

HEBER CITY CORPORATION
75 North Main Street
Heber City, Utah
Airport Advisory Board Meeting
Wednesday, March 13, 2013

4:00 p.m.
Regular Meeting

Public notice is hereby given that the monthly meeting of the Heber City Airport Advisory Board will be at in the Heber City Office Building, 75 North Main, South door, in the Conference Room upstairs. The following items will be discussed:

Agenda:

Approval of Minutes

February 13, 2013, Regular Meeting Minutes

Item 1 Airport Manager Report

Item 2 Final Review of Terminal Area Development Plan Drawings and Review of Comments received from the February 13, 2013 Open House

Item 3 Update on RFP for Consultant Services

Item 4 Discuss placing Airport Advisory Board Meeting Minutes, Information Packets, and Meeting Audio on the Heber City Website

Other Items as Needed

Times are approximate and may vary if needed.

Those interested in the above items are encouraged to attend. Order of items may vary if needed. In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, those needing special accommodations during this meeting or who are non-English speaking should contact Karen Tozier or the Heber City Planning and Zoning Department (435-654-4830) at least eight hours prior to the meeting.

Posted on March 7, 2013 in the Wasatch County Community Development Building, Wasatch County Library, Heber City Hall, the Heber City Website at www.ci.heber.ut.us and on the Utah Public Notice Website at <http://pmn.utah.gov>. Notice provided to the Wasatch Wave on March 7, 2013.

Karen Tozier, Administrative Secretary

1
2
3 HEBER CITY CORPORATION
4 75 North Main Street
5 Heber City, Utah
6 Airport Advisory Board Meeting
7 Wednesday, February 13, 2013

8
9 4:00 p.m. - Regular Meeting
10 5:00 p.m. – 6:00 p.m. – Open House
11

Members Present: Nadim AbuHaidar Airport Advisory Board
Dave Hansen Airport Advisory Board
Kari McFee Airport Advisory Board
Tom Melville Airport Advisory Board
Erik Rowland Airport Advisory Board

Absent: Jeff Mabbutt Airport Advisory Board
Mel McQuarrie Airport Advisory Board

Others: Mark Anderson City Manager
Terry Loboschefsky Airport Manager
Karen Tozier Airport Advisory Board Secretary

12
13 Others: Justin Pietz, Armstrong Consultants; Dale Stewart, Richard Gerlach, Jeff Bradshaw,
14 Tim Glenn, Paul Boyer, Paul Schneider, Beth Schneider, Jim Church, Lynn Oswald, John
15 Ackerson, and Terry Small.

16
17 Chairman Rowland convened the meeting at 4:00 p.m. with a quorum present. Boardmember
18 Mabbutt and Boardmember McQuarrie were excused. This meeting was held in the City
19 Council Chambers.

20
21 **Approval of Minutes**

22
23 **January 9, 2013, Regular Minutes**

24
25 Boardmember Hansen motioned to approve the January 9, 2013 Regular Meeting Minutes.
26 Boardmember McFee seconded the motion. Voting Aye: Boardmembers McFee, Rowland,
27 Hansen, AbuHaidar, and Melville. Voting Nay: None. The motion passed.

28
29 **Item 1 Airport Manager Report**

30
31 Terry Loboschefsky reviewed his report. The concrete for the beacon should go in this month.
32 It will be going in next to the SRE Building. Loboschefsky discussed upcoming projects and
33 airport conditions and asked Boardmember AbuHaidar to report on the number of flight
34 operations during January. Boardmember AbuHaidar indicated that the volume was up
35 approximately 30% on the ramp primarily due to traffic for the Sundance Film Festival and that
36 it had made a record for the number of landing fees. Mark Anderson concurred by indicating

37 there had been 114 operations that paid landing fees in the month of January totaling to
38 approximately \$4,800. Having de-icing capabilities had been helpful. Loboschefskey had some
39 sample of crack chips that were on the runway. He indicated there was a soft spot at A6 where
40 he thought a larger aircraft had touched down. He first noticed it when the temperatures dipped
41 their lowest this winter and did not believe it was from the snowplow. Discussion topics from
42 the airport manager report were reviewed. There was discussion on wildlife; DNR had been
43 called, they'd rounded up and run-off seven deer. Loboschefskey expressed they would be
44 vigilant on this. Skydiving and powered parachuting operations were discussed. For skydiving
45 they would have to meet the Airport Minimum Standards. Something could be added to the
46 Rules and Regulations to address powered parachuting operations. Boardmember AbuHaidar
47 commented on the safety hazard associated with this and Terry Loboschefskey concurred that he
48 thought this was a safety issue. Loboschefskey indicated that Hangar 29 has been sold and that
49 they were rapidly running out of city hangar space to rent and hopefully will sell the remaining.
50

