

**CITY OF PARK RAPIDS
AIRPORT COMMISSION**

REGULAR MEETING

April 1, 2015, 9:00 A.M.

Airport Conference Room

Park Rapids, Minnesota

1. CALL TO ORDER: The April 1, 2015, Regular Airport Commission Meeting was called to order at 9:00 a.m. by Don Douglas.

2. ROLL CALL: Present: Commissioners Donald Douglas, Dan Dyre (arrived at 9:03 a.m.), Scott Johnson, Thom Peterson, and Councilmember David W. Konshok. Staff present: Scott Burlingame, Ryan Mathisrud, Carmen L. Lockhart and John McKinney (arrived at 9:33 a.m.). Absent: Dave Konshok and John DeCoster. Others Present: John Peterson of TKDA, Dave Olsonawski and Jed Nordin of Hubbard County and Tom Hass.

3. ELECTION OF CHAIRPERSON AND VICE CHAIRPERSON: A motion was made by David W. Konshok, seconded by Thom Peterson, and unanimously carried to nominate and elect Don Douglas as Chairperson and David R. Konshok as Vice Chairperson.

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

5. APPROVE MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 12, 2014 SPECIAL MEETING: A motion was made by Dyre, seconded by Thom Peterson, and unanimously carried to approve the minutes of the November 12, 2014 Special Meeting as presented.

6. FINANCIAL REPORT: No comments.

7. GENERAL BUSINESS:

A. MASTER PLAN AND ALP UPDATE:

John Peterson of TKDA presented a draft of the Airport Master Plan Update Scope of Work and a Capital Improvement Program drawing for 2015-2016 for taxiway overlays and pavement removal. Peterson explained this was already included on your CIP but there have been significant changes to these two items since the CIP was approved. So I want to go over them for informational purposes and authorizations for this work is yet to come. Peterson said we started with the Airport Master Plan, ALP Update as this started with what we were calling a terminal area feasibility study last year. The airport last went through a full Master Plan process in the 70's and was updated in the 90's for the Airport Layout Plan only which is really just the graphical portion of the Master Plan so we started proposing a planning study for the terminal area only to look at required apron areas and hangar expansion and the FAA said they wanted us to go back to the table and reevaluate the whole Master Plan. There is quite a bit of new regulations over the past couple years

and there are also requirements for an aeronautical survey and it's called AGIS, it's a GIS. The only way now that you can get it funded is part of the Master Plan process so the local district office is really pushing that as well. So, we went from a \$150,000 study to look at the terminal area to what is now a \$368,000 over all Airport Master Plan Airport Layout Plan Update and Aeronautical Survey. There are definitely good and bad things to it as right now we are sitting at 5% local funding on this again, with things like the AGIS Survey and stuff, they won't be able to be funded otherwise, it is something that you will be required to do by 2018 so that itself is a \$125,000 item that you are getting funded mostly 95% through state/federal funds at this point so while it's a lot of work that may not necessarily benefit the city in the short term, it is good to get it included here. Peterson said he included the scope which is not light reading material, it's pretty hefty at 40 pages and what's also included in here is the fee, there is a large spreadsheet of what's collected with the aeronautical survey and there's a schedule. The Master Plan is basically a two year program and we hope to kick it off the end of May. One of the things that the Airport Commission and staff should be thinking about prior to the May kick-off meeting or whenever we schedule it, is who will be on the Technical Advisory Committee. MnDOT and FAA will both probably have two representatives that they use, MnDOT Planners will have one and possibly two from MnDOT, TKDA as your Planner and Engineer for the airport will be involved and the rest is city and how it usually comes down and it is up to the discretion of the city of who's included. Peterson said he typically sees a couple members of the Airport Commission involved and a City Council member and sometimes there are county interactions with someone from the county involved and major users of the airport. There are no limitations on who can be included but obviously these things get cumbersome with more people involved so we typically see a 10 to 12 person Technical Advisory Committee. Peterson explained there are about 4 to 5 meetings throughout the process so we would like to get going probably late May for the kick off meeting so we can obviously get this done as soon as possible. Then there is probably not another meeting for three to four months after that.

