn't rank very high necessarily unless it is an  
36 emergency repair or replacement and because we are in that situation we sent that  
37 correspondence in and they were sympathetic to that and said yes if it has to be replaced,  
38 it has to be replaced so again we're hopefully on the cusp of getting those dollars cut loose  
39 for the city within weeks to months.

40  
41 Konshok commented he thinks it is important to bring it up here on the prioritizing  
42 because that's been our problem in the past is we think in our mind what's prioritized but  
43 actually that fed is the driving force here so I think your emphasis on that is good so they  
44 understand that. I'm thinking things like the hangar and things like that, we need it but it is  
45 low priority and lessens our ability to get it. Zitzow stated Konshok brings up a good point  
46 so the state has a formula for prioritizing projects, the feds do as well and obviously as I  
47 said none of these dollars happen in a vacuum so you are competing against, in theory a

1 limited need and a finite number of dollars nationwide and statewide chasing those  
2 projects and one purpose of the CIP and earlier in September DeCoster and I met with the  
3 fed and state reps and ran them through this draft and the reason that is important is that  
4 they have feedback and say we are trying to juggle projects across the state, why don't  
5 you move this one up and move that one back, this one will prioritize well this year and this  
6 one won't. So again, it's a give and take between projects that are reasonable and rational  
7 and even necessary at a local level but then working with the agency folks to make sure  
8 that fits into their checkbook and the way that they prioritize dollars as well.

9  
10 Konshok said that is good for the group here because they sometimes wonder why  
11 can't we get that and that priority thing I find is a bottom line so there are other forces out  
12 there even nationally. Sometimes what Burlingame needs looks like it is real easy but  
13 sometimes even the mower is slow and I think it's good that we all understand that is part  
14 of the equation and the big thing is I think it is a very good system and they have been very  
15 fair about it and if we really need something aeronautics is small enough that they will do  
16 some bending for us if necessary.

17  
18 Zitzow said those are all good points and maybe to look at the list from 2016 on  
19 down, again we don't need to go line by line as that isn't necessarily the purpose of today's  
20 outline but you can see that there is a mix of different types of projects, there's essentially  
21 maintenance type projects relative to your existing runways, taxiways, aprons, there's  
22 some projects that are related to development like building development, t-hangar  
23 development type projects, there is equipment on there and there's projects farther on  
24 down in terms of even making sure that projects that we know are coming you know,  
25 runway 13-31 isn't going to be in the condition that it is in forever, the fuel system isn't  
26 going to be in the condition it is forever so because of all of this infrastructure has a finite  
27 life span we know that we have to look ahead and plan for that so that is really the purpose  
28 of it .

29  
30 Voigt commented on the apron replacement and removal area and advised where  
31 he sees a problem is going to be is somebody pulls up and does a run up they are going to  
32 block that whole thing and to do run up over there so should that be made up into a run up  
33 area? Zitzow said interesting question, let's zoom ahead to this Exhibit C graphic as well  
34 because this essentially illustrates the same thing that you just asked about. The orange  
35 area on the Exhibit A this Exhibit C also incorporates the aerial so you can see the existing  
36 aerial and the existing photo underneath all the line work. We also included here in  
37 concept what the final pavement markings might look like both for accommodating small  
38 aircraft tie downs as well as the larger parking and the maneuvering in and out. Let's talk  
39 about what's driving the pavement removal – currently we have a lot of pavement out here  
40 that essentially connects longitudinally the taxiway with the apron. FAA in their design  
41 standards in terms of keeping taxiway safety, they have this surface called the Taxiway  
42 Object Free Area (TOFA) which that essentially says is that based on your design aircraft  
43 to your airfield and they are looking at wingspans and they're looking at keeping that  
44 taxiing path clear of obstructions. That's permanent and temporary obstructions and in  
45 order to satisfy those criteria we have to clear any pavement that isn't satisfactory anymore  
46 simply to have them chevroned or marked out because by the  
47 FAA rules and regulations they are basically saying if you have pavement there you are

