COMMISSIONERS PRESENT
Don Albright, Chair
Dottie Deerwester
Eric Crane
Carl Steinmann

STAFF PRESENT
Greg Owen, Airport Manager
Ken Ronk, Airport Assistant
Cathy Elawadly, Recording Secretary

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT

OTHERS PRESENT
Corbett Smith
David Dietz
Steve Savonen
Jeff Sloan
Mike Whetzel
Bill Gawthrop
Ray Meyer
Daryl Hudson
John Eisenzopf

1. CALL TO ORDER
The Airport Commission meeting was called to order by Chair Albright at 6:00 p.m. the Ukiah Regional Airport, Old Flight Service Station, 1403 South State Street, Ukiah, California. Roll Call was taken with the results listed above.

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE - Everyone recited the pledge of allegiance.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – November 6, 2012 and December 4, 2012
M/S Crane/Deerwester to approve November 6, 2012 minutes, as submitted. Motion carried (4-0).

Commissioner Crane made the following corrections to the December 4, 2012 minutes:
Page 2, lines 13, sentence to read, ‘Airport staff is assessing/evaluating this software program that could become a feature of the Airport Noise Abatement Program.’

Page 2, line 48, sentence to read, ‘Is of the opinion the program benefits the tenants and the Airport.’

M/S Crane/Deerwester to approve December 4, 2012 minutes, as amended. Motion carried (4-0).

4. AUDIENCE COMMENTS ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS
Mike Whetzel:
• Is informing the Commission a Calstar helicopter has damaged the rudder to one of his customer’s aircraft. He has photographs showing the damage.
• Continues daily to clean up debris in and around his hangar generated by Calstar helicopters that operate in close proximity to his hangar.
• Will request the Planning Commission review the Use Permit that was approved for the Calstar relocation project.
• Has observed Calstar is operating with a different helicopter than what was being used when the use permit was approved. He would like the issue of Calstar using different helicopters to be reviewed.
• For compliance with the Airport Land Use Plan and corresponding allowed/permitted uses for the different zoning designations on the Airport would like to see Calstar relocated to the east side of the Airport or at least an effort made to make this move possible as provided for in this document.
Airport Assistant Ronk thanked Senior Master Sargent Deerwester for her military service. She has retired after 21 years of service. It was an honor to be able to attend her retirement ceremony.

Staff, Commission, and public members thanked Dottie Deerwester for her military service to this country.

5. DISCUSSION/ACTION

5A. Airport Layout Plan Grant

Airport Manager Owen:

- Introduced consultants from Mead & Hunt that will give a presentation about the process relative to the scope of services in association with the details for the Airport Layout Plan Update project that concerns the future of the Airport. The design aspects for the project come later.

David Dietz, Mead & Hunt will explain the grant and planning process for the scoping of services (see attachment 1 of the staff report) that will be undertaken to update the Airport Layout Plant (ALP) for the Ukiah Regional Airport, as well as provide information about changes to FAA policies. Accordingly:

