

SUMMARY MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE COTTONWOOD AIRPORT COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF COTTONWOOD, ARIZONA, HELD SEPTEMBER 16, 2010 AT THE COTTONWOOD COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 826 NORTH MAIN STREET, COTTONWOOD, ARIZONA.

Chairman Gradijan called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m.

Roll call was taken as follows:

Commission Members Present

Aleck Gradijan, Chairman
Jim Moeny, Vice-Chairman
Marv Lamer, Commission Member
Doug Palmquist, Commission Member
Bill Tinnin, Commission Member

Commission Members Absent

Staff Members Present

Tim Costello, Public Works Director
Dan Lueder, Development Services General Manager
Barb Herrick, Administrative Coordinator

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG

Chairman Gradijan led the Pledge of Allegiance.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Chairman Gradijan asked if there were any comments regarding the minutes of the Airport Commission. There were no comments and a motion was made by Mr. Moeny to approve the minutes. The motion was seconded by Mr. Palmquist. The vote was in favor of the motion.

BRIEF SUMMARY OF CURRENT EVENTS

Mr. Costello indicated that he had no current events to share at this time and any information will be covered in agenda items.

CALL TO THE PUBLIC

Mr. Karl Priggee of Red Rock Skydiving, Cottonwood AZ, addressed the commission regarding concerns about the placement of the AWOS at the airport. Mr. Priggee noted that he was informed by Mr. Costello of possible locations for the placement of AWOS. He stated that he has talked with the United States Parachute Association and the Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association and they are in agreement that the placement of the AWOS could be an obstruction and hazard to aviation. The FAA has recognized that skydiving and hang gliding are valid and

authorized aviation activities. Therefore the placement of the AWOS should conform to the FAA guidelines concerning obstruction and hazards.

Mr. Costello informed Mr. Priggee that his item will also be covered in an agenda item regarding the capital improvement plan, but we do appreciate the comments.

Mr. Tom Mulcaire addressed the commission and had a couple of items of concern. He wanted to know if the city has quit watering at the airport by the runway, and if so, why. He also wanted to know why the weeds were so high at the airport.

Mr. Priggee also noted that the weeds were out of control, but he did notice that the city had begun to work on them. He stated that the reflectors along the taxiway are hidden by the weeds and ineffective.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Discussion of Monthly Fuel Usage

Mr. Costello referred to the chart and noted that fuel sales were higher than last month and we still have a competitive price.

Update regarding Cottonwood Airfest 2010

Mr. Moeny stated that we are just about a month away and the planning is going well.

Mr. Costello added that we are looking for volunteers for the event that will be held on October 16.

Discussion of the draft Airport Emergency Plan

Mr. Costello stated that a couple of minor items had been changed. He also noted that the Fire Department still needs to make their comments. Even though it is still a draft, it will still be used if the need arises.

Chairman Gradijan added that he felt the document was well written and a great start.

Mr. Priggee asked if the draft Emergency Plan would be disseminated to the tenants so that they can review and make comments. Mr. Gradijan stated that because he is a commercial operator at the airport, we would be happy to receive comments from him.

Mr. Costello noted that he would make the Emergency Plan available to Mr. Priggee.

Discussion and possible action regarding project recommendations for the Airport Capital Improvement Program (ACIP), ADOT and FAA grant programs

Mr. Costello indicated that he added this agenda item again because by the next meeting we will have to have a solid version of the plan for submittal for grants. He went on to say that at the last meeting the project priorities in the plan were discussed and our priorities are the same as presented in the plan.

The top project is the 300 foot extension of Runway 32. One of the qualifying criteria of the grant program is that the project has to be on the ALP (Airport Layout Plan) and it is not at this time. There would also be a required environmental review for the project. Mr. Costello went on to say that our FAA project manager is approaching the project from the standpoint of meeting FAA standards for runway length.

Mr. Gradijan wanted to know what the time line would be for the state grant for the LPV approach.

Mr. Costello stated that he did not know at this time, but he would check into it.

Mr. Palmquist added that previously it was mentioned that there were concerns about extending the runway and having two runway lengths. Is it still a problem?

Mr. Costello stated that it is still an issue until they agree to the 300 foot extension because it is a part of the whole decision.