1 inviting someone to use it and if you're inviting someone to use it you're having aircraft,  
2 statically or dynamically, in a TOFA while someone else is trying to use the taxiway. This  
3 standard has put an enormous burden or conflict I should say with run up pads, it just has.  
4 We've seen this statewide, region wide and nationwide. As the FAA has pushed the  
5 envelope on clearing TOFA's we have traditionally had to give up those areas that are  
6 prized for aircraft operations especially run ups and you have these head on head on  
7 taxiing situations or you have to sit and wait for somebody to taxi. As a user of the field I  
8 would look for suggestions about what is shown in green has to go and there's really no  
9 negotiation on that topic. However, talking about run ups and what we might envision as  
10 the future of run up operations that's still an important topic and we can talk about it and  
11 now I'm asking a question and people haven't had a chance to stop and think about it but  
12 what are some of the other opportunities? Voigt said I just see what is going to happen  
13 here, you're going to have some guy in a 172 or whatever and he's sitting here and 3M is  
14 going to pull in behind him and he is going to rush this guy because he needs to get going  
15 and there is going to be an accident because he didn't do a proper run up. Zitzow said  
16 that is 100% what we don't want to do, so we have to satisfy the FAA criteria but we don't  
17 want to introduce a local safety operating condition. One area jumps out at me, in fairness  
18 I really haven't sat and thought about this but just sitting here looking at the graphic would  
19 there be an opportunity to allocate, if you will, a portion of the apron the post construction  
20 apron and just working with the users of the airfield to know that this is where we do run  
21 ups. Voigt said it won't happen, as a pilot I just know you're going to taxi out and do your  
22 run up down there, it's just the way it is. You can put a run up area over here and well you  
23 just as well can put it there as put it here, you're not going to go over there, you know what  
24 I mean? I don't know, I just look at that like it's stupid. Zitzow responded well you're not  
25 alone. Voigt said we have a run up area on the end, are they going to take that out too?  
26 There is enough room there if you get off the edge and you can still get by? Zitzow said  
27 the answer to the other end is no because we have made the design rationale that in areas  
28 where we are simply doing mill overlay, the FAA essentially allows you to preserve what  
29 you have and what you have down there at the other end in terms of your radius and fill it  
30 design is not so outstanding from the standard that the FAA has put a spotlight on it, but  
31 these tangentially connected aprons don't fly. Voigt asked can't they just cut out a piece  
32 here and then it wouldn't be connected to the apron, it would be, well you would have to  
33 specifically go over there for a run up area. Zitzow said let me make a note of that and I  
34 will ask. Zitzow said what we could look at and I don't have it listed here and maybe this  
35 graphic could be improved by illustrating where The Object Free Area sits and it essentially  
36 sits just south of the removal and pavement as we basically tried to maximize the amount  
37 of pavement we could keep. Voigt commented you did a great job there. Zitzow advised  
38 pavement that you have you don't want to give away unless you absolutely have to. The  
39 idea that was posed was could we look at the recreation or the creation of new or salvage  
40 some of the pavement down here that would still be outside the TOFA but could enable  
41 aircraft to go out here and run up. That is something that we can look at, I can lay that out  
42 and see if that fits. The other idea I thought is there a way to guide some of the aircraft to  
43 this zone, it's essentially taking your idea and applying it to the area that the FAA has  
44 already said yes, that can stay. That means a couple of tie downs get lost, that means we  
45 may need some additional pavement markings to help guide people to that spot, that  
46 means pilots have to relearn what they are used to. All of that kind of hurts in the short run

1 but the long run motivation that the FAA has is to keep TOFA's clear and that's bad for run  
2 ups but it is great for people that are using the taxiway.

3  
4 DeCoster suggested that since we haven't had a chance to really think through it  
5 and it's a very valid concern I think this probably needs some engineering to be brought  
6 back to the group and Voigt and Hass probably have some hands on input on what is  
7 practical to get people to do verses what is a nice theory. Zitzow said this is a good step in  
8 the process, we are under contract working on the design and right now the work largely  
9 has been the formulation which is getting the financing part of the project into FAA and  
10 some of the pre-project submittals but getting the geometry right we're right at that step in  
11 the process so this is a timely conversation and I will definitely take that back.

12  
13 Zitzow stated sprinkled into the CIP at some intervals pavement crack and joint  
14 repairs. DeCoster said to Voigt's point, do you want to talk about the rework with the  
15 salmon colored area. Zitzow said the project next year includes some pavement removal  
16 and it includes some pavement recon in and around these intersections, mill overlay  
17 largely for the rest of the alpha and it also includes mill overlay for the portion here of what  
18 is going to be left of the apron. One of the questions was reinventing or maximizing the  
19 layout especially of the pavement markings to make sure that the larger aircraft can  
20 maneuver in and around the apron with the two feeders verses the entire lateral being  
21 open and getting in and around to the passenger boarding areas, fueling but also leaving  
22 enough room for the tie downs so this graphic illustrates that. The aircraft that are  
23 illustrated are the 3M G5 and smaller and so we used those design criteria to make sure  
24 that this layout maximizes the efficiency of the apron and your variety of users to people  
25 with some heavy iron all the way down to relatively small aircraft so we want to make sure  
26 it works for everybody. Voigt said it will definitely be tight in here when 3M is here with all  
27 their aircraft. We still have to park aircraft over here because you can't park where you  
28 have them, basically by the fuel pump there so otherwise you block up more ramp. Zitzow  
29 said correct, so anything on the stripes that are basically taxi lane guidance route type  
30 striping obviously those are not intended to be long term duration parking and those are  
31 more maneuvering type markings. This area that is boxed to the south of the ramp that  
32 area would be available for static and aircraft parking and that would still open up as you  
33 can see the taxi markings for aircraft to maneuver in and out. Again, this is a concept, this  
34 is not set in stone as we are early on in the design phase, the pavement layout is  
35 essentially per FAA guidance there is not a lot of latitude on that, marking is a little more  
36 flexible and I like feedback so as you have a chance to digest this, the run up pad  
37 comment is a good one and we can take that into account.