Peterson said just a little synopsis of what is included in that scope - there are 10 pieces to a Master Plan, again now we are more looking at an overall FAA mandated Master Plan as yours is well out of date and I should also state that Park Rapids has been able to get away with not doing a complete Master Plan to this point because nothing has really changed in terms of its operation within the airport system. A general aviation airport and is still a general aviation airport and those things haven't changed so you've been allowed to just do a update to the Airport Layout Plan up to this point but we are 40 some years old so it is time to revisit it. What we will look at is we do a fairly thorough existing conditions inventory that's pavement, buildings, basically your baseline for the airport and from there we go into forecast demand which is aviation forecast, it's operations of the airport and we re-establish the baseline and a lot of times the operations data is in FAA's system and the state system is basically a guess so we re-establish that and from there we can forecast the growth for the airport for the next 20 years so the Master Plan has a 20 year scope. We look at facility requirements, and that's probably going to be the main focus on this since we started with the terminal area master plan we are going to look at what's needed in the terminal area for the most part, your airfield isn't the high concern as you are built out right now to what your previous Master Plan had shown. You still show extensions to both runways in the future and we're just going to reevaluate those and

make sure that those future items are still appropriate. That takes us into airport alternatives which is looking at the existing airport as it is and look at what was previously planned and normally we do like three or four alternatives for that but the airfield here is well established and there aren't any issues with zoning as that has all been taken care of so we are just going to reevaluate the airfield as a whole and most alternatives are going to be in the terminal area and then we do recommended development from there after the alternatives are evaluated. The other step as I mentioned is the aeronautical survey that basically collects the entire airport plus the approaches and as I said there is not a huge short term benefit, the long term benefit is we are seeing airports that have gone through this process gaining better minimums on their approaches without doing anything. Like a reduction of a quarter mile in the cloud ceiling might come down just because the FAA has better data and is able to lower those minimums on the approaches so some advantages there. Peterson stated we will update the ALP and establish a new implementation plan which includes your Capital Improvement Program so we develop Capital Improvement Program for 40 years and we put funding on it so things that are in the Master Plan are not only just paper but actually a plan going forward so the city can budget backwards on that.

Peterson advised there is a public involvement component and I would guess for this one there is just one public meeting towards the end and then the final documentation. Peterson said this draft is at FAA right now, and is the third draft that has gone to FAA so I don't expect any major changes from them now, their processes have changed and they're more involved than they have been on these before. I would expect the scope to stay pretty much as it is here and should be improved within the next two weeks at which point this will essentially become the authorization from TKDA to the city. This will be federally funded this year's grant again, 90% federal, 5% state and 5% local so that 5% local share has changed now and should be updated but I could talk about the overall program for this year too. The other thing that was programmed for this year, we had programmed construction of what's shown in brown for this year which was overlay taxiway A and basically a reconstruction of the end down here where there is hashed pavements and stuff. What's happened since then, this was programmed for state apportionment funds which is also federal programming but it's money that the state gets to allocate and it got crossed off the list by the FAA because they wanted the Master Plan process started to reevaluate these pavements that are removed at the end. So, they wanted the Master Plan process started before they would proceed with that. So as it stands now, it is all 2016 discretionary funding – good and bad. The good part is it doesn't come out of your entitlements, that is federal discretionary off the national list, much like the cross wind runway was. Obviously it slipped construction a year. With the federal timelines as they are and we wanted to get design concurrent with the Master Plan we are proposing doing a design for those projects yet this year funding those so those projects on the CIP, the construction slides to next year but the design engineering would stay this year. Authorizations are in process, \$75,000 to \$80,000 for that and that would get us up through bidding phase next spring which is nice it's all under federal grant so there won't be any large local outlay to get the project to the construction grant next year. We have \$300,000 in accumulated entitlements and between those two projects we were sitting at a need for \$400,000 in federal and we have, Scott contacted the City of Benson and Benson is willing to loan Park Rapids \$150,000 of their entitlement funds which are expiring anyway. Peterson explained he works for the City of Benson and they haven't had a grant