Grant process/cycle

- The Airport runway and other relevant infrastructure/facilities require maintenance work.
- An ALP update is required before any planning, engineering and/or design work is done for the maintenance work. The draft ‘scope of services’ for the ALP update details the specific work tasks to be completed for the project goals and those tasks are provided for in the ‘Project Understanding’ section of the scoping document. The ‘Project Understanding’ section indicates the last significant update to the Ukiah Regional Airport ALP was in 2006. Prior to 2006, the ALP had minor updates in 2004 and a major update in 1994. The ALP needs to be updated to address such issues as nonstandard runway width, nonstandard taxiway configuration, potential for a future parallel taxiway on the east side of the airfield, siting of a transient apron on the northeast corner of the airfield and siting of helicopter parking position as shown on the AIP map.
- Noted a significant portion of the effort for the AIP update will involve development of new plan sheets, an airspace plan, and a property map.
- The intent is to get the project completed quickly enough to have FAA approval by the time the next grant cycle comes around so that engineering aspect can be completed and pavement maintenance not delayed any longer than necessary.
- What occurs with regard to the grant process/cycle is that an airport typically provides the FAA with a five year set of capital improvement projects in November of each year that are updated annually.
- Environmental documents for purposes of the FAA are submitted in December for maintenance projects so that funding can go forward for the subsequent calendar year. Because the City of Ukiah did not have Mead & Hunt selected until December 2012, there was a rush to get the appropriate environmental paper work into the FAA in time to schedule a meeting that was very late into the grant cycle. Mead & Hunt was able to meet with the FAA and had to make some project changes. The FAA rejected Mead & Hunt’s approach with regard to certain engineering aspects for the Airport. It was at this time Mead & Hunt was advised that a standard ALP update for the Ukiah Airport was required. Grant funding allocated for an ALP update is $75,000. This is the standard amount pertinent to proposed runway maintenance work. To this end, Mead & Hunt rewrote the grant application for the Airport CIP. The intent is to process the grant application in accordance with Council approval in time to meet FAA grant deadlines so the ALP update and subsequent maintenance work can move forward. An outline of scoping services for the ALP update was necessary to get the grant application.
- Anticipates that sometime this spring the scope service award will be funded, but City Council and FAA approval is required. There is still time to rework the scope of services.
• With regard to the scope of services, there are sets of work elements that must be completed as part of the ALP update.

• The scoping draft for this Airport is what was recently used for Round Valley and Little River for their ALP updates. The document is generic in terms of its overall scope and specific for the types of things that are being looked at for the Ukiah Airport.

• Is hopeful Congress does not change the grant funding cycle, which has occurred in the last few years.

• The goal is to have the funding in place for the ALP update by next fall so there will be better understanding what the next construction projects will be and once this is defined the next series of grants can be pursued.

City relationship with FAA
• Relationship is largely regulatory.

Airport relationship with FAA
• Relationship is contractual. The FAA has almost no direct authority over the Airport.
• The power the FAA has over the Airport is contractual. In short, the FAA offers money and if an Airport is looking for funding for a capital improvement, it must comply with FAA rules.
• Advisory Circulars are FAA guidelines that airports must follow.

Consultant relationship with City
• Mead & Hunt works for the City.
• While most of the money is coming from the FAA indirectly Mead & Hunt has a contract with the City. Mead & Hunt serves the City.
• The City has the discretion of determining what it wants to see on the ALP/property map because the Airport belongs to the City. As engineers, planners and pilots, Mead & Hunt can advise the Airport on what is prudent, useful, and appropriate for the Airport as it pertains to the issues concerning the ‘Project Understanding’ and what the Airport wants to see on the property map. Mead & Hunt also advises on the necessary standards that apply for projects.
• The Airport makes the final determination as to what they want to see on the final drawing.

Likely FAA airfield design issues
• Referred to the ALP map and explained the issues with regard to the aligned taxiway, angled taxiway and runway width that will have to be addressed this time around for the ALP update.

Aligned taxiway: The aligned taxiway on north end of runway is aligned with the runway. For years the FAA has wanted to eliminate this element because it is viewed as a safety hazard because of the concern pilots may not be sure if the area is a runway or taxiway. The issue is essentially about a displaced threshold versus a relocated runway. The FAA is of the opinion it is clearer/cleaner if a pilot enters/exits at a right angle. A revision to the FAA Advisory Circular indicates taxiways are no longer acceptable. The ALP update for review by the FAA will dictate what must occur when the runway gets reconstructed as part of the next project.

Runway width: Standards for runway width as it relates to the category of aircraft the Ukiah Airport was designed for only needs a 75-foot wide runway. Mead & Hunt is of the opinion the runway width can be kept at a 100-foot width. Unless the Airport is willing to pay the difference in maintenance costs between a 100-foot and a 150-foot width the runway will be narrowed to 100 feet the next time there is maintenance performed and grant funding is being requested for this purpose.