38  
39 Zitzow indicated we have this project immediately for Alpha and Apron and we are  
40 also underway with the master plan. One of the big tasks of the master plan is to evaluate  
41 the usership of the airport and make sure that your facilities adequately serve the private  
42 and public users that you have. Zitzow stated he can't forecast the findings of that report,  
43 that is going to take time but one of the things that comes up is do we have the right blend  
44 of hangars, do we have the right number of hangars, do we have the right types of  
45 hangars? Do we have enough private hangar spots available for development and enough  
46 taxi lanes built to leave to those to drive that development or enable that development?

1 And then you have the question of t-hangars. One of the questions I've heard at  
2 Park Rapids is also do we need to have areas that invite more corporate expansion? We  
3 have listed those projects in order and a couple of the projects, if we start to develop  
4 hangars that replace or become landing spots for hangars that exist now I was thinking the  
5 order of that is critical and I know there has been some discussion about expanding the  
6 east apron and potentially replacing or even removing and relocating the hangar here and  
7 we have taxi lane private development as well shown. The project that you show or that  
8 you asked about is really more largely linked to connecting the 36 end and that continues  
9 on down to the 36 end of the field of the crosswind and so good projects, projects that are  
10 feasible, justifiable and theoretically eligible. Voigt asked that connection that's later in the  
11 CIP than the runway and rehabilitation of 31 correct? Zitzow said correct and that would  
12 not necessarily be a sequential necessity to do your taxiway development after your  
13 runway rehab or reconstruction however and this is where again that commitment to  
14 annual coordination with your agency reps is important. The FAA has a hard time justifying  
15 dollars for development until your existing airfield needs are met so I'm not saying that 13-  
16 31 is crumbling but if we get 5, 6, 8 years down the line and 13-31 is crumbling and we go  
17 to the FAA and say we would like to build a brand new taxiway that we don't have currently  
18 they are going to say we show that you have air sight needs that you should meet first.  
19 Again, it become a little bit of a prioritization battle.

20  
21 Zitzow asked if there were any questions or comments on the CIP? McKinney said  
22 part of the process that I want to encourage you is to talk to these guys and just because it  
23 looks good on paper it doesn't mean that it works in reality so the more you can do of that  
24 the better. On timing, we just need to know as far ahead of time what is coming because  
25 the administration has to come up with the money, even local share. Zitzow said there is  
26 timing and there is phasing of dollars and there is also timing and phasing in design of the  
27 actual physical improvement and I think part of the purpose of this group and I want to be  
28 engaged with the group and even outside this group coming up and meeting with you as  
29 we get deeper into design on next year's projects specifically so that a couple things, the  
30 final product is right so that when we are all done and everybody is using it that we can  
31 agree that was the maximized approach in terms of the engineering, but also in terms of  
32 getting between existing and ultimate, my saying is where there is construction there is  
33 destruction and construction is inherently impactful to your operation especially when  
34 you're taking out a parallel taxiway full length doing an apron so on the construction  
35 phasing and the schedule that's something that I want all of us to be involved in that  
36 discussion and that's a discussion that we will have over the course of this winter, we're  
37 talking months, not years. I know obviously with the project bidding next spring and going  
38 into construction next summer or fall, these are the types of things that we want to talk  
39 about here coming up in the next two to four months.

40  
41 Voigt asked is there anything else maybe outside of what we need to talk about  
42 right now but talking about where this purple taxiway is on Exhibit A, compared to taxiway  
43 82 which is really, other than it is just really fun to try to make that taxiway sometimes – it  
44 is really a pointless taxiway, maybe a roll up here, you would roll all the way but you're so  
45 close to the end I'm thinking more of the standpoint of landing 31 you really can't make  
46 that taxiway and you end up having to roll all the way down here to 83 which is, the ideal  
47 taxiway is here for landing 31 for most aircraft and then even landing coming the other way



1 this one is adequate for pretty much everything that comes in and out of here and if it  
2 wasn't you would roll down to the landing but I just wonder if a guy were to take that out  
3 now, would the FAA trade us for taking that out and not redoing that and putting one here?  
4 Zitzow stated they may. Voigt said if you don't want to fix that one and just move it or do  
5 we not want to give anything up and just ask for that. I mean it's nice I like it just for the fun  
6 of it to see if you can make it but it is not a real practical taxiway. Zitzow said all the  
7 development that is shown on this graphic is shown in the current airport layout plan so the  
8 FAA would say from a planning standpoint and from a design standpoint what's shown is  
9 justifiable, in their eyes it makes sense, we're not asking for something that is outside of  
10 the box. It's a question that we can ask and if the airport wants to go down that path, we  
11 will go down that path for sure. From a budget and design standpoint I would say that we  
12 probably would not invite doing both in other words building this and keeping that. I like  
13 your concept of is it maybe an either or type question and I can live with that question,  
14 that's a good question.

