

Wednesday, May 15, 2019 at 5:30 p.m.

MEETING MINUTES

Lake Havasu City Police Council Chambers
2360 McCulloch Blvd N., Lake Havasu City, AZ 86403
www.lhcaz.gov

1. CALL TO ORDER

A quorum being present, Chairman Stebbens called the Airport Advisory Board meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chairman Stebbens led the Board in the Pledge of Allegiance.

3. ROLL CALL

Alondra Davis-Mowry conducted a Roll Call of the Board members:

Regular Board Members Present: Chairman Shannon Stebbens, Vice-Chairman Louis Worthy, Robbie Willis; Shannon Hicks-Hankins (alternate), Ed Weber (alternate),

Regular Board Members Absent: Dave McNary, Brian Schultz, Mark Zieff

Council Member Present: Jim Dolan

Airport Operations Staff Present: Damon Anderson (Airport Supervisor), Alondra Davis-Mowry

4. CALL TO PUBLIC

Chairman Stebbens requested a Call to the Public for any comments and issues to address. There being no statements from the public, Chairman Stebbens closed the Call to the Public.

5. MINUTES

5.1 Approval of February 20, 2019 Meeting Minutes

- Board member Hicks-Hankins motioned to approve; Board member Weber seconded. Unanimously approved.

6. COMMUNICATIONS, ANNOUNCEMENTS, AIRPORT SUPERVISOR'S REPORT

6.1 Supervisor's Report

- Mr. Anderson reported on the following:
- The FAA 5010 Inspection Report was received, and details that the Airport master record is complete and correct, and includes a review of safety features. The team checks for obstructions on approaches and noted that the embankment on the south

Wednesday, May 15, 2019 at 5:30 p.m.

MEETING MINUTES

end of the field on the far side, the embankment is a little in the obstruction area, but they'd noted it and asked that the brush be kept down. The report indicated that everything looked good; however, the pavement condition was downgraded from good to fair. The report has been forwarded to the FAA ACIP team who is working on updating the 5-year plan so that it can be addressed by federal grant funds in the next 5-year ACIP.

- A pre-ACIP meeting was held this week, and next Tuesday, June 21, city officials will travel to Phoenix to attend the ACIP meeting with FAA officials and engineers, and our consultants, to make sure everything is being prioritized right, and is how we want certain items to be listed, such as soil cement, signage, and hydrants.
- Annual hangar inspections continue. All but one of the city owned hangars have been inspected, and personnel are starting to work on preparing letters and processes to go out to private hangar owners to outline what next year's inspections will entail.
- The gate code change that was done on April 16 hit a glitch when one user wrote the gate code on a piece of paper and taped it to a keypad. We'll be issuing a new code to users, and we are still working toward using a key card reader system so that this can all be avoided in the future. We do have some key cards, but are looking into expanding the system so that it is fully functional.
- We learned that the backup generator works as it should when an accident occurred on the highway, and a truck hit the power pole and knocked out electricity at the Airport.
- As a supplement to the Supervisor's Report, Chairman Stebbens asked Mr. Anderson to elaborate on the ACIP process in terms of what we have to do in order to get a grant. Mr. Anderson explained that the Airport Capital Improvement Plan (ACIP) is a lengthy process, and it involves the city putting together documentation that meets specific deadlines for submittal, and that includes draft plans for design, proposals for consulting and engineering, cost estimates, and the like. He said that city officials review and prioritize the projects, with those addressing safety as generally being higher on the list. The Chairman further clarified that it is a step process, with the FAA approving items contained in the ACIP, which then allows the city to move forward and solicit consultant work. He added that Mr. Anderson and other city staff devote a great majority of their time to working on grant applications and all of the program documentation.

6.2 Upcoming Events

- There were no events announced.

Wednesday, May 15, 2019 at 5:30 p.m.

MEETING MINUTES

7. PUBLIC HEARINGS

7.1 Discussion and Possible Action Regarding Revising City Code Section 11.08.350 Parking Restrictions

- Chairman Stebbens opened the Public Hearing with a statement that it is not for the intent to revise the City Code, and that the AAB had fully discussed parking restrictions 15 months ago, and that the Board unanimously agreed with all of the parking restrictions as written. He said that the purpose is to get the word out to a public forum and all of the people associated with the airport, as to what the rules are because many of the issues are going to come up during the inspection process of the hangars. He read aloud the restrictions direct from the written code. The Chairman also read aloud City Code Section 11.08.340 Motorhomes, Boats, and Recreational Vehicles, adding that during the discussion 15 months ago, the Board had unanimously advised staff that the Board saw no reason why a boat or recreational vehicle should be stored in a city-owned hangar, but that they would leave it to the Airport Supervisor's discretion to determine on a case by case basis for that type of storage in privately owned hangars, with said determination being done as a written record so that it would be tracked, and open to anyone's inspection.
- The Chairman invited public input.
- Tom Stokely, Hangar 74, stated that he felt it isn't a big issue to store a boat, motorcycle, or razor in the hangar if the hangar is being used primarily for aircraft. He stated that the previous Airport Supervisor had a theory that if the airplane was impeded by other items, then it had to be resolved; otherwise, storage of a boat or other vehicles wasn't an issue if it didn't impede pulling the aircraft in and out. He added that he keeps a razor in his hangar, and currently a boat, and that many of the hangar users make use of the full extent of the hangar.
- The Chairman clarified that the above statement regarding not having to move anything in order to get an aircraft in and out of the hangar is a federal requirement, and was not an independent determination of the previous Airport Supervisor. He added that the rule states that in the footprint of the aircraft, there is to be only the vehicle that you arrived in, and that no impediment shall remain to moving the aircraft in and out of the hangar. He stated that his personal opinion is that the reason that the hangars at the Airport are less than a commercial storage unit is because when you purchase an airline ticket, federal tax on that ticket goes into an aviation trust fund, and is what the FAA expends to keep the prices down at airports, meaning the aviation trust fund money is for aviation purposes, and not to support storage of your razor or your boat. He noted that FAA rule 5190.6B requires that the Airport sponsor have these types of ordinances out there. I think at this time, we have the case-by-case basis covered by way of consent of the Airport Supervisor covered under the current code,

Wednesday, May 15, 2019 at 5:30 p.m.

MEETING MINUTES

however it can't be carte blanche or it could violate grant assurances and affect the city's ability to obtain federal dollars. Also noted was that you can call the FAA, but generally won't get answers to questions, and they won't get involved in managing the airport. The Chairman then asked for the Airport Supervisor's input.

- Mr. Anderson said that he agreed with both the Chairman and Mr. Stokely's perspectives, noting that the case-by-case basis should work, with attention to the FAA rule. He stated that he'd like to follow the case-by-case method, and by way of visually observing good housekeeping with no fire hazards, leniency on a case-by-case basis is his preference when storage is found to be neat, orderly, clean, and not impeding the movement in and out of the aircraft. He noted that the hangars are of different sizes, and owners/tenants want to fully utilize the space. Mr. Anderson said that in cases where tenants have taken over a hangar to renovate old vehicles, and they don't have an aircraft or a pilot license, that he would send inspection letters out and document those situations in order to address compliance issues, and agreed with the Chairman that the FAA is not in the business of managing airports.
- The Chairman reiterated that the Board had agreed to leave the matters in the hands of the Airport Supervisor, stipulating that there is written record, to protect other hangar tenants with written authorization. He then invited additional comment by any of the Board.
- Member Willis stated that he spends a lot of time at the Chandler Municipal airport with a pilot friend of his who has a hangar there. He reported that in comparison, there the vibe with the people at Lake Havasu City Municipal is first class. Mr. Willis expressed that there is a feel of community at Chandler, and there is a sense of community among airport users here. He stated his belief that using a case-by-case method of oversight is preferable.
- Member Hicks-Hankins added that she agreed with Member Willis, and stated that common sense comes in to play, and she would trust the Airport Supervisor's judgement of case-by-case management. She also noted that there is always "that one person", but that if the airport user community as a whole knows what the rules are and follows them, and back up the Airport Supervisor, then that "one person" won't mess us up. She said that if everyone in attendance, and those watching on television help spread the word about what we're trying to preserve and help to grow that environment, then everyone can work together for a great experience,
- Mr. Anderson added that often, when a hangar is sold, the new owner isn't aware of the rules. He said it is his job to educate the owners of the FAA rules, and the do's and don'ts, when they come in to sign an Agreement.
- The Chairman summarized that this was on the agenda as an opportunity for public comments, and that the Airport Supervisor would continue his oversight of allowable uses in line compliance for federal funding opportunity.
- There being no further public comment, Chairman Stebbens closed the Public Hearing.

Wednesday, May 15, 2019 at 5:30 p.m.