Right angled taxiway: There is a 45 degree angled taxiway on the southeast portion of the runway. The FAA wants this to be a right angle and this is pretty much the way it will be on this issue.
There was a discussion where would the end of the runway be. Can the north end of the runway be converted from a runway end to a displaced threshold? Would this be effective to clear distances? There will be other variables the consultants will look at. There may be other options and there may be a way to add more runway back in as part of the reconstruction. This is one issue the scope of services for the ALP update could be more precise in. The scoping section that talks about where the runway should terminate at the north end will be amended.

**John Eisenzopf:**
- Related to the relocated thresholds as being a ‘done deal.’ What does this mean? 500 feet of pavement is very useful to Calfire.
- Asked if the runway width of 75 feet as categorized by the type of aircraft the Airport was designed for is in Advisory Circular? Requested the Advisory Circular reference number in this regard.
- Requested clarification the primary objective/goal is the resurfacing of the runway.
- Requested clarification the cost for resurfacing was 1.8 million dollars. What percentage of the cost is paid by the FAA, California Division of Aeronautics, and the City?
- Calculated the City’s grant match in costs would be $100,000.
- What would be the cost benefit ratio for routine maintenance versus resurfacing?
- Agrees the runway needs resurfacing and as such according to the State of California Division of Aeronautics says the useful life of a runway with maintenance can be doubled for about 1/5 of the cost. The runway at the Airport lacks maintenance and as such an associated high cost has resulted. The runway at the Airport is not being maintained. The runway at Ukiah Airport is the most poorly maintained runway he has ever landed on and as a result the City will have to pay $100,000 in grant match funds to resurface the runway.

**David Dietz:**
- The FAA is not going to allow an aligned taxiway to remain. Pavement cannot be counted as runway. Acknowledged that pavement is a lot better than dirt or gravel at the end of a runway. The issue largely comes from incidents that occur at major air carrier airports and is not relevant to this airport. Essentially, the FAA sometime uses the ‘one size fits all’ scenario. The best that can be offered is to take a good look if it is possible to get some of runway area back or can the area be converted from a runway into a displaced threshold, which in turn would turn the area back into runway. Currently, this is not the situation.
- Confirmed the Advisory Circular references the 75-foot runway width on airport design.
- His experience at other airports with the same category of aircraft using the Airport expects the FAA to probably go with the 100-foot width and this is one category up. The reference number is 1505300-13A.
- Confirmed the resurfacing of the runway is the one project that has been identified so far.

**Staff:**
- Confirmed the cost for runway resurfacing is approximately 1.8 million dollars.

**David Dietz:**
- The FAA pays 90% and the State typically pays 5% of the 90% and/or 4.5% with City's match.
- Routine maintenance versus resurfacing is not an either/or matter. Normally asphalt should have some surface treatment every five to seven years for Ukiah's type of climate. The process could begin with a slurry seal or crack seal or related minor treatments with a more major treatment within 10 years followed by a full reconstruction in 20 years. This is the normal cycle of treatment for runway wear and tear. Airport pavement actually deteriorates faster than highway pavements because they do not get as much use. Freeway use by cars and trucks on asphalt actually helps the asphalt liquid part move up to the surface more to hold the rock in place. The Airport runway should be getting some sort of surface treatment every five to seven years. It has been a long time since the runway at the Airport has had much more than crack seal.
• The FAA recommends airports have an airfield payment maintenance system which provides
for a program for the 20-life of each section of pavement on an airport. This is also a useful
tool to have for grant funding purposes.

Commissioner Crane:

• Asked about the grant application and whether the project involves grinding.

David Dietz: At this point there is no design element in place.

Commissioner Albright:

• Will the FAA grant application be completed similar to what was included for Little River
airport runway improvements?