15  
16 DeCoster asked if Zitzow should pursue that? McKinney asked does it jeopardize  
17 the current okay as it is justifiable if we go in there and say we don't need it we want to  
18 move it down here and then if they don't give us the down here location then we don't get  
19 the rehab either? Zitzow said he doesn't think so. Voigt said we have to have one or the  
20 other. Zitzow said the question would be really well posed to the agencies looking ahead  
21 we do envision at some point wanting to connect 36 with a direct route taxiway to Alpha  
22 and ultimately essentially to the apron to shorten runway crossings, etc. Does it make  
23 sense for all of us to start to reanalyze the need for essentially three back to back to back  
24 feeders? You know maybe we start to make progress towards the future project by making  
25 an interim step, that's really the way I would ask the question, that way we're not pitting the  
26 two concepts against each other. DeCoster added and jeopardizing the ability to keep  
27 this? Zitzow said and even so usually working with our FAA reps usually I wouldn't  
28 interpret that as a real dangerous question, it's a planning question. We can ask it. Hass  
29 asked if anybody else has any feedback on it now do you think that's a good idea? It would  
30 if you were landing the other way though. Hass said it is pretty impractical for all intensive  
31 purposes. Voigt said even landing on 13 you're still going to be stopped before this new  
32 intersection. Zitzow suggested emails and phone calls to discuss this before the next  
33 meeting as this is good engineering feedback on next year's project and this is the kind of  
34 stuff we want to get into. Voigt asked if they will let you align these. Zitzow advised they  
35 will not and the FAA is embarking on a rather ambitious goal, again this gets back to  
36 taxiway route TOFA protection and there are two sides of the same coin, loud and clear  
37 the new design they see does not look kindly upon big pieces of taxiway and apron  
38 abutting and they will not let you co-align taxi lanes or feeders with taxiways without getting  
39 a modification of standards and on something on this we don't have such an honoris  
40 condition that they would grant a modification to standard. On this one they are basically  
41 saying you guys can meet the standard and it does have impact you know and like I say, it  
42 is impacting a lot of airports. Burlingame asked if it is strictly from a safety standpoint?  
43 Zitzow replied yes, the FAA, the design AC is really aimed at commercial service and hub  
44 airports so really where this came from if I put on my FAA engineering hat, is towered  
45 airports and people crossing non-movement lines. That's what's driving it because they've  
46 had aircrafts have runway incursions because they peel out of the apron, commercial jet  
47 liners, right onto an active runway. If you look at the safety logs there are many examples

1 and there are even some non-GA airport examples, there has been a couple notable and  
2 luckily no one got hurt and luckily no aircraft got damaged either but they had runway  
3 incursions at Metro Reliever airports where commercial operators came right out of an  
4 apron and onto a runway thinking that the runway was the taxi, that's what's driving this.  
5 So again, are you seeing a lot of the issues that the other airports are seeing, no probably  
6 not, you've probably had very few unsafe conditions here. Voigt said it's a little confusing  
7 when you're on this ramp and we've got new pilots that fly in here all the time and they are  
8 from wherever and they may come in here and pick up their aircraft and they've never  
9 even been here before so when they go out here it's kind of confusing because they don't  
10 really see a taxiway out here and I see this as somewhat of a clarification to them, but on  
11 the flip side we lose. Zitzow agreed, it really is, there is good and bad to all of it and I  
12 guess focusing on the best part of these design updates is that you as a frequent user of  
13 the field are possibly going to have fewer of those awkward encounters with people who  
14 are itinerant. Zitzow commented you brought up a couple great points and I love CIP's and  
15 I could talk about engineering all day long and I don't think you want to do that. Are there  
16 any other questions you want to talk about? I do have a couple other items on the agenda  
17 and those will be quick.