in three years so doesn't suspect that they will ever actually ask for that back so it would be transferred to Park Rapids to fully fund the Master Plan and the design this year. Peterson said that's where it stands for the federal projects and there are a couple other outstanding things on your CIP for state funding and one deferred state grant offer should be coming out soon for fiscal 2016, starting July 1st. The self-serve jet fuel was included in that and I believe the rest of it is all equipment.

David W. Konshok said just to clarify you said the Master Plan and ALP Update was \$368,000 right? Peterson said yes. Konshok asked are you saying that's covered by the entitlements, ours and Bensons? Peterson said yes as is the apron taxiway design but what I didn't go back and calculate is what was included in the airport budget for this year, it should be less since with the construction in there we basically taken out a million dollars so I think your local share is significantly less for 2015 now that that construction is in 2016. Peterson said he will look at those numbers. Konshok said his question is do we need money from the City Council? Peterson said he would guess not. Konshok said okay. Peterson explained the projects have changed, the total dollar amount should be less. Peterson said he will look at that and see what was included in the local share that was submitted and what it now is and obviously the 2016 one is going to change significantly from what was previously approved with that construction on for next year. Konshok asked do you have a dollar amount expected on the design of the apron and taxiway? Peterson said \$75,000. Konshok said okay. Peterson advised the other thing that would maybe, the Master Plan is over \$100,000 so it is going to need an independent fee estimate and we have some information on that and it has to be basically prepared by someone else independent of that planning effort. We will forward some information to you guys and the city will have to solicit an independent fee estimate for that so there are some additional admin costs and that cost will be included in the grant too. As it was, I think the total amount for the federal was \$4,000 or \$5,000 with a \$150,000 from Benson.

Peterson said if anyone reviews the scope I said it is not finalized yet if anyone has comments or questions, let me know. It's a lot of work and what's maybe most, I would pay particular attention to the schedule that's in there because it's a two year process and consider who would be involved with the Technical Advisory Committee. It is possible once this stuff has gone through authorization, we would like to do a late May kick off meeting, is the TAC is not established by that point, that's not the end of the world although any potential advisory committee members it's nice to have them their so they are present at that time. We will do authorizations first before we schedule that. Konshok asked if you need any formal action from either the commission or the council to accept those? Peterson asked if the commission recommend authorizations to the council? Konshok said I think we do. Peterson said I don't have final numbers yet and I was hoping that scope would be approved by now by FAA but I don't think it's going to change but I don't want to give you an authorization that gets tweaked later so. Konshok asked so you say you want that in May correct? Peterson said yes so we may need to hold a special meeting in May. Douglas asked if that can be handled by executive meeting? Konshok and Lockhart said they didn't know. Douglas said he will investigate that.

B. APRON/TAXIWAY RECONSTRUCTION PROJECTS:

John Peterson of TKDA stated he addressed this with the above item. Construction would be next year for all of Taxiway A Overlay at a minimum and then reconstruction on the southeast end here and move all those pavements and obviously the lights all move back and stuff so when this is all done there is going to be a lot more green out there. We are going to look at minimizing the amount of apron removed at this stage until future projects for expansion of the apron are done. I mean you are not supposed to park there but it does help in movements. Douglas asked so in the interim 3M will still have enough footprint there? Peterson said yes, that's our goal. We might look at restriping how the taxi lanes are out here so we can utilize some more of that but right now the whole hashed is just if you have two crossing aircraft there at the same time. Douglas asked if we are still going to have a home down here for these T-Hangars or are they going? Peterson said well that project is on your CIP for 2017 which would then be construction of a 16 unit on this end and that would be the future apron expansion. Hass asked so what do we do with a year between? Peterson said apron expansion is in 2019 so it would be constructed there, move that and then the next year reconstruct this as apron. Hass said so you've got two years of airplanes being bottlenecked there? Peterson said it will be as it is now until then so it would be 2019 before you have additional parking area. Hass said but you're going to take this out next year? Peterson advised not all of it, only the areas adjacent to the taxiway and showed Hass the drawing. We wouldn't remove these red areas next year, only the brown so all the hashed apron would still be there. Konshok said so it's just those two sections on the sides of the taxiway at the end? Peterson said yes and actually there are two marked taxiways right now so you actually pick up some green grass out there. Peterson said that's why they wanted us to start this Master Plan to figure out what does this look like ultimately before we start removing too much.