David Dietz:

• While doing a grant application similar to Little River airport is certainly one option, the design
aspect must first be a consideration.

• One of the elements in formulating a five-year CIP is in addition to the surface evaluation
would be test coring for around the pavement to get an idea what is underneath and what is
left in terms of the base material. This evaluation will determine the type of treatment. Data
gathering will be part of the process. Drainage will be looked at also as part of the
evaluation.

• The runway edge lights are at the end of their lives so the grant package will include the
replacement of these lights as well as other necessary improvements to better the
function/quality of the Airport and reduce liability.

• The planning effort determines the short and long-term view of the Airport in terms of
assessing needs to improve its overall function as it relates to safety and liability.

• It is much easier to get FAA grant funding for runways than taxiways and aprons because
there is a hierarchy of quality of projects. Runway improvements are the highest priorities
because of safety concerns.

• The FAA is short of discretionary money. Airports are guaranteed $150,000 grant entitlement
money each year that can be applied to any eligible project. Airports are unable to save
enough money for major projects since airports are allowed only four years to do so and
discretionary funds to do major projects is competitive. A runway project is a lot easier to get
discretionary funding for because it is money that is not allocated very often. Airports can
typically save enough in two years of the $150,000 grant entitlement money that is allocated
annually for routine taxiway and apron segment rehabilitation.

Commissioner Crane:

• Is it possible to piggyback the entitlement money for projects?

David Dietz:

• It is possible to piggyback entitlement money. The FAA will ask if entitlement money will be
used for the runway rehabilitation project. Part of pursing competitive funding is being able to
convince the FAA there are other worthy projects that are also high ranking. Another
approach for getting other rehabilitation projects onboard is matching funds. The
consideration would be whether or not pursing matching funds is economically feasible
because money must be appropriated out-of-pocket. This then becomes a City issue and a
negotiating issue for the FAA.

Commissioner Albright:

• Little River airport moved its runway lights inward 25 feet and did not have to remove the
corresponding 25 feet of asphalt and whether or not this makes sense?

David Dietz:
• It often makes sense to move lights inward and leave the left over ex-runway pavement as a ‘paved shoulder.’ It also reduces maintenance. This decision will be made when working with the engineers for the project because there may be other issues such as drainage or construction related.

• If certain projects cost more, the FAA may decline to pay where the City would have to pay for the difference.

• What will be considered the scope of ‘the project’ will be discussed by the consulting engineer because there may other portions of the project having to do with drainage, electrical improvements and other things weighed in/factored into the cost. There may be preferences about paved versus unpaved runway shoulders and/or other maintenance issues that will become part of the project package.

• It is important to keep in mind the Airport belongs to the City. Mead & Hunt’s job is to advise of FAA specifications and regulations, but the choices however small are that of the City on each of the projects. Things like LED lights and other lighting features/systems that are now available will be choices the City can make decisions about as part of the discretionary element.

Mike Whetzel:
  • Does Homeland Security have grants available for projects?

David Dietz:
  • Projects have to be related to safety since the FAA does not consider security their problem. There is no money available from Transportation Security Administration (TSA).
  • Airports should be aware that grant funding may be available for fencing which in addition to being security related is a safety precautionary measure. This is not an item that is high on the list of projects for GA airports and there is no TSA money available.
  • FAA Part 139, airline airports are looked at first when it comes to discretionary funding.

John Eisenzopf:
  • What effect would narrowing the runway have on instrument approaches and the obstacle clear surfaces? Will obstacle clear surfaces remain the same?
  • Asked how the ‘vasi’ and/or visual approach slope indicator would be treated?
  • For the lighting system, would a new pappi be a consideration?