Mr. Palmquist wanted to know why it would be an issue to have a displaced threshold if the environmental study shows that there is not a problem and the weight-bearing capacity meets the standard.

Mr. Costello's responded to Mr. Palmquist's question by stating that in 2007 we were trying to add this to the ALP and there was resistance then with the displaced threshold, it was not the FAA's preference. Basically, they were saying that it was more complicated.

Mr. Palmquist stated that there are displaced thresholds all over the country, and it needs to be clarified because it does not go along with the rest of country. He also felt that we should challenge them on the issue if the environmental end is not a problem and there is nothing else that comes up as a problem.

Mr. Costello added that at this time, the FAA has not told him anything yet regarding this request. Our project manager has requested that we let him work through the process to get a response. Mr. Costello also stated that the environmental has not been cleared yet, but noise could be an issue.

The second project selected was the AWOS. Mr. Costello stated that at the last meeting other positions were mentioned for location of the AWOS. Mr. Costello said he read a report that was

put together by our engineers regarding different site locations, because we were hoping we could place it on land that we owned instead of having to purchase land. A placement that was considered was near the mid-field windsock. Because the ground is higher there, the 35' antenna would protrude into the airspace 25 feet. The FAA would prefer this area to be clear of obstructions. It was also asked if one could move it westerly to get it away from the runway. This movement would place it in the area that is currently being used as the parachute drop zone. As mentioned earlier by Mr. Priggee, this placement would be a serious obstruction. Mr. Costello went on to say that he would be talking to a private property owner that is in the Master Plan. This property is further south.

Mr. Tinnin asked why the tower is 30 feet tall.

Mr. Costello said that the height is a FAA standard. The anemometer (wind speed and direction instruments) is placed at the top so it can be clear of ground obstructions. The standards also state that it should be set back 125 feet from any building and obstacle height is controlled in a radius of 500 feet around the AWOS.

Mr. Gradijan added that no matter where we put the AWOS, we probably will not get a definitive, accurate reading because we have irregular terrain that affects the runways.

Mr. Palmquist asked Mr. Costello if he had any documentation as to the requirements for the AWOS.

Mr. Costello stated that he had an engineer's report and a circular and he would send it to Mr. Palmquist.

Mr. Priggee addressed the commission and stated that he agrees with Mr. Gradijan regarding the readings obtained from the AWOS.

Mr. Costello referred to the last paragraph of his memo in reference to a new pavement management report that is just coming out. The new report has changed from recommending a seal coat to calling for an overlay on the runway and parallel taxiway. It was suggested that in 2014 a pavement overlay on the runway and parallel taxiway be done. It was suggested that we place this in the five-year plan.

Discussion of enforcement of the Operating Rules regarding the Mooney aircraft (N5800Q) and mobile mechanic services*

Chairman Gradijan stated that this item was discussed a couple of weeks ago in a special meeting of the Airport Commission. He went on to say that we are here to discuss only the two items that are mentioned. Mr. Gradijan asked for comments.

There were no comments from the commission members. Mr. Gradijan asked if there were any comments from the public.

Dennis Bayless, attorney, addressed the commission and stated that he represented Tom Mulcaire. Mr. Bayless stated that he protested that we are discussing this today because it is a violation of the open meeting laws. He stated that: # 1, we have two items listed on the same line item, and that is in violation. #2, there is not proper notice. No one knows what it is that you are discussing, and for that reason you are violating the open meeting law.

Chairman Gradijan asked for direction from Mr. Lueder. He also said that they could contact the Attorney General and state their objections.

Mr. Bayless stated that he was not looking to do that, and he said he was just giving us notice of what he thinks is happening.

Mr. Lueder suggested we table the discussion until we have had time to confer with our city attorney regarding the issue.

Chairman Gradijan asked for a motion to table the item and the motion was made by Mr. Palmquist. A second to the motion was made by Mr. Moeny and the vote was unanimous.

NEW BUSINESS

There was no new business

SET FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

Mr. Lamer stated that he was confused about the "Call to the Public" where we can't give direction and matters that are brought up by the public. He asked to have added to the agenda an update on watering at the airport and weeds. Mr. Lueder noted that he would ask for direction from Mr. Horton regarding this issue.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Moeny made the motion for adjournment. Mr. Tinnin seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous and the meeting was adjourned at 5:36 p.m.