8. INFORMATIONAL/DISCUSSION:

A. COUNTY BYPASS: David Olsonawski introduced himself as the Hubbard County Engineer and Public Works Coordinator and Jed Nordin, his assistant. Olsonawski explained what's been taking place is we do have a project scoped it is a truck route and is not called a bypass, it is a truck route from Highway 34 where we finished off north by the candle factory going south and then coming in on the east west stretch of the south end of the airport so we took over those township roads a year or two ago and now we are planning a 55 mph 10 ton route from Hwy 34 around to finish and complete our truck route. The original layout was on the existing road and we had that planned and started doing our project memorandum and got involved with the FAA and they informed us that the city had an updated plan as of 2013 which we weren't aware of and you finished or completed your airport crosswind runway and paved it. That brought to light that existing roadway was in the place of your future plans. If we were to build a new road there the FAA said that they would not participate in anymore or additional funding to the city to improve the extended crosswind runway so that kind of put a clinch in what we were doing. Olsonawski said to bring you up to speed we have met with RDO and the property owners out there and we are suggesting and I think we are in the process of moving our road so I don't have to put a 20 year agreement together with the city saying that we will pay to move our road 20

years from now when you want to expand your airport to the south that additional footage that you were looking at so I believe we have a route laid out right now that will avoid anything in the future and we brought that to show to your folks so hopefully we are done discussing this with the FAA and you folks and we just want to share with you that I think that we've got a success story here that will please everybody. We are going to take off from the Todd Becker farm there go south and go around the RPZ flight zone outside that area that the FAA was concerned about that we were in, we are going to avoid that completely. We also are going to move the road to the south by doing that, the intersection at 71 that is presently now in the original airport flight zone area will no longer be there, we will obliterate that roadway 400 or 500 feet back from Highway 71. But to share with you we did meet with MnDOT yesterday and are trying to get them to cooperate and work with us but to show you an aerial of what we are doing here. Nordin explained it is tough to see where the red line comes around but this is the existing road coming here on the south side and we will turn in by Todd Becker's place here and come down just on the north side of where RDO's pivot is right now and so the only thing that we've got to do is to make sure that they are able to re-coop some of this land is they are going to put an extension on there with another pivot and so that's the only stretch that they will lose and it will kind of inconvenience Becker's here but the big advantage to the airport would be getting out of that RPZ A Zone. If you guys do your runway extension to 700 feet, that puts your RPZ A down to there, which then the road would have to be moved so if we come in and we come out of here we are still in the RPZ B Zone but I believe A is the one that they are very concerned with.

Olsonawski asked Peterson if you see any issues with where we're at in this area here because we don't want to be hassled by them again. Peterson said there are no road restrictions in Zone B. Nordin explained that as we come out to Highway 71 here, we are looking at some different options to work with RDO whether it becomes possibly doing a free right here for the trucks using this or come across on a frontage road type deal. We have yet to meet with them on that but they had proposed that at one point with MnDOT coming from the existing road so I don't think they will be opposed to that.