David Dietz:
  • Narrowing the runway is not based on anything physical on the ground but rather on the category of runway.
  • The good news is that over time, the instrument approach design guidelines are getting meshed more clearly with the airport design guidelines. They used to bear no resemblance to each other and have gotten closer and closer so that airport design concepts actually interconnect pretty well with the actual procedures used to design instrument approaches so this is less of an issue than it used to be. All of this has to do with the airport design and there is no proposal to change the category of the runway.
  • When the Airport gets to the runway project, one of the bigger items to consider is the vasi. Because the vasi is a FAA-owned facility, any desire to change/modify or move it would require the Airport to engage in a Reimbursement Agreement where the City pays the FAA to move or replace the equipment. The cost of the agreement is actually more than the cost to install a new pappi. When it comes time to look at the runway lighting project, the City must decide whether or not to take over the responsibility for maintaining the system by putting in a new airport lighting pappi. To this end, the cost and liability goes along with the responsibility for maintaining the system. The City can choose to negotiate to purchase the pappi and leave it as a FAA maintained facility. This would have to be negotiated at the time and there are not explicit guidelines. The consultants have been successful in some cases about getting the FAA to accept the facility. It is easier today than it used to be. What would occur is to get the FAA to put in an upgraded pappi that would be connected to the lighting system. It is
possible to install a pappi at a $150,000 cost per a FAA reimbursable agreement. The other
ting from the FAA to fly the approach and check
that the path is operational such that if the approach is moved, the cost to the City would be
$15,000 to do so.

Commissioner Crane:
- What if the runway end moves?

David Dietz:
- This would change that location as well as the facility itself. The issue is the pappi and vasi
have a five-mile horizon.
- Explained the process after the grant is approved and contracts are awarded, which should
occur in April or May.

Corbett Smith, Mead & Hunt: Explained the scoping of services process for the Project and the
assumptions and deliverables to be made for each element described in the scope of services:

Project Understanding
- Specifies what will be done and includes a list of the issues that need to be addressed to
complete the ALP update.
- Will be exploring as part of the project the potential for a parallel taxiway from the opposite
side of the runway and helicopter issues to include the possibility for a helipad, dedicated
apron, parking, and other relevant issues.
- Will likely be adding to the project understanding section that the location of the runway end
will be clarified because right now related to the Project Understanding it is not written this
way.

Element 1: Study Design
- Section describes the work elements that will be completed as part of the ALP update and
what has been done up to this point in terms of comparing the scope of work and preparing
the CIP.
- Will be exploring the potential

Element 2: Project Management
- Section talks about how Mead & Hunt will communicate with the City and the FAA by
providing status reports.

Element 3: Site Visits
- Section talks about meetings.
  Meeting #1 - Scope review (public meeting) is the Airport Commission tonight.
  Meeting #2 – Review of concepts (staff meeting) is the opportunity to review the projects and
  formulate alternatives. Mead & Hunt will meet with Airport staff.
  Meeting #3 – Review of concepts (public meeting) would be another meeting like tonight
  where Mead & Hunt will present refined alternatives.
  Meeting #4 – Adoption meeting (public meeting) for the adoption of the ALP by the City.

Element 4: Draft Airport Layout Plan (Sheet 1) Update, Element 5: Airspace Plan Preparation (Sheet
2) and Element 6: Draft Property Map Development (Sheet 3)
- Sections discuss the deliverables that Mead & Hunt will be providing to the City to include an
draft ALP (sheet 1), Airspace Plan (sheet 2) and Airport Property Map (sheet 3).

Element 7: Final Plan Preparation
- Covers the production and coordination requirements of the final ALP.

Element 8: Airport Layout Plan Narrative Report
A narrative report will be provided that documents how the conclusions were made for the various projects relative to alternatives and the final design. There is a section on the responsibilities of the City, fee associated with the ALP, schedule/timeline for the proposed project and comments on additional services.

Commissioner Crane:
- Referred to schedule/timeline for the proposed project related to Meeting #4 and assumes Council will be at the meeting. Questioned whether Council would be able to review and approve the ALP update in a single meeting? Meeting #3 should likely be a joint meeting with the Airport Commission and City Council.