51 **Item 2** **Review Proposed Scope of Work for Hiring a Consultant to Identify**
52 **Conditions When the City should Consider Granting Lease Extensions to**
53 **Existing Reversionary/Non Reversionary Leases and Evaluation of the**
54 **Current Lease Agreement**
55

56 Chairman Rowland asked Mark Anderson to review information he had provided in his memo.
57 Anderson reviewed this and read the draft scope of work he and Chairman Rowland had
58 prepared to review as a starting point for the Board to propose to the City Council to engage a
59 consultant to:
60

- 61 • Identify conditions where the City should consider granting extensions to existing
62 reversionary and non-reversionary leases.
- 63 • Evaluate the current hangar agreement and make recommendations for modifications to
64 existing lease rates to maximize City/Hangar owner benefit in light of the current market.
65

66 Boardmember AbuHaidar advocated a rates and leases charges policy document. He asked if
67 this would this be a potential product of the analysis. Boardmember Hansen asked for
68 clarification on whether the consultant would be gathering information for the Board to put a
69 standardized packet together or whether the consultant would do this. Anderson answered that
70 he would anticipate that the consultant would help the City understand what the appropriate fees
71 and charges are warranted at this Airport and from that he would probably expect the Board to
72 come up with a final recommendation for City Council approval. He suggested changing the
73 language to say:
74

- 75 • Evaluate the current hangar agreement and make recommendations for modifications to
76 existing lease rates for the purpose of developing a rates and charges document to
77 maximize City/Hangar owner benefit in light of the current market.
78

79 Brief discussion after this.
80

81 Boardmember AbuHaidar motioned to adjust the verbiage to include the verbiage suggested by
82 Mark (Anderson) which was to achieve a rates and charges policy that has a potential end
83 product of what their contract is due. Boardmember Melville seconded the motion. Voting Aye:
84 Boardmembers McFee, Rowland, Hansen, AbuHaidar, and Melville. Voting Nay: none. The
85 motion passed.

86

87 Mark Anderson indicated he proposed to take this to the City Council on February 21st and if
88 there were any members who would be so inclined to attend this meeting to answer any
89 questions the Council might have; this would be appreciated.

90

91 **Item 3** **Review of Proposed Terminal Area Development Plan Drawings and Review**
92 **of Comments Received from Airport Users**

93

94 Mark Anderson explained that the terminal area drawings reflect the changes that were discussed
95 at the previous Airport Advisory Board meeting. Changes made at the last meeting had been
96 moving the 100 x 100 hangar potentially to be constructed south of the existing 100 x 100
97 hangars and moving the helipads further back to where they wouldn't be an obstruction to a
98 CII/DII category airport. The final modification had been to the fuel storage location.

99

100 The bulk fuel location was discussed. Justin Pietz of Armstrong Consultants answered questions
101 and presented information. He indicated problems with this location for the bulk fuel location
102 was there is too much grade and not a lot of room; a separation of 50 feet from fuel farm to
103 structures is necessary. He also explained that the FAA does not like vehicular traffic and
104 aircraft traffic mixing and this would be an issue at the point of access for the SRE Building if
105 tanker trucks are using this access point. There was discussion of modifying the plans at the gate
106 at the far end by bringing the fence around and having it come in between the hangars and
107 adjacent there would be public access; there will be have a pedestrian gate access and there may
108 be a vehicle gate access onto that ultimate apron. Anderson explained that one of the things they
109 had asked Mr. Pietz to incorporate into the drawings was some taxilanes to connect from the
110 western apron area back to the taxiway. He has added two of these back from the apron to
111 access the taxiway. Pietz commented that this would provide adequate circulation here.

112

113 Boardmember AbuHaidar asked if a hangar, possibly 120' x 120', would fit in the old ramp area
114 adjacent to the current FBO. Pietz indicated they hadn't depicted this but it was a possibility;
115 there was flexibility in this and that adjustment could be made.

116

117 Justin Pietz then explained the process of the getting the drawings ready for final, about the
118 terminal area drawing which would go on file with the FAA as the Airport Layout Plan Drawing
119 Set which is the vehicle for making projects grant eligible from the FAA. He indicated that just
120 because something is shown in the drawings does not mean it is set in stone; it is more to set a
121 vision for the Airport so everyone knows where it is going so that you are not shooting from the
122 hip when doing future projects and get a result that makes sense.