Olsonawski said at Highway 71 here we would obliterate that back here but would probably leave the road in place because you have utilities along there and so does RDO so they will be able to come off of our existing road and we would put an entrance onto that and probably will maintain it but it will probably go back to the city because we're not going to be purchasing any easement or nothing from the city at this point that I can see would have to on the airport and that's what the FAA was also concerned about, that we could even purchase an easement from city on the airport so that was a lot of paperwork involved and we really want to remove ourselves from that issue and move forward. Our federal funds are available next year and that's where we want to start, building this next year. Nordin said if the potential was to move it in 10, 20 or 30 years anyway we may as well get it done now. Olsonawski stated he doesn't want to go through the expense of having to take a 55 mph new road and move it again 15 years or how long it takes your future plans to extend your cross runway so hopefully this is going to meet everybody's needs and I think this is the right decision rather be an issue with the FAA for safety purposes.

Peterson stated that is an improvement to existing condition too because that road existing in that section now is in the runway protection zone for the primary, not just an improvement to the future, but an existing improvement. Olsonawski said I don't think we've told them that yet, because once we move the road south then all of a sudden we are out of that zone. Nordin said once we get everybody in agreement on this then we will move forward with the project memo and that's when the FAA and the Office of Aeronautics will get back involved with the approval on this. Konshok asked so you're back on track in terms of design construction? Olsonawski said yes as long as the right of way and everything else goes good with RDO. If MnDOT and us can't work out something with RDO here we will just connect it to 71 and they will have to do some future work or whatever to make that right once we make a design change on 71 South and right now there are no plans there other than discussing the possibility of safety money to eliminate the entrance of the RDO truck right now and move it down the road to where we come across or a free right and do a left turn lanes and those types and we have some different options. Konshok asked if they are discussing that? Olsonawski said yes and we are going to meet with RDO again to look at that. Olsonawski stated it is hopefully designed and built in the same year. Olsonawski thanked Burlingame for inviting them and letting them bring the commission up to speed.

B. Tom Hass addressed the commission and stated he just wanted to talk to you for a second and I think I have talked to most everybody individually as I would like to lease a spot and build a hangar and was trying to get some lease agreements updated in our future for my business over there on an existing building and I got some bad taste in my mouth and just wanted to share that with everybody and I did a little research and I think what the city proposed to me was out of line and wanted to inform the board of different solutions so I will probably just leave it at that and I think I've had individual comments to everybody and I just want it to be a fair process moving forward here and I would like to expand and move ahead but the climate I was proposed to a month ago now was less than conducive so I wanted to point that out and the other thing I guess the letter I got said a May time frame for getting back with me just seemed a little excessive. You can push your local people or people to do that to move that up a little bit that would help you know if you start getting your lease agreement in tack in May and getting contractors in line, they are going to be all busy until late summer so it's not a hard subject, let's just move forward. Konshok asked if we can hammer all this out and come to an agreement on it what is your intent, your desire is still looking at doing construction this summer? Hass said he wants to put up a storage shed for himself with the intent of it being able to be used as more of a facility in the future but in the short term a storage facility as this time of year we get airplanes tied on the ramp and thunderstorms come rolling in and we've got nowhere to put them and they're our customer's airplanes and it's a struggle. Konshok said I think that has certainly been the desire all along is to facilitate the procedure or what not. Thom Peterson said you need to be competitive, that's for sure. Konshok said absolutely.

Hass said he would be interested in your Technical Advisory Committee, you said a person could have an interest on the airport. I kind of sat back in my own little cocoon over there and existed for the last 15 years and I appreciate the help Park Rapids has given me but maybe it's now time to get my voice known here. John Peterson said we often see

FBO's as part of the Technical Advisory as obviously you guys are here every day and know the airport and how it operates. Hass said if you invite me I will probably come to the meeting and if you don't invite me I understand, I'm kind of a hothead sometimes. McKinney said we would be lost if you're not here. Thom Peterson said well he is one of the top Garman distributors in the world so it's a pretty big asset to have him here in Park Rapids I would say.

