

TUOLUMNE COUNTY
AIRPORTS COMMITTEE MEETING
Columbia Elementary School

MINUTES
March 14, 2016

I. WELCOME AND CALL TO ORDER

Meeting was called to order by Chairman Stenger at 6:05 pm.

II. ROLL CALL

John Gray – present
Ed Gregory – present
Steve Martin – absent
Karl Rodefer – present
Jim Stenger – present
Greg Thompson – present
Karl Dambacher - present

County Staff present includes, Benedict Stuth, Airport Manager, Daniel Richards, Deputy County Administrator and Kalah Beckman, Administrative Assistant.

III. PUBLIC FORUM

Janet Gregory says that the Pine Mountain Lake office building needs new paint inside and out and that the planter box out front of the office building needs to be rebuilt. She says that she knows that volunteers will help do the work if the materials are provided by the County. Ed Gregory says that the Density Altitude Indicator at Pine Mountain Lake is smashed and he would like to see about getting it replaced. Mr. Gregory also says that an Obstruction Survey is required for both Columbia and Pine Mountain Lake Airports because IFR approaches for both airports are currently not approved. He says that if people fly to PML and ask for the IFR approach the FAA will not give it because the survey needs to be done. Mr. Gregory also says that the bathrooms in the pilot's lounge are often trashed and they need to be checked more often. Mr. Gregory would also like to announce that the EAA will be holding a Young Eagle Rally at Columbia Airport on April 23, 2016 from 9 am to 12 pm. Mr. Gregory also asks if the draft minutes for the meetings can be sent out sooner.

IV. CONSIDERATION OF APPROVING THE MINUTES FROM THE NOVEMBER 9, 2015 MEETING

Mr. Rodefer moves to approve the minutes from the November 9, 2015 meeting. Mr. Gregory seconds the motion. Motion carries 6-0.

V. CONSIDERATION OF AMENDMENTS TO THE HANGAR AND WAITING LIST POLICY AND RECOMMENDATION TO SEND AMENDMENTS TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS FOR APPROVAL

Mr. Stuth informs the committee that after having the new hangar policy in place since December 2015 the policy has been mostly successful but a few items have come up since the adoption of the new policy that have led the Airport Office to seek amendments to the policy. These amendments address items that were either somehow overlooked during the original drafting of the policy or that need further clarification. The proposed amendments are as follows:

1. Addition of language to Section I, addressing the procedure for the sale of an aircraft by tenants.
 - i. Previous version of Reserve Space Permit had language addressing the procedure of the sale of an aircraft but that language did not get transferred to the new policy. Language being recommended as amendment to the new policy has been reviewed by County Counsel.
2. Clarification on what happens to a person's place on a hangar waiting list if they are offered and accept a hangar. Currently, a person may pay one \$300 deposit and put their name on any or all waiting lists being maintained by the Airports Office. The Airports Office is seeking clarification on whether a person may retain their position on other waiting lists once they have accepted a hangar and if so are they required to pay another deposit to retain their position(s)?
3. Addition of Port-a-port (PAP) Waiting List to Section II Part A.
 - i. The creation of the PAP waiting list was approved by the Airport Committee at the same time that the new hangar policy was adopted and therefore was not included in the language of the original document.

Mr. Stenger opens the item up for discussion, starting with the first amendment, the sale of an aircraft. Mr. Stenger says that the committee had spoken before about there being a ninety (90) day window for a tenant to buy a new aircraft. Mr. Grey moves to approve the amendment. Mr. Rodefer seconds the motion. Mr. Stenger opens the item up for public comment. Jay Carter suggests that a six (6) month deadline to buy a new aircraft is common. Mr. Carter says that it is pretty hard to buy and sell an aircraft in ninety (90)

days. Mr. Carter says that a person will not want to pay rent on an empty hangar if they do not have the intention of buying another aircraft. Mr. Grey amends his motion to approve the amendment to the new policy with the language allowing six (6) months for a tenant to buy a new aircraft. Mr. Rodefer seconds the motion. Motion carries 6-0.

Mr. Stenger moves on to the second amendment, regarding hangar waiting list position. Mr. Rodefer suggests that if a person wants to keep their position on a list their deposit would not be applied toward the hangar rent but would stay in place as a deposit to remain on the waiting list(s). Mr. Stenger asks Mr. Stuth to write up what the committee has just discussed and bring it back to the committee at the next meeting for a vote.