123

124 Chairman Rowland read Brandon Wolsey's written response out loud at this time. Wolsey had
125 wanted to know if there would be a place to park glider trailers. Boardmember AbuHaidar
126 voiced that he thought the other large issue was the self-service fuel farm. He thought this would
127 be a traffic issue and wondered whether this would work from an operation standpoint.

128 Extensive discussion ensued on a location to place a glider storage area / glider staging area, and
129 a location to place the self-storage fuel farm. Justin Pietz discussed summer peak times for jets
130 and gliders and indicated he thought the two uses should be separated. He explained that for the
131 purposes of these drawings it was most important to show intent to build a hangar; the drawings
132 show the glider storage area as paved. He explained that if the City ever decides to submit a

133 grant it is shown as paved; the option is still there to keep it more open and keep gliders in this
134 location, and the FAA is not really going to care about that. He thought it would be more
135 important to show the intent as far as paving and not necessarily where the gliders will be placed.
136 He summarized that the plans are okay as far as the glider storage area is concerned. The fuel-
137 farm was a separate matter and this was discussed further particularly whether to leave the self-
138 storage fuel farm on the plans or to take it off the plans as it is not a requirement to have a self-
139 storage fuel farm. Chairman Rowland asked for the Boardmembers' thoughts.

140

141 Boardmember Melville: leave the self-storage fuel farm where it is

142 Boardmember AbuHaidar: leave it open and don't show it

143 Boardmember McFee: agreed with Boardmember AbuHaidar

144 Boardmember Hansen: thought also to take it off the drawings

145

146 Chairman Rowland asked for comments from members of the public in attendance.

147

148 Dave Guerrell stated he was a user of the Airport and that he was also representing the
149 Commemorative Air Force position with regard to the changes. He indicated that the fuel farm
150 issue got his attention because clearly removed from the rest of the area it is inconvenient. He
151 indicated that you rarely would find an airport that would have a sitting area like that. In terms
152 of access to flight planning, access to toilets, refreshments, etc., almost no one could be choosing
153 to be that far removed from those facilities.

154

155 Regarding the Commemorative Air Force, Guerrell indicated they had some strong concerns
156 about the plan as shown there relative to access to the hangar, the work that they have done, the
157 thousands of dollars that have been contributed to landscaping for the hangar area for the CAF
158 on the west end, and the potential they had understood when the hangar was initially built to
159 have the ability to expand onto the pad to the south/southeast. He continued that he was not sure
160 if this particular plan had any awareness of those agreements and the amount of work that has
161 gone into the CAF Hangar and so they would strongly look for the opportunity to provide input
162 as to how that would impact their facility going in on this piece of property. Mr. Guerrell
163 provided the audience with information on the CAF's operations and stressed the necessity of
164 accessibility and visibility.

165

166 Boardmember Hansen clarified the plans indicating that the area Mr. Guerrell thought was ramp
167 was actually parking area for the proposed movement of the FBO Building and road access to it.
168 Justin Pietz explained that this was to remain public and their intent was not to put a gate there.
169 Guerrell expressed that this was consistent with their plans. Boardmember Hansen commented
170 this might actually improve the situation because it would be a lot easier to plow.

171

172 Jim Church, President of the EAA Chapter 1519 based at the Heber Airport spoke. He explained
173 that EAA stands for Experimental Aircraft Association. This EAA Chapter has 53 members; he
174 indicated that he thought that perhaps they need more input into the Airport Advisory Board. He
175 asked "What is the impetus for this expansion plan, Number 1; and Number 2 what were the
176 funds to commission it?" Mark Anderson addressed his comments. Church suggested that to
177 save some money don't bother with the designated helipad as most helicopter pilots like to be
178 close to the FBO. From personal standpoint he indicated he would like to see self-fuel; he did
179 not see that go away.

180
181 Chairman Rowland indicated it was time for the open house. Boardmember Melville motioned
182 to close the regular meeting. Boardmember Hansen seconded the motion. Voting Aye:
183 Boardmembers McFee, Rowland, Hansen, AbuHaidar, and Melville. Voting Nay: None. The
184 motion passed. The regular meeting adjourned at 5:03 p.m.

185
186 Mark Anderson explained to the public that after this open house the Airport Advisory Board
187 will take into consideration the comments that they receive and ultimately finalize a drawing that
188 they would make recommendation to City Council to adopt to amend the Master Plan/Airport
189 Layout Plan (ALP), and there will be a public hearing at the City Council level as well. He
190 further explained that at the City Council's public hearing they will be welcome to express their
191 comments of support or concern with what is being proposed. He noted that this is not their only
192 opportunity to comment on this if they feel the Board is not going in a direction that is best for
193 the Airport.

194
195 **5:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.**

196
197 **Open House – Justin Pietz - Armstrong Consulting –Public Review of the**
198 **Proposed Terminal Area Development Plan Drawings and Public Input**
199 **Period**

200
201 Chairman Rowland turned the time over to Justin Pietz of Armstrong Consultants to review,
202 present information, and to answer questions on the Terminal Area Development Plan Drawings.

203
204 Justin Pietz of Armstrong Consultants introduced himself. He is the Planning Manager at
205 Armstrong Consultants and is also a principal in the firm. He explained that they were hired by
206 the City to put together an update to the Terminal Area Drawing (TAD) and then explained what
207 the TAD was and how it works. He explained that when they got involved with this they had
208 some items they really wanted to talk about when discussing the terminal area:

- 209
210 1. Hanger expansion; big and small,
211 2. Apron expansion for both large and small aircraft,
212 3. Bulk fuel storage for the FBO as well as self-serve fueling for a lot of the small piston
213 driven airplanes,
214 4. Access to the hangars; separating vehicular and airplane traffic so vehicles do not drive
215 down taxiways and taxilanes to avoid incursions between the two,
216 5. Access gates / locations, and
217 6. Glider storage / glider staging areas in the summer

218
219 After the City approves the Terminal Area Drawing the next step is taking the TAD and show
220 them on the Airport Layout Plan which the FAA will review. The FAA will look at the drawings
221 from an airspace standpoint and make sure that the drawings aren't showing anything that is
222 going to encroach upon any of those required setbacks from the runway. They also looked at the
223 long term C&D category runway location just so that they are not planning anything that would
224 have to be removed in the long term. Pietz also spoke about the Capital Improvement Plan, the
225 FAA funding process and commented that input is valuable.

226
227 At this time the public began asking questions which Justin Pietz answered.

228
229 Optional locations for the fuel farm were pointed out. One gentleman indicated he supported Jim
230 Church's idea to take out the plan for helipads and put the fuel farm there. A second suggestion
231 was to move the helipads down by the designation for the new FBO. Regarding this suggestion
232 Beth Schneider pointed out concerns with this area would be taxi traffic, back taxi traffic, and if
233 the gliders are going to be down in that end there would be that movement toward Alpha 2
234 assuming that was still going to be that glider operation point.

235
236 There was a question regarding a location for small hangars which Mark Anderson answered,
237 there were 30 hangars that could be built. There was a question on whether the purposes of the
238 drawings were for Airport C and D certification. Pietz replied that the purpose of this was not to
239 address C and D configuration; they want to make sure that this plan did not have anything that
240 would have a negative or adverse impact on if that ever happens, if this does or does not happen
241 this isn't going to cause a problem that is going to encroach upon them. The gentleman asked if
242 this is in the long range plans of any safety certification or whether this was too far down the
243 road.

244
245 Mark Anderson answered that this was not in current airport layout plan; the city anticipates
246 getting funding for an update to the ALP in 2015 and there will probably be lots of discussion
247 about that. He indicated it is clear that the FAA and UDOT Aeronautics support that concept
248 and are willing to earmark funds that would start that progression as early as 2019 with an
249 environmental assessment and acquisition construction in 2021/2022 approximately. It would be
250 a 10 year process to get there. It would not be determined whether this is a direction the City
251 thinks is the best interest to go until after the Airport Layout Plan is updated in 2015. Discussion
252 regarding what would happen to hangar row; which in this scenario would be removal.

253
254 The 11 x 17 Terminal Area Drawings were passed out to the public to view. The demarcation
255 line shown on drawings was explained. The Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) was explained in
256 detail to those in attendance. Mark Anderson pointed out upcoming projects that would impact
257 the Airport and the apron rehabilitation was explained. Anderson indicated that the Airport will
258 likely be closed for upwards of a month. Discussion on combination of rehabilitation of apron
259 and runway and discussion on plans for the beacon, vault, and lights.

260
261 The public asked more questions; which were addressed. These questions included:

- 262
- 263 • The distance of the fuel pit from the end of the runway
 - 264 • The Environmental Assessment
 - 265 • Movement of the AWOS
 - 266 • The area over the old landfill
 - 267 • Landing fees, general fund, and grant matches
- 268

269 Paul Boyer indicated he would prefer the City think of them as partners, not as a user, and as
270 partner they have specific needs including some resolution of different items over the years such
271 as lease items. Anderson related discussion they'd had regarding to the City hiring a consultant
272 for examination of leases. He explained that the reason for this was they wanted to develop a set
273 of criteria that could be universally used on the Airport. Discussion earlier in the meeting
274 relating to this item and the pertaining motion was recapitulated for Mr. Boyer. The timeframe