18  
19 Dyre commented on the t-hangars stuff is that I hate to go through all this time and  
20 all this money and end up with the same number of hangars we have, I mean we really  
21 need fifteen or sixteen more and we have people looking all the time for t-hangars so I  
22 hate to see us do all this work and move those hangars over and have the same number  
23 of hangars ten years down the road which doesn't really make any sense. Zitzow said  
24 great point and a couple things, in the previous version of the CIP hangar development or  
25 hangar issues were kind of handled in different years and prioritized in different years and  
26 one of the things you will see in this order and the reason that we propose that the  
27 calendar is set up the way it is to make sure we make it through this planning process in  
28 the next 18 months because a lot of the questions about the hangar need and quite frankly  
29 the justification as the FAA and the state look at your master plan and your hangar list and  
30 say well if you are asking us to participate in hangar funds that's great but you have to  
31 show that there is a need. The master plan is part of what does that. We're not trying to  
32 indicate that this is a permanent condition because the ALP still has quite a bit of, in  
33 theory, multiples of expansion so we have the land and we may have the need too but  
34 your point is well noted because we have an existing facility that is being used and you've  
35 got to be careful before you maybe start trading or eliminating that facility at the expense of  
36 another project.

37  
38 Konshok commented this goes along with what he is saying and even though it is  
39 on here to demolish this one down here and what I see from the state level it is getting a  
40 lot tougher to get hangars, the easy days of having new hangars at a decent price is gone,  
41 it's low priority, it's just bad and one idea that I've sort of been toying with, and it sounds a  
42 little crazy, but I did talk to Marshall and they have done it and instead of tearing down that  
43 16 unit over here they have moved for or five of them and nowadays with jacks and  
44 portable things they just plain moved them down field and it just seems like having your  
45 cake and eat it too. I would like to preserve our old one and build a new one. We need  
46 both and it would be really tough to lose that one and so we wouldn't gain a thing so  
47 maybe that is a possibility. It was Marshall that has done that so it is feasible cost wise, it

1 seems like it would be much more economical and we wouldn't lose hangars in the  
2 process. DeCoster said he actually had that conversation with TKDA when they were  
3 working on the CIP and we need to investigate that and see if they are in fact relocatable  
4 so that will be part of the process. Konshok said to have it on the table because we should  
5 think about it. Dyre said I don't know if everybody is formally on the list but I know there are  
6 a lot of people that talk about wanting a hangar and I'm not sure that they are formally  
7 signed up. Voigt said he has two people right now that are not on the list that want  
8 hangars. Dyre said so maybe we need to push to get people to get on the list and in fact  
9 there a number of people like that. Zitzow we are touching on another subject and we will  
10 jump ahead to the master plan. **(see 7d)**

11  
12 **6. CITY ADMINISTRATOR UPDATE – John McKinney:**

13  
14 **6a. Dave Konshok Replacement on Commission:** McKinney advised that  
15 David W. Konshok moved to St. Cloud and accordingly we needed a council member to fill  
16 that position. His replacement on the council has taken his position but the council hadn't  
17 decided who's going to be doing what in terms of making up the committee assignments.  
18 However, Erika Randall indicated an interest in being on the Airport Commission and  
19 remaining councilmembers had no problem with that so Erika Randall will be on the Airport  
20 Commission. Erika Randall is an assistant county attorney for Hubbard County and her  
21 husband is a commercial pilot for RDO.

22  
23 **6b. Strategic Planning Workshop Overview:** DeCoster explained obviously  
24 we've had discussions with Voigt and Hass about other business aspects and other  
25 commissioners and others that have been interested in the airport and where is the airport  
26 going. We've talked at great length about financials. We've talked about trying to make  
27 sure that we are providing a competitive airport and there are a whole lot of things out  
28 there that frankly need discussion and it's not a concise discussion that has ever taken  
29 place I don't believe in the recent past so we've asked a cross section of people including  
30 a couple of city council people, EDC because we want to get them out here as being a  
31 development component to sit and have a deep dive discussion about options and what  
32 are the priorities and what are the financial arrangements. As I've told them I think we  
33 sometimes get labeled as being all about money and obviously money is a factor and it  
34 really is going to boil down to the city council because they are the ultimate jurisdictional  
35 body for the airport since the airport is part of the city that they need to give us some  
36 guidance about what are the relative priorities, so we are going to convene a non-public  
37 meeting that is going to include a select group of people and this is not meant to be  
38 exclusionary, please don't take it that way but we need to have some candid discussions  
39 about what the strategic future is for the airport. We will be bringing those comments and  
40 reports back to the commission and back to the city council. This is a start of a process  
41 and it's a way to try to get our arms around where are we going and how we can get there.  
42 That is just a brief overview of what we are talking about if you heard things about a  
43 Strategic Planning Workshop. Hass asked when is this going to happen? DeCoster said  
44 we will be convening tonight with our first session and again we tried to get people that, we  
45 have one person in particular that has no interest in the airport, a local businessman that  
46 again to bring a perspective as a resident of the city and a business in the city and  
47 economic development is in there so we're really trying to get a good cross section so we

1 don't have it looking at one facet whether it's financial or development, it's not just any one  
2 aspect, we really want to get a cross section of discussion to figure out what is the best  
3 comprehensive plan and not just a single focus plan.  
4