Corbett Smith:
- Changes can be made to the schedule.

Mike Whetzel:
- Does an EIR have to be prepared for the project?
- Even though the project is federal do CEQA guidelines apply?

David Dietz:
- It is likely the City must do some sort of environmental document in order to adopt the new ALP. An environmental document would not be required if the ALP update had been to show an apron was built.
- The City must determine whether or not an EIR is necessary for the project. This is an issue that Mead & Hunt will discuss with staff, but is not required as part of the grant application.
- It may be if a CEQA review is required for the project the cost may be recoverable from the FAA @ 90%. It is possible, but not guaranteed because the FAA would have to agree.
- While the FAA may have an interest, it is a City document that is City approved.

Bill Grothrop:
- Approximately how long will the Airport be shut down for runway rehabilitation?

Corbett Smith:
- The length of time the Airport would be shut down has not been defined. The design engineers would be able to provide this information once the project has been designed and the techniques are known. A consideration would be given to Calfire so it can operate during fire season.

Commissioner Crane: Runway renovation would definitely have to work around Calfire.

Mike Whetzel: Asked if Calfire is still considering moving its base to the east side of the Airport.

Staff: The moving of Calfire is a moot from their standpoint at this time. Calfire does not have the funding at this point.

Commission consensus:
- Supports Meeting #3 be a joint meeting with the Airport Commission and Council in the City Council Chambers.

There was discussion about how the Airport Compatibility classification for the Airport relates to the runway project.

Corbett Smith:
- With the history of the Airport and aircraft that exist, i.e., civilian, military and fire, the length of the runway would be a specific item unlike the width.
David Dietz:
- The runway design criteria is based upon the approach speed, weight, and wing span of the aircraft and the type of approach procedure the Airport uses. A 100-foot width is good for aircraft up to a 737 depending upon what the approach speed is.
- The issue with what to do when it comes to Calfire aircraft, which is seasonal, for the runway rehabilitation depends on the Airport.
- The Airport is located in the B2 Airport Compatibility Zone and classified as a BII airport. This is basically the middle part of general aviation for aircraft over 12,500 pounds. Super King Air is the classic BII type of aircraft if one is looking at how large a BII aircraft is and this includes light jets.

Commissioner Steinmann:
- Asked how Ukiah’s runway can be classified the same as Round Valley and Little River Airport.
- Understands how the FAA for financial reasons would like to see the Airport runway as short as possible.

David Dietz:
- Round Valley Airport has a lower runway classification. Little River Airport is likely still classified the same as BII because of the fact it has such a large runway while Round Valley does not. Round Valley airport runway is classified BI.
- Shortness of distance for a runway is not an issue, the narrowing has to do with maintaining more pavement than is desirable for aircraft. The FAA is not interested in shortening the length so the length is maintained unless there is an operational problem. Ensuring the length is retained is not an issue. If it can legitimately be recognized that an extra 200 feet is necessary or the Airport gets this length back, the FAA is not going to object. This is purely a technical issue for the FAA.

Commissioner Albright: If the Airport is able to get the 200 feet of runway length back would the displaced threshold have to be moved?

David Dietz:
- The displaced threshold would have to be moved as part of the runway project as would lighting and striping.

Commissioner Crane: Would aircraft be able to touch down at end of pavement?

David Dietz: This would depend upon the situation. If the runway threshold is moved, the end of the pavement would be the end of the runway where the markings would change. However, if the displaced threshold is the situation, it could be the landing threshold would end up being in the same spot.

The runway project will be looked at from a technical perspective taking into consideration the situation of the runway and whether it should be any different than it is today. Sometimes it is not obvious for airports why the old threshold was put where it was after the runway was shortened. Sometimes it makes sense and other times not. It must also be noted that FAA design standards do change where several new categories in this regard have been added that were non-existent before and do affect placement of displaced thresholds, aprons, taxiways etc.

