

**GRAND COUNTY AIRPORT BOARD
REGULAR MEETING
MINUTES**

**December 2, 2024 @ 4:00 p.m.
Grand County Commission Chambers, 125 E. Center Street
Moab, UT 84532**

A. Call to Order

1. The meeting was called to order at 4:03 p.m.
2. Members present: Jody Patterson, