

Heber City Corporation
Airport Advisory Board Meeting
February 24, 2016
4:00 p.m.

REGULAR MEETING

The Airport Advisory Board of Heber City, Wasatch County, Utah, met in **Regular Meeting** on February 24, 2016, in the City Council Chambers in Heber City, Utah

I. Call to Order
[City Managers Memo](#)

II. Roll Call

Present: Board Chairman Mel McQuarrie
Board Member David Hansen
Board Member Kari McFee
Board Member Jeff Mabbutt
Board Member Ron Phillips (Arrived at 4:09 p.m.)
Board Member Heidi Franco
Board Member Ronald Crittenden

Excused: None

Also Present: City Manager Mark Anderson
Airport Manager Terry Loboschefsky
Deputy City Recorder Allison Lutes

Others Present: Charles Cummings, Jeremy McAlister, Dale Stewart, Paul Boyer, Gerry Hall, and Nadim AbuHaidar

III. Pledge of Allegiance

IV. [Minutes for Approval: January 20, 2016 Regular Meeting](#)
[January 20, 2016 Draft Meeting Minutes](#)

Board Member McFee moved to approve the minutes of the January 20, 2016 meeting. Board Member Hansen made the second. Voting Aye: Board Members McQuarrie, McFee, Hansen, and Mabbutt. Board Member Phillips was excused. The motion carried.

1. [Airport Manager Report](#)
[Airport Manager Report: January 2016](#)

Loboschefsky reviewed the contents of his Airport Manager Report, and highlighted some of the items for the board. Loboschefsky also noted that the controlled burn by Public Works as

indicated on the Airport Manager's Report had not been performed as yet, however Public Works was coordinating with the Fire Marshall concerning dates and notification to pilots. Additionally, Vaisala, the company that provided maintenance on the Automated Weather Observing System ("AWOS"), recently advised Loboschefsky that it would no longer be doing AWOS maintenance, but agreed to commit to the term of the current agreement, ending on September 1, 2016. A new certified AWOS maintenance provider would need to be identified to assume the maintenance of the system after the current agreement expired.

Board Member Phillips arrived at 4:09 p.m.

Loboschefsky reviewed the challenges encountered with snow removal during the preceding two months. He added that he intended to develop a firm and rigorous snow removal policy that would include contingency plans, to avoid any confusion or questions. Finally, Loboschefsky stated that in the prior week, 60 mph wind gusts picked up one of the gliders tied down on the east side, and put it into the fence, severely damaging both glider and fence. An estimated 80-foot of fence needed to be repaired, however the insurance company for the glider owners had committed to paying for the fence repairs.

2. [Update on Responses to the Airport Consultant RFQ](#)

Anderson explained that the City solicited RFQs as part of its FAA requirement to obtain an airport consultant/engineer, and received 5 responses: AECOM, Airport Development Group, Armstrong Consulting, GDA Engineers, and JUB Engineering. Subsequently, the City Council identified Ron Crittenden and Heidi Franco to serve as members of the selection committee that would do one of two things: 1) either short list those 5 respondents; or 2) view presentations by each, if a short list could not be developed. The Council wanted to include a couple of Airport Board volunteers as well as staff to participate in the committee. Board Members Hansen and Phillips volunteered to serve on the committee.

Board Member McFee moved to appoint Board Members Hansen and Phillips to the selection committee for the airport planning services consultant. Board Member Mabbutt made the second. Voting Aye: Board Members McQuarrie, McFee, Hansen, Phillips and Mabbutt.

Board Member Franco suggested the committee meet to preview the proposals. The committee members agreed to meet on Monday, February 29 at 4:00 p.m. in the Heber City offices.

3. [Update on Items Referred to the City Council](#)

Anderson reviewed that the City successfully completed the purchase of the Maverik parcel, located at the end of Runway 22, within the Runway Protection Zone ("RPZ"). The transaction closed on February 17. He added the City intended to keep the existing building on the property for storage needs. Additionally, City staff would be including a grant proposal to complete the fencing on the west side of the parcel in the Council packet for the upcoming meeting on March 3. Board Member Franco opined that the six-foot chain link fence would not be the most beautiful entryway to the City. She thought the intent was to plant grass in that area. Anderson

responded that he asked the FAA about landscaping, and was told the only way the FAA would provide assistance for landscaping would be if the need was to eliminate a bird problem.

With regard to reversionary leases, Anderson reviewed that the City Council wanted a better understanding of the pros and cons of each and more clarity on the commercial hangars and how they would be considered similarly situated from an FAA perspective. Anderson added that the FBO building lease was very similar to the lease agreements for the other reversionary hangars, however the FAA indicated that because the FBO hangar was a commercial operation, it would not be considered similarly situated to the others. Therefore, Anderson felt the FBO lease would not be affected if the Council were to decide to convert the reversionary hangars to non-reversionary hangar leases. The item will be on the City Council agenda for the March 3 meeting. With regard to Hangar 5, Anderson reviewed that in June 2010, the City Council approved its conversion from non-reversionary to reversionary. The current owner purchased the hangar in January 2011, and the Assignment Agreement clearly stated it was subject to the June 2010 lease terms. The FAA concluded that even though it was not initially a reversionary lease, Hangar 5's lease was very similar to the other 8 reversionary hangars, and therefore would be similarly situated.

Anderson added that Council Members Smith and Bradshaw were asked to weigh in on the financial aspect of the lease conversion offer.

Concerning the issue regarding a RFP for a second FBO, Anderson reviewed that Council wanted to hear from Nadim AbuHaidar first before making a decision. The issue would be on the March 3 agenda, and AbuHaidar would be presenting a report at that time.

Board Member Franco inquired whether City staff had compiled any comparable FBO lease rates in the state. Anderson stated they had collected some data, but it was incomplete. He and Loboschfsky noted that there were not many comparable airports within the State of Utah, and some airports were designated Part 131 airports with scheduled air service, which added more complexity to the data. Anderson and Loboschfsky were agreeable to sharing the data with the Board, despite its being incomplete. Board Member Franco added the staff should expand its research to obtain data from resort related airports, to get a good cross-section of information.

4. [Discuss Airport Hangar Development](#)
[Aircraft Hangar Development Guide](#)
[Spanish Fork-Springville Airport Design Standards](#)
[St. George Municipal Airport Building Development Standards](#)
[Airport Drawings](#)

Anderson indicated that the City needed to have a better sense of the degree of interest aircraft owners had expressed in the past concerning hangar development. To that end, Anderson asked Loboschfsky to prepare a letter to send to the 40-50 individuals who had expressed interest over the past couple of years. Anderson added that one individual had been regularly contacting both he and Loboschfsky, expressing interest in building a 50x50 hangar. Another individual who owned a property in Red Ledges wanted a hangar for his King Air. Consequently, Anderson felt there was sincere interest, and wanted to learn how committed the interest was.

Anderson projected a map of the airport, showing proposed future hangars in blue. He added that the Building Department indicated that the separation of the museum hangar from the proposed hangar to the south would present a fire concern; absent any fire protection systems, that proposed hangar could not be built. Chairman McQuarrie indicated the hangar could be built, however it would potentially require 2-hour or 4-hour walls. As to the remaining six proposed hangar pads, the utilities were stubbed, but the sewer lines were not; the area would be served by septic tanks. Anderson added that he hoped the City would receive a pad fee because the infrastructure was there, and at one time, he believed the City Council discussed a \$30,000-\$35,000 fee for a 75'x75' hangar.

Anderson directed the Board to another location mid-field where another hangar was proposed, either set back or situated to the west. The final proposed group would be located by the run up area near Runway 22. The Master Plan proposed eleven 50'x50' hangars: six on the west and five on the east, and nineteen nested T-hangars in the middle. All utilities, including sewer, were already stubbed in that area. Because of the square footage consumed by nineteen nested T-hangars, the Building Department indicated it would be necessary to install fire sprinklers, thus it was proposed they build the T-hangars in pods of six or eight, rather than nineteen in one group. Anderson concluded, stating that the area was pretty much shovel-ready and would only require extending the asphalt to the taxi lane.

The Board identified three options for hangar development: 1) the City would construct and sell the hangars; 2) allow hangar applicants to contract with a contractor on their own and build to airport standards; or 3) identify a qualified contractor to develop and build all of the hangars. Anderson then briefed the Board on the history of the development of the current hangars, which started in 1989.

Anderson stated that while it was the City Council's ultimate decision, he would not recommend the City develop the hangars, mainly because the airport manager was part time, whereas when the existing hangars were constructed, the airport manager was full time, had some construction skills, and could manage the project. However, Anderson felt that the City could do the project successfully, but there should be firm commitments and deposits.

Board Member Franco felt the City should not develop with City funds and that either a developer or the individual applicants could build to airport standards. She also expressed that the current airport standards were ugly, and felt there should be more color and variety among the hangar buildings. Board Member Hansen noted that Chino airport had a whole row of hangars that adopted a 1930's type of architecture and signage with different colors, and thought the 50'x50' hangars could be built that way. He felt it would be more prudent financially for the City to identify a developer to build the hangars, and have the developer pay the pad fees. Another option Hansen proposed was for the City to keep the nested T's and rent them out any way it wanted, either month-to-month or year-to-year. Those hangars would be manageable by Loboschfsky. Board Member Franco felt if a developer were to build the hangars, then the City should establish construction deadlines to avoid potential periods of incomplete construction.

Discussion followed concerning the three options. Board Member Mabbutt expressed that having one contractor build the hangars would be more favorable; the City would direct what

pad fees would be paid up front. Board Member Hansen suggested that the project could be broken into three phases: Phase 1, the 50x50 hangars; Phase 2, the nested T-hangars; and Phase 3, the larger hangars.

Board Member Phillips was in favor of allowing the individual lessees to build the hangar structure within the City guidelines. Board Member Crittenden agreed. He expressed that he would like the Board to present the three options to the City Council, with individual Board members' reasons in support of which option they would be in favor of. Board Member Phillips expressed that his least favorable option was having one developer build out all of the hangars, adding that airport hangar development shouldn't be a speculative enterprise, but rather based upon individual need. He felt allowing individuals to build their hangars would provide more flexibility, and would guard against the possible downturn in the economy, where groups of hangars may be built and could sit empty.

Board Member Mabbutt felt there would be a big problem with the nested T's in allowing individuals to construct as needed. He felt one company would need to build all of those hangars, since it was one structure. Board Members McFee and Mabbutt expressed that the City could build the nested T's and then rent them out.

Nadim AbuHaidar felt the City needed to consider a potential for a traffic flow problem at the east end of the airport where the thirty additional hangars were proposed, due to a proposed self serve fueling area.

Anderson shared that those who had expressed interest in hangars didn't have a preference as to whether the City or a developer build the hangars, and many felt they didn't have the experience to manage a general contractor. Anderson added that one of his biggest concerns in having one developer was keeping the contractor profits reasonable, because it was a sort of monopolistic situation.

Board Member McFee moved that the Board send to the City Council the three options for hangar development and ask that the City Council decide which option they feel would be best for the City and bring back to Board so that it can move further.

Board Member Phillips requested the motion be amended to state that the option to allow individual lessees to negotiate with their own contractors to construct their hangars was the preferred option. Board Member McFee amended the motion as stated. Board Member Phillips made the second.

Further discussion ensued regarding the potential three construction phases.

Board Member Hansen further amended the motion as follows: the Board submits to the City Council three options for airport hangar development, and was seeking the City Council's guidance as to whether or not it had any interest in pursuing any of the three options identified. The Board was leaning toward the option to allow individual lessees to contract with their own contractor. Further, the Board identified three distinct development phases: 1) the 50x50 hangars at the west end; 2) the nested T-hangars; and 3) the larger 75x75 hangars. Board Member McFee

agreed to the amended motion as stated. Voting Aye: Board Members McQuarrie, McFee, Hansen, Phillips, and Mabbutt.

In response to Board Member Franco's inquiry regarding Chino airport standards, Board Member Hansen indicated he would contact individuals he knew to obtain written hangar development standards.

5. Other Items as Needed

Board Member Hansen requested that the issue regarding the second FBO be added back to the upcoming agenda. He added that OK3-Air's presentation before the City Council was scheduled for the March 3 meeting, so the Board should be able to address the second FBO issue at its next meeting. Board Chairman McQuarrie responded that it could not be on the agenda until the City Council acted on the request to negotiate with the current FBO that the Board had sent earlier.

Nadim AbuHaidar expressed that at the last meeting, the Board voted 4-1 to not proceed with the RFP for a second FBO, and this was not accurately presented to the Council in the February 4 Work Meeting.

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Allison Lutes, Deputy City Recorder