There was further discussion concerning the potential for a future parallel taxiway on the east side of the airfield and the apron on the northeast corner of the airfield the FAA would like to see reconfigured to a right angle as to how this would affect the operation of the Airport in terms of determining the location of runway connectors and essentially where the runway would end.
• With regard to runway maintenance, it would not have been cost effective for the Airport to make repairs at this point because the runway has reached its end of life already.
• Is not aware of a runway maintenance program in place for the Airport at least for last 20+ years.
• Is aware of a runway maintenance project done in the 1983 or 1984.

5B. Airport Fencing

Airport Manager Owen:
• Referred to attachment 2, Proposal/Contact and chainlink fence specification from Arrow fencing.
• Two bids were completed for Airport fencing. One was for the chainlink fence from Calfire to the oil tank and on out to State Street. This fencing would cost $6,000 and if barbed wire is included the additional cost would be $600.
• The other bid is for a four-foot tall wrought iron fence where Calstar was formerly located. The cost for this fencing is $7,200 where much of this cost would be for the gate.
• Is of the opinion even though the wrought iron fence is for a relatively small area, it would be aesthetically pleasing. The fence would be for safety as opposed to security purposes.
• Security fencing is not a requirement for the Airport.

Commissioner Crane:
• Likes the idea of putting a six-foot chainlink fence that is down at the base of the hill or at least part way down the hill for this front location.

Airport Manager Owen:
• Putting a fence in the Airport entryway location would displace/disrupt the landscaping that has been done.
• People can and will access the Airport if they have the desire to do even if they have to climb over a six-foot fence that has barbed wire.

Airport Assistant Ronk: Has observed that aircraft in the vicinity of the shed where Ukiah Aviation is located are turning such that the wing tips touch the bank so a fence would not likely be a good idea in this because it would probably get hit regularly.

Commissioner Albright:
• Is of the opinion putting a fence down below where Calstar was formerly located does not serve a purpose because it would be located at the bottom rather than the top of the hill where the planting area is located.

Commissioner Deerwester:
• A wrought iron fence would be more for show and deterrent than anything else.
• Asked about the proposed chainlink fence to extend from Calfire to the oil collection tank to State Street and whether it would replace an existing fence.

Airport Manager Owen:
• A fence does not currently exist in this location and explained how a fence would work in and around the hangars.
• Fencing costs would be paid out of the Airport Maintenance budget.
• While Airport fencing is a discussion/action item, he stills needs to go through City purchasing to make certain all necessary specification/information is correct.
• If the Commission decides to go with the $7,200 wrought iron fence for the entryway to the Airport is of the opinion this would be an improvement from an aesthetic standpoint and would have liked to seen the same done for the fencing in and around Ukiah Aviation because it would look so much more appealing.
• The wrought iron fencing proposal includes a security gate.
Commissioner Crane:

- If a security fence were the intent it should be located further back.
- It is a good idea to put the matter of airport fencing out to bid.
- Questioned why a gate was not included for the $6,000 chainlink fence.
- Does not support the wrought iron fence proposal. Preference would be a chain link fence for the entryway area instead that would be closer to the parking lot so that when a person came through the gate when it was open the view would be unobstructed over the hillside.

Airport Manager Owen:

- A gate is not listed on the specification but would be included as part of the fencing project.
- It may be a wrought iron fence would be feasible for the backside rather than the front side of the entryway or the fence can be installed along the parking lot side.

There was discussion about the best and most feasible location for the wrought iron fence and gate for the purpose of creating a welcoming presentation to the Airport. It may be that providing for some landscaping would highlight/complement a wrought iron fence, such as vines.

Commissioner Deerwester does not support six-foot high chainlink fencing. Fencing type and material for the entryway should be welcoming for people wanting to visit the Airport. The fence could consist of landscaping.

Commissioner Crane:

- Would rather spend money on grass/irrigation systems and some fencing with less lineal square footage than what is being proposed.
- Would like the proposals to go out to bid. Suggests having alternate, backup proposals.