5 McKinney added he doesn't see this as a standing committee they are only going to  
6 meet once or twice at the most and I need them from a political standpoint to get some  
7 communications going with non-airport people as we need to fund the things that we want  
8 to do out here, I need support politically, they expect you guys to support it or argue for it  
9 at least. I'm looking for a group that can support and be informed about the process not  
10 the projects so much as the process. I want to add credibility to whatever this commission  
11 comes up with so that when we go to the council and say we got to have some local share  
12 funding, there is a conception out there that we get grants and everything is paid for with  
13 grants and you just have the local share, well some of the stuff that we bite off as local  
14 share is a little tough for me to sell if I don't some homework ahead of time and that's the  
15 point and that's why I'm supporting this.  
16

17 DeCoster said even things like running gas supply lines out to the new hangar  
18 positions, who pays for that? We talked to the utilities and they don't want to pay for it  
19 because they don't have the bird in the hand if you would, so it really is just to say okay if  
20 we want to take the airport forward what does that look like and how do we get there?  
21 Again once we get that objective view the idea is we will come back to the commission and  
22 thoroughly vet that with the commission and have the same discussion with the city council  
23 level so it's not just one person's opinion or a couple people's opinion about what's the  
24 strategic direction for the airport, it's going to discuss issues like rent, let's put the elephant  
25 on the table, we keep talking about we've got to pay the bills and I know what your guys'  
26 responses have been so we will get an objective view to come in and give us some  
27 guidance on that which may help break the log jam we've got. So it really was intended to  
28 be a, as McKinney said, short term tool to help us form where we want to take this. There  
29 are property tax issues but that depends on ownership and all that stuff, we've got some  
30 ideas we want to vet with people but it's not the kind of stuff you can do in a public setting  
31 so we're going to try and have a real good candid conversation with a cross section of  
32 people and come up with ideas, not answers but ideas that we can then take further with  
33 the commission and the city council.  
34

35 McKinney commented any recommendations or ideas will come to the commission  
36 and not directly to the city council.  
37

38 There was further discussion concerning who was invited and the intent and  
39 purpose of the meeting.  
40

41 Konshok added one thing that he found in talking to politicians and they want to  
42 know why money is spent out here and I can clearly tell you guys the best thing that you  
43 can tell them is that Voigt and Hass provide good paying jobs at the airport and that comes  
44 across very well.  
45

46 **7. CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT UPDATE – Matt Zitzow, TKDA:**  
47

1           **7a. 2016 CIP Review: see above**

2  
3           **7b. 2016 Apron Replacement Project Overview: see above**

4  
5           **7c. CSAH 28 Realignment Overview and Update:** Zitzow said before you is  
6 Exhibit D, a graphic keeping this at a real simplistic level. Hubbard County is pursuing  
7 construction of a new route of CSAH 28 which is essentially a truck bypass taking some of  
8 the truck load off of downtown and getting it directed to Highway 71 by a southerly route  
9 and it misses the city. One of the things that came up was whether or not the existing  
10 roadway could remain and be used for that route. That route conflicts with your future  
11 runway protection zone if runway 36 was ever expanded to the 4,100 foot length. What  
12 this graphic illustrates very simply is this dark gray and glue outline is what Hubbard  
13 County currently Hubbard County proposes as the alignment for the roadway. You can  
14 see that it cuts across what is now agricultural land and then ties in at a t-intersection  
15 south of the existing township road intersection with Highway 71. This portion of township  
16 road would be abandoned as a roadway but retained as right-of-way because there are  
17 existing utilities there that would have to remain as public utilities so there would be no  
18 land ownership transfer but all traffic would be routed this way, there would be no vehicle  
19 traffic here at all. The purpose of this graphic was to assure you as a commission to make  
20 you aware as users of the airport that that roadway does not conflict with the planned  
21 development of the 4,100 foot length runway of 36 and so we have cleared that. The two  
22 red boxes are essentially the runway protection zones which have to be cleared of  
23 roadways or should be cleared of roadways here. Voigt inquired how long could they make  
24 that runway then? Zitzow stated on this alignment as you can see here this portion is  
25 essentially your buffer space. The county didn't use that buffer space for your benefit, it  
26 was only to make sure that their horizontal alignment and the maintenance of space for the  
27 roadway is maintained. To answer your question I would say probably another 300-400  
28 feet. Voigt asked if we ever did want to expand that runway to say 5,000 it may not be  
29 doable with that road there? Zitzow said correct, without impacting the other end. Now  
30 this does get into the topic of how long of a runway can we ever imagine. Currently the  
31 planning document which is the Master Plan and ALP show that 4,100 foot as an ultimate  
32 length and anything beyond that would have to go through the rigors of the planning  
33 exercise to make sure the FAA could justify it and that's all based on aircraft user numbers  
34 and crosswind coverage, etc. etc. and I don't mean to exhaust that topic here today but  
35 currently the roadway they are proposing does not conflict with the runway that is on file for  
36 plan.