Mr. Stenger moves on to the third amendment, regarding the PAP waiting list. Mr. Rodefer moves to accept the addition of the PAP waiting list to the hangar and waiting list policy. Mr. Gregory seconds the motion. Motion carries 6-0.

VI. DISCUSSION OF ADDITIONAL PROCEDURAL LANGUAGE
PROPOSED TO BE ADDED TO THE HANGAR AND WAITING LIST
POLICY PERTAINING TO REPEAT VIOLATIONS

Mr. Stuth explains to the committee that the new policy has procedures in place to address airport use violations but as the policy is written now, once the tenant has corrected the violation, it goes away and the violation is allowed to be committed repeatedly with no consequences. The Airport Office is recommending the addition of language that would limit the number of violations of the same type that can be committed within a given time period. The Airport Office is looking for a discussion on the language proposed in the item memo or other recommendations. Mr. Rodefer asks if the proposed language has been reviewed by County Counsel. Mr. Stuth says that it has been reviewed by County Counsel. Mr. Grey asks what happens to someone who has repeatedly violated the policy. Mr. Stuth explains that in the language he is proposing, when a permittee reaches two (2) violations of the same type within the given time frame the permittee will automatically receive a Notice & Order, instead of going through the steps of the Notice of Violation and Opportunity to Correct. Mr. Gregory asks if there is a set of violations. Mr. Stuth explains that the violations include having an aircraft in the hangar that is not airworthy, not having an aircraft in the hangar at all, storage of unauthorized items and safety and fire violations. Mr. Stuth asks the committee how many violations should be allowed and in what time period. Mr. Rodefer asks if Mr. Stuth is recommending two (2) violations or three (3) violations before the Notice and Order is issued. Mr. Stuth replies that if a tenant commits three (3) violations, of the same type, within a certain time period, that tenant will be issued a Notice and Order instead of a Notice of Violation and Opportunity to Correct. Mr. Rodefer asks Mr. Stuth to write up the proposed policy changes and send it out to airport tenants for public comment before it is brought back to the committee for a vote. Mr. Rodefer says that he accepts the language as it was proposed to the committee. Mr.

Gregory does not know about the proposed ten (10) year period. Mr. Gregory suggests that the tenants should come up with the time period. Mr. Stuth is given direction by the committee to release the policy amendment to the public for comment as it was proposed to the committee and to bring the comments back to the committee at the next meeting.

VII. STAFF REPORTS

Mr. Stuth reports that the Master Plan Update for Columbia Airport is underway. The Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) for the Master Plan Update has been established and they held their first meeting in February. The PAC will meet three (3) more times in the next eighteen (18) months. Its function is to comment on the information gathered by consultants and provide input on wording for the Master Plan Update. These comments are taken into consideration. The information is then presented at a public workshop and the Airport Committee for comment. Ed Gregory is part of the PAC for the Master Plan Update.

Columbia Airport Taxiway A and B Reconstruction design is 95% complete. The Plans and Specifications for the project will be brought to the Board of Supervisors in April to be accepted and sent out to bid. Currently, the engineers estimate is approximately 1.9 million dollars. It will be funded through a Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) grant, and state and local matching grants. The project will completely reconstruct all of Taxiway B, reconstruct part of Taxiway C and resurface the portion of Taxiway C that is not reconstructed. Mr. Stuth hopes to have bids back in May and start construction in July, and have the project completely finished by September.

Thirty-one (31) individuals have submitted deposits to remain on the Hangar Waiting List at Columbia Airport, which is roughly half of the number of people that were previously on the waiting list. Mr. Stuth explains that if hangars at Columbia Airport continue to turn over at the same rate that they have for the last year, then the wait time for a hangar at Columbia Airport will be about eight (8) years. Mr. Stenger asks Mr. Stuth about the possibility of having new hangars built based on the fact that the Airport now has a list of people willing to put down a deposit for a hangar. Mr. Stenger asks Mr. Stuth what the committee needs to do to expedite the process of getting new hangars built. Mr. Stuth explains that the Airport is currently working with their Airport Consultants, Kimley-Horn on getting a rough order of magnitude cost for building new hangars and t-shades for the airport. Once an estimate has been established the Airport will look at funding options, build a business plan for all of the options and bring it back to the committee. Mr. Stenger asks for a date on which the committee can expect to see the plans. Mr. Stuth explains that the consultants are working on getting the rough order of magnitude costs for free, while at the same time working on the plans for the Taxiway B & C project. Mr. Stuth expects that if there is no delay in the work, the committee might expect to see something by mid-summer or early fall. Mr. Stenger asks when construction could be expected to start. Mr. Stuth replies that it would