Airport Manager Owen:

- Staff can provide the landscaping and irrigation system.

Commission consensus:

- Likes the idea of grass and landscaping that is clearly visible for the entryway.
- Not supportive of installing a wrought iron fence.
- Supports a six-foot high chainlink fence with a gate for the entryway. The gate should be at least as wide as the walkway if not wider.
- Supports a 300-foot long chainlink fence that would extent from Calfire to State Street that will include a gate.
- No barb wire for the 300-foot chainlink fence.

Airport Manager Owen:

- Would like to take the fencing proposals to City purchasing for a determination whether or not to go out to bid.
- If the project goes out to bid the Commission will have the opportunity to review them.

5C. Budget FYI 2012-13, 2013-14

Airport Manager Owen:

- Referred to two separate Airport budget sheets one of which has YTD budget information as of 11/6/12 and 1/24/13 (attachment 3).
- Recently the City has gone 'live' with the new financial software and finds the new system has many capabilities the former system did not, particularly in terms of being able to track information more efficiently such as fuel revenue and sales.
- The new financial system has a new account numbering system for each revenue and expenditure line item as shown on the budget sheets.
- Revenues and expenses are now shown on one sheet.
- Fuel sales have increased.
- The Airport has a fund balance.
• It may be time to look at purchasing a self-serve fuel tank as way to further increase fuel sales.

Commissioner Crane:
• With regard to the former 291 account now 61100, General Government Services, supports City Hall understand in terms of assigning charges to this account that the Airport will be appropriating a large sum of money for the runway rehabilitation project.

Commission generally reviewed and discussed the budget:
• It may be beneficial to have another column that shows the negative and positive for line items in the budget sheet for clarity purposes.
• Would like to see budget information 'previous year to date.'
• Asked for clarification regarding line items 56110 & 56111.

Airport Manager Owen:
• Line items 56110 and 56111 are sub-categories for Vehicle Repair and Maintenance.
• Money must be on-hand to repair the fuel trucks. Both the fueling trucks (Jet-A and Avgas) are having problems because they are getting old.

Commission:
• It may be time to look at the fueling trucks and consider costs/pricing associated with repair versus replacement, particularly for the Jet-A fueling truck as well as the cost of purchasing a self-fueling tank and having a self-serve fueling station. Would like to see an analysis related to these costs.
• Asked about salaries, non regular.
• With the new financial software would like to add columns on the budget sheet as necessary for budget comparison purposes to assist with having updated posted information for better understanding of Airport revenue and expenditures.

Commissioner Albright: While self-serve fueling systems may benefit airports, prefers having airport staff fuel his aircraft as a matter of convenience.

Airport Manager Owen:
• Down the road would like to consider consolidating the part-time positions into full-time for better use of time that would benefit Airport daily operations.

6. REPORTS
6A. Airport Land Use Plan Scheduled for Review by Council
City Council may have the opportunity to review the Airport Land Use Plan in the spring.

6B. Airport signs for old lumberyard
There have been no rental inquiries.

7. AGENDA ITEMS FOR NEXT REGULAR MEETING
1. Airport fencing
2. Airport budget
3. Maintenance committee update that could include a paving inventory

8. COMMISSIONER COMMENTS/STAFF COMMENTS
Commissioner Crane: Landside paving is showing wear and tear and recommend possibly chip sealing.

There was Commission/staff discussion regarding the Calstar incident reported by Mike Whetzel above.
Airport Manager Owen: Airport Day is June 1.

Commissioner Deerwester:
  - The VFW and American Legion are interested in having a booth at Airport Day.
  - There will be a parade on Memorial Day and asked if anyone has ideas about this event to let her know because the VFW and Veteran’s Service Office are coordinating the parade.

9. ADJOURNMENT
There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 9:13 p.m.

Cathy Elawedly, Recording Secretary