John Peterson asked if that should be an agenda item for that May special meeting then is establishment of a Technical Advisory Committee? Konshok said that would be a good time to establish that.

Lockhart asked do you want to set a date for this special meeting? John Peterson said you usually go the first Wednesday of the month, so the first Wednesday in May is the 6th at the same time 9:00 at the airport. John Peterson said if that works then we would want that first Technical Advisory Committee meeting the last week in May. Konshok said can you provide Carmen information on what the typical makeup of that is and how it is established? Peterson said except for the public involvement piece of the Master Plan there is nothing really too procedural in place but yes, I can get you the information on what the typical makeup of the Technical Advisory Committee is.

McKinney stated with respect to the timing on Hass' deal, both he and Jeff Voigt have raised the question about where do we arrive at the number for the rental and the assumption was that we would be cognizant of what is going on in other locations but to generate that information and to collect that data John DeCoster is already working on that for some other reasons and he thought he could have that data ready so that when he came with a number he would have examples of specific prices in other locations that were similar and he thought he needed till May to do that so that was an arbitrary date picked by him. Hass gave McKinney printed information and said he did it in three hours and so I don't agree with John on that just so he knows. Hass said it's not bias, you know it's, I'm not saying bias, but I went to the people that I knew and airports that I knew that did local. McKinney said well you are far better and more able to do that than I am. Hass said I wish there was a public, but there's not, there used to be a study done in the Department of Transportation did in or MnDOT did it but they no longer have funding for that so they don't do that anymore so that's where I started. McKinney said well your knowledge of what's apples and apples is? Hass said well we don't have apples in Park Rapids, we've got oranges and Detroit Lakes has apples and Hibbing has grapes, you know they are all different and we've got to question that a little bit, but I think it has to be reasonable. McKinney said he will talk to DeCoster and see if he can meet with you earlier. Konshok asked if that can be added to the special meeting agenda. McKinney explained that what we will be doing is generating a number to negotiate the rental price and I think the rest of it is pretty much agreed to as that was the issue wasn't it? Hass said well that's where it stopped and the negotiation stopped when the price was three times what it should be. Konshok asked doesn't that come through the commission for review and recommendation before going to the council so we don't delay you any further. McKinney said well DeCoster's approach was to get the deal worked out with Jeff on all of the nuances and then show everybody else here's what we've got, what do you think, so that's what the timing on that was. Konshok said well I'm just saying it would be good to use a deadline of

the special meeting in May because otherwise the next meeting of the commission isn't until mid-summer and these guys need an answer before that if we are going to get any construction done this year, really May needs to be the deadline to wrap all this up right. McKinney said well if everybody is able to perform that's fine with me, but I am agreeing to something that everybody else has to do something and I don't so. Konshok said well that's what you do as administrator. Konshok said I just agree with Hass that you know this and as you know we've been working on this all through winter and the rest of that and now we are really up against a deadline where if we expect anything to get constructed this summer we've got to get this stuff approved and recommended and to the council for final approval and get it out of the way. Burlingame stated he spoke with Tom like he spoke with everybody else also and I called DeCoster to see if we could up that time a little bit and his issue is that he is working with those three other communities to try to come up with the same thing that he is doing here so he didn't feel that he could get it done any faster, but McKinney can talk to him. McKinney said well there again his recommendation is that he will work on it with Jeff Voigt who is really the FBO and that was his approach to get that agreement done and then use that as the cornerstone for the rest of the agreements. McKinney said he will talk to DeCoster and see what he can do. Konshok added again the whole point of this and why we started so early is because we wanted it done before this construction season so if that's going to be a problem or issue then we need to know about that, because that was the original intent to get the leases done and get the current operation agreements done, the leases done, all that done prior to construction season.

9. ADJOURNMENT: A motion was made by Dyre, seconded by Thom Peterson and unanimously carried to adjourn the meeting at 9:45 a.m.

Don Douglas, Chairperson

Carmen L. Lockhart
Recording Clerk