275 for action on this issue was summarized; it was being expedited and will be resolved. Question
276 from the public as to whether they would have the opportunity to work with this consultant as
277 Paul (Boyer) was asking. Chairman Rowland answered that anytime they meet as a Board is an
278 open meeting and they are more than welcome to come and to participate in the meeting. The
279 gentleman indicated he wanted the airport partners to be able to meet with the consultant.
280 Discussion on this process. Chairman Rowland asked what as partners they wanted. Beth
281 Schneider indicated that they would be hard-pressed to miss any of these meetings but would be
282 hard pressed if they don't know about them. She indicated that sometimes that communication
283 had not been very good, but that it had been good for this meeting. Boardmember Hansen asked
284 if they were okay providing the consultants doing the study with their contact information; this
285 way the partners would be able to provide their input. Beth Schneider was okay with this.
286 Chairman Rowland noted the comment form that was being passed out that evening; the partners
287 were asked to provide email addresses and the City would notify them with future solicitations.
288
289 There was a comment from the public for a request for the development of a grass landing strip.
290
291 Chairman Rowland thanked those in attendance for their input. The meeting adjourned at 5:53
292 p.m.

DRAFT- Unapproved Minutes

Memo

To: Airport Advisory Board
From: Mark K. Anderson
CC: Mayor & Council
Date: 3/7/2013
Re: March 13, 2013 - Agenda Items

4:00 P.M.

Airport Manager Report: Enclosed is the monthly Airport Manager's report that has been prepared by Terry Loboschefsky. Terry will be on vacation and not be able to attend the meeting. I may be able to answer any questions the Board has regarding the report.

Final Review of Terminal Area Development Plan Drawings and Review of Comments received from the February 13, 2013 Open House: Based on the comments received at the open house, Justin Pietz from Armstrong Consulting made revisions to the Terminal Area Drawings. Karen Tozier has also summarized the comments that were received from airport users for the Board. (See enclosed drawings and comments) The Board should review the comments and the proposed drawings to determine if any additional changes should be made before the drawings are submitted to the FAA for comments and approval by the City Council.

Update on RFP for Consultant Services: Since the Board last met, the City Council approved the request to engage a consultant. Attached is a copy of the RFP that has been sent out to five different consulting groups. The Board should discuss dates that the RFP's are reviewed and when interviews would be conducted. It is anticipated that any interested members of the City Council would be invited to participate in the selection process as well. The Board may want to reschedule their April meeting to an earlier date, rather than wait until April 10th to review the proposals.

Discuss placing Airport Advisory Board Meeting Minutes, Information Packets, and Meeting Audio on the Heber City Website: Chairman Rowland has asked that this item be placed on the agenda for discussion.

Other Items as Needed:

Heber City Airport – Russ McDonald Field

Airport Manager's Report February 2013

1. Existing Grants/Projects

- AIP #24 Beacon project: Concrete foundation poured 1/16/13. Installation of new tilt-down beacon tower completed 3/7/13. Demolition of existing beacon tower scheduled 3/8/13.
- RFP for hanger lease study has been approved by City and released for bid

2. Upcoming Projects

- ADP/CIP review and update to include *design* of runway 4/22 rehabilitation and possible apron rehabilitation in 2013
- Terminal Area Plan presented for public input 2/13/13. Comment period open until March 1st. Armstrong Consultants (ACI) to submit final version to FAA for review.
- UAOA Conference in St George 3/14/13 will not be attended (schedule conflict).

3. Airport Condition

- 1 snow removal operation completed in February for a total of 8 ops.
- Considerable flight ops occurred during the President's Day holiday period
- Pavement issues on approach end of RW4. ACI has been advised. May need temporary repair until RW rehabilitation project.
- Wildlife – Dog on field caught and now up for adoption by Animal Shelter. As a result of dog chase, gap in fence where deer were getting in has been located and closed.
- North webcam on OK3Air's main hanger being repaired by the NWS.
- Online NOTAM filing by AP Mgr now authorized
- AWOS – OK
- Taxiway lights at turnoffs A4 thru A7 (PO runway lighting circuit) non-operational, 21 lights total. Lighted Navaid signs A1, A2 & A4 non-operational. \$500 to repair (HBE).
- Runway lights operational
- Segmented circle OK
- PAPI Lights operational
- Rotating beacon to be replaced and tested, windsock & lights operational

4. Discussion Topics

- Ramp access road spur between hanger #1 (hanger row) and OK3Air Maintenance hangar needs some means of vehicle control. Airport users are driving between parked A/C. This has raised concern from A/C operators as well as OK3Air. Currently an "Authorized Vehicles Only" sign is in place, blocking spur.