depend on the funding mechanism that the County chose to go with. Mr. Stenger asks what he should tell people if they ask when new hangars will be built. Mr. Grey and Mr. Rodefer comment that there is currently not enough information to provide a timeline and that the work with the consultants must be completed before a timeline for construction can be given. Mr. Gregory comments that hangars should be included in the Master Plan Update. Mr. Stenger comments that the current Master Plan included the plans for two (2) new rows of hangars. Mr. Gregory asks if the water issue for new hangar rows was resolved. Mr. Stuth replies that Cal Fire has said that if the airport were to dig a well and install holding tanks they would accept that in lieu of a fire hydrant.

Mr. Stuth says that the Airport will be working on old hangar maintenance, replacing old hangar doors and weatherizing the roofs over the course of the spring and summer. The striping will also be repainted. Janet Gregory asks if there are any plans to do any striping at Pine Mountain Lake. Mr. Stuth replies that there are a number of projects planned for Pine Mountain Lake Airport including re-grading the parking lot and upgrades to the Airport Lobby and bathrooms. Mr. Stuth reports that the Airport is dealing with the night time IFR being closed. He comments that the Airport office was notified by the FAA the day the NOTAMs were posted. The IFR approaches were never surveyed by the FAA. The FAA has to fly the approaches with the VASIs and PAPIs as mitigating factors and verify that there are no obstructions to the approaches. Mr. Stuth states that it is a matter of getting Flight Procedures out to the airport to fly the obstruction surveys at night. Mr. Stuth says that he has been notified that Flight Procedures has said they will be out within the next year and he is pushing them to come sooner. Once the surveys are done, the NOTAMs will be lifted. Airport staff has done a daytime survey.

Mr. Gregory asks if there is a completion date for reinstalling the deer fence at Pine Mountain Lake Airport. Mr. Stuth says all the materials have been purchased and that time just needs to be scheduled for maintenance staff to do the work. Some of the fence has been restrung. Mr. Stuth explains that one of the issues with the deer fence is that so many splices had been done that it wasn't actually stopping deer anymore. Because of this, enough materials had to be purchased to completely restring the fence line to provide enough current to be an effective deterrent for the deer.

Mr. Rodefer asks if there have been any further issues with the lighting at Pine Mountain Lake Airport. Mr. Stuth replies that the Airport office had received one report from an individual regarding issues with the lights coming back on. Airport staff tested the lights and followed up with the individual who said that he had gone back out and tested the lights again and had no problems. Mr. Stuth says that airport staff cleaned all the equipment and tested it all and changed the timer from 15 minutes to 30 minutes to prevent the lights from turning off before a pilot is able to land.

Mr. Stenger asks if the Draft minutes can be distributed sooner. Mr. Stuth says he will check with County Counsel and if they approve he will make that happen.

Mr. Gregory asks about the through-the-fence issue at Pine Mountain Lake. Mr. Stuth says that the access agreements were ready for PML residents to view but the issue had to be put on hold because there are some clauses in the access agreement that made it deficient. In order for the access agreements to have any legal viability the people with deeded access may have to agree to remove some sort of property rights to accept the access agreements, otherwise they would be unenforceable. Mr. Stuth says because of this they are back to square one but are looking into another avenue of getting the agreements through but it still needs to be determined whether or not this option is plausible before it is brought to PML residents. Mr. Gregory asks if the access fees would go towards all taxiways, including private taxiways at PML Airport. Mr. Stuth says that any fees collected would go towards maintenance of the parallel taxiways and runways and the parking aprons and would not include the private taxilanes.

VIII. SET NEXT MEETING DATE AND ADJOURNMENT

The next meeting is set for Monday, April 11, 2016 at 6:00 PM.