37  
38           Konshok mentioned we really did, and maybe something even more important than  
39 clear the way for the 36 and that was the earlier plan kept on going straight ahead as it  
40 now exists and lower flights and all that, but the big thing this one does is it keeps us away,  
41 completely away from the approach to 31 which is your major and will continue to be your  
42 major runway and we had restrictions in there earlier so this is a real blessing the way this  
43 one ended up. It was a blessing there was a conflict here and they really went back and  
44 studied it and a major benefit is that highway intersection there that's our main approach  
45 will continue. Konshok added as you extend 31 that crossing will become even more  
46 important so this is a major improvement. Zitzow said correct, very well put any  
47 development in runway protection zones whether they are existing or in the future is highly

1 scrutinized by FAA and is impactful to your users in theory so what Konshok said is  
2 actually correct, getting that intersection moved to the south is an improvement.

3  
4 **7d. Master Plan update:** Zitzow said the master plan is one of the big topics is  
5 forecasting and that's user's forecasting that are based here or not based here to make  
6 sure that our airfield needs are met but that's also forecasting about what do the facilities  
7 need to accommodate here or what they could accommodate here. With regards to that  
8 question, Cole, an airport planner with TKDA had sent out user surveys and the more of  
9 those that we can get back the better and I don't know if each of you received one yet.  
10 Here's an idea, the master plan is a lengthy process and currently what we are doing is  
11 looking at Awas data, we're looking at some of the topics that are pertinent to specifically  
12 Park Rapids that we know we needed to cover. The user survey as well as Awas data and  
13 flight aware data really start to feed some of this forecasting effort and that is going to be  
14 one of the major topics in January. The Technical Advisory Committee for the master plan  
15 and I think many of you that are here are on that Technical Advisory Committee and we  
16 had initially had a date of January 16<sup>th</sup> but I don't know if that is set in stone so we need to  
17 confirm that. But well ahead of meeting in January, in order to make that a productive  
18 meeting and be able to actually talk to you about some of the forecasts that we see and  
19 some of the issues would be that user survey. I will get a copy of the user survey and  
20 attach it to the meeting minutes because if you know folks that didn't get that for whatever  
21 reason, distribute it. DeCoster said Brumbaugh also has a waiting list but we just don't  
22 know how old it is, how current it is and we've actually been talking about making some  
23 phone calls to update that also but I think somebody made the comment that a lot of that  
24 desire is going to boil down to the dollar sign and the number that goes in front of what's  
25 that going to cost to lease so we've got to deal with that side of it too.

26  
27 DeCoster said I like Konshok's idea if we can have a lower cost relocation of these,  
28 obviously we can keep price point that kind of hits the lower end. If we have to go out and  
29 develop new, we will keep the cost as low as possible but it is going to be more expense  
30 than \$85-\$95 per month. Konshok said the old fashioned way at this point any new  
31 hangars would be about \$400.00 per month and what that would do to our market here.  
32 DeCoster said with that said, we just came aware today of a state loan program for  
33 hangars and it has been a ten year amortization and really hard to rationalize where you're  
34 trying to write off the debt in ten years and Zitzow's boss just emailed me today and said  
35 that the state program at zero percent interest is now going to be extended to twenty years  
36 and that changes economics considerably so that's a good news item that I think we have  
37 to factor in. DeCoster said what Zitzow said is important and this is all the information that  
38 needs to be acquired for the airport master planning process and the more we have will  
39 give us the ability to really right size the future CIP and then also talk about how we're  
40 going to fund all that and talk about what kind of rent rates would be applicable.

41  
42 Zitzow said his statement to the master plan and projects is that all of these parts  
43 from planning and engineering and funding process work in concert. The Master Plan ALP,  
44 your CIP and then ultimately projects, all of that works in concert because to get those  
45 grant funds you have to have everything justified. Looking at having your CIP being  
46 updated on an annual basis as this CIP is due to MnDOT, they have an online program  
47 that the city enters their update every year, that's due November 15<sup>th</sup> and I think we are

1 well on track to having a handle on that and in essence this is the draft that is proposed for  
2 inclusion, again that doesn't tie you to projects but it does make you eligible for projects or  
3 at least in consideration for prioritization. So the next step is really this goes to MnDOT and  
4 I understand that the City Council either has been made aware of this or will be in their  
5 budgeting processes. McKinney said well they will be, that's in process now, the CIP is at  
6 the finance committee level at this point. Zitzow said so all those pieces are happening  
7 concurrently over the next four to six weeks. McKinney stated to answer your earlier  
8 question, all of the members of the Airport Commission are on the Technical Advisory  
9 Committee.