MEETING MINUTES

7.2 Discussion Regarding Request for Proposal for Aeronautical Land for Lease North Central Ramp Area

- Chairman Stebbens introduced this item, and asked Mr. Anderson to brief the Board on the RFP.
- Mr. Anderson described the document as a straightforward boilerplate RFP, scheduled for publication on the city website on May 16. The RFP addresses four acres specifically, outlines the uses that have been approved according to the signed Airport Improvement Program (AIP), and stipulates that proposals suggesting items not in the signed AIP, would be subject to additional costs such as applications for category exclusions, environmental impact statements, and the like. Proposal criteria includes that it must come in at a fair market value, and any appraisal will have to be by an outside, FAA approved appraisal firm. Mr. Anderson stated that submittal of written questions will be due by June 10, with the proposal due date of June 18. This sounds vague, but we have to wait and see what the proposers submit: what will they propose for rent, how long will the proposed terms be, different things like that. He said that a committee will review all proposals when they come in.
- Chairman Stebbens opened the Public Hearing.
- Tom Stokely, Hangar 74, stated that on page 5, paragraph 4-Expectations, reading the text that referencing proposals must address existing hangars having access to the existing public or new taxiway areas maintained, or appropriate mitigation with regards to relocating or reconstructing the existing assets, with mitigation and addressing the existing hangars and revenues will be a critical part of the evaluation of a proposal. He then read the Google definition of the work mitigation as “the action of reducing severity, serious or painfulness of something. He expressed that the term mitigation was concerning to the existing hangar owners/tenants, and stated that the FRP will be sent to the AOPA’s legal staff, to ensure that the six hangars are protected because there are no other hangars to go to.
- Chairman Stebbens noted that he was pleased to see this addressed in the document since previous Board discussion with Mark Clark had requested language for mitigation on behalf of the existing six hangars.
- Council Member Dolan commented that he understands Mr. Stokely’s concerns with how mitigation will be viewed, and that it is important that it be covered. He said the process will involve staff evaluating proposed mitigation, and what they will be comfortable presenting to the City Council, who will ultimately decide if proposed mitigation is enough. We will have to see what proposals come in, and how staff evaluates those proposals.
- Chairman Stebbens reiterated that it was every Board member’s desire to make sure that the existing six hangar owners/tenants will have a hangar to park their aircraft in even if it is in a different location. He recalled that during the discussion with Mr. Clark,

Wednesday, May 15, 2019 at 5:30 p.m.

MEETING MINUTES

who said that it wouldn't matter where on the airport the hangars were located as long as you were able to park your plane in a hangar even if it had been moved, and that there was agreement from the people affected that that was the case. He added his comment that he hoped the airport sponsor, before accepting a proposal, would require an FAA approved appraisal to ensure that the RFP's statement that the lease rate will be at fair market value is complied with. The Airport Supervisor agreed that the FAA would require that fair market value. The Chairman offered that the best thing would be to get proposals for construction of executive hangars, with no loss of revenues from the existing hangars.

- Member Weber asked about a possible omission in the RFP, commenting that it addressed the project will be completed in a timely manner, but there is no language about the project starting in a timely manner. He raised concern that sometimes contracts delay the start of projects, and wondered if the city had considered any protections if that were to be the case on this project. The Airport Supervisor responded that if the RFP itself can't be revised before publication, that the evaluation committee will address that subject during review of the proposals.
- Member Hicks-Hankins asked the Airport Supervisor if he knew how many proposing entities might be waiting for the publication, as she had heard rumors, but noted that the time line to submit a proposal is very short. Mr. Anderson said he also heard rumors that there was interest from a variety of potential proposers.
- Pam Rudolph, Hangar 76, stated that she was a lot more comfortable with the wording in a draft RFP that she saw in February, in that the language was that "they were going to address relocating the existing hangars and the existing tenants". She pointed out that the current version of the RFP doesn't include the word tenant, and she was more comfortable when it was included in the previous version.
- Chairman Stebbens said he didn't see anything in the RFP as it is written that is a showstopper and that would prompt a request of staff to address. He said he was comfortable with it being published, and seeing what proposals come in.
- Council Member Dolan stated that he was comfortable with the RFP in that it is a boilerplate proposal, although he understands the aspects of mitigation are vague in this situation, but he thinks that it will fall on the evaluation committee to decide and ask those questions as they come up. He added that before he would vote, he would want to know what the plan would be if hangars had to be moved, or new ones built to replace the existing six, and how timely that effort would be. He will want to be sure that there is a realistic resolution for the people who are already out there. He noted that it is early in the process, and that he has faith the process, and that the evaluation committee will have answered many of the questions before going to City Council. When asked if he knows what the approval process entails, Mr. Dolan responded that he didn't have any detail about who would be on the committee, or what their evaluation and recommendation timeline will be.
- There being no further comments, Chairman Stebbens closed the Public Hearing.

Wednesday, May 15, 2019 at 5:30 p.m.

MEETING MINUTES

8. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

- There were no immediate requests for discussion items. Members were invited to send requests to the Airport Supervisor or Ms. Davis-Mowry.

9. FUTURE MEETINGS (third Wednesday of each month)

- Wednesday, June 19, 2019
- Wednesday, July 17, 2019

10. ADJOURN

- Motion to adjourn by Board member Hicks-Hankins; seconded by Board member Weber. Without objection, the meeting was adjourned at 6:05 p.m.