10  
11 Zitzow said thank you very much and appreciates the time.

12  
13 **8. DEPARTMENTAL REPORTS:**

14  
15 **8a. Business Services – John DeCoster:** DeCoster stated working with Zitzow  
16 and coming together with the CIP and meeting with the FAA and the state trying to work  
17 that and then I guess I would like to ask the question, you're getting a lot of detailed  
18 information today that at least in my time working with the airport and the commission is  
19 more than I think we've been given in the past so I would like to have feedback between  
20 the departmental reports, the stuff that Zitzow has done and kind of the new template,  
21 commissioners I'm curious if it is too much, not enough, what are your thoughts? Douglas  
22 stated he thinks it is a real good mix. Johnson added one the things from his standpoint is  
23 when he looks at especially the financials, as I look at the expense side of it from your  
24 budget to your actual, you know, as I'm looking at contract services, when you look at  
25 financials like that if there is something bigger than a 10% maybe we should have an  
26 explanation so that we know why that deviation is there. DeCoster said sure, a variance  
27 report, good comment. Johnson said that might be something that is beneficial as we look  
28 here at this something that would make up that or why that was occurring. DeCoster added  
29 we go have some seasonal costs and there will be times when like insurance, we haven't  
30 had our premium hit yet so but I think that's a good explanation to kind of take that off the  
31 table.

32  
33 **8b. Field Services – Scott Burlingame:**  
34 **(i) 2015-2016 winter operations plan**

35 Burlingame stated there is no snow yet. Konshok stated we have a unique  
36 operation here being from a small town where our airport manager wears a lot of hats but  
37 one hat that is really important and not too many places have it especially in a smaller  
38 airport he has direct communication with 3M and knows their flights and that is an ideal  
39 situation to have someone on the field in a small town.

40  
41 **8c. Facility Maintenance Services –Chris Fieldsend:**

42 **(i) Heating Repairs Arrivals/Departures Hangar:** Fieldsend advised that  
43 the t-hangar, all the furnace heaters, the radiant heaters in the main hangar have been  
44 fixed now and also the lighting has all been fixed inside. The outside lights will all be fixed  
45 within the next couple to three weeks so we're trying to get it straightened up out here.

46  
47 **8d. Planning and Zoning – Ryan Mathisrud:** Mathisrud advised he has been

1 working with a property owner just outside of aircraft runway 13-31 just on the north side of  
2 that they have property that they have been looking to sell and subsequently they had two  
3 purchasers that both wanted to build towers that exceeded 129 feet so that's something  
4 that I would say is unusual but our airport overlay zone has affected this particular property  
5 owner but as you all know maintaining a safe flight paths and safe runway area for aircraft  
6 taking off and landing is critical to this airport and so periodically somebody wants to  
7 develop land that would be in conflict with our airport overlay district. We do our best to try  
8 and administer that an in this case we had to enforce that.

9  
10 Mathisrud distributed a copy of the Airport Overlay Zone. In response to this issue  
11 some of the feedback we received was that where is this information, where is your  
12 overlay district? The real estate agent that was involved in this transaction said he looked  
13 at the county and there is no information available on this overlay district so what we did  
14 was we worked with the county and I actually got our Airport Overlay Zone uploaded into  
15 the GIS so now anybody who is involved with real estate transactions now has access to  
16 this information and can easily see whether or not the real estate they are dealing with is in  
17 that protection zone. That is one positive thing that came out of this. What do you think  
18 about that, any questions or concerns?

19  
20 Konshok stated he is very pleased because he can go back far enough to when we  
21 had real difficulty when we first got that zoning done out there and we had all kind of  
22 conflicts at that time and so this will be a great help to you for administrating this and even  
23 for the rest of us to know where those lines are. Luckily years ago we protected that and  
24 eventually 13-31 will be extended where it will be even more important so I'm really  
25 pleased to see this and it's a good tool.

26  
27 Mathisrud suggested sharing this information with any real estate people you might  
28 know.

29  
30 **9. OLD BUSINESS:** None.

31  
32 **10. NEW BUSINESS:** None.

33  
34 **11. OTHER BUSINESS:** None

35  
36 **12. NEXT MEETING DATE:** There was discussion concerning coordinating the  
37 Airport Commission Meeting with the Technical Advisory Committee for the Master Plan  
38 Update perhaps on January 16<sup>th</sup> but that will be determined for certain at a later date.

39  
40 **13. ADJOURNMENT:** A motion was made by Dyre, seconded by Konshok  
41 and unanimously carried to adjourn the meeting at 3:30 p.m.

42  
43  
44 \_\_\_\_\_  
45 Don Douglas, Chairperson

\_\_\_\_\_  
Carmen L. Lockhart  
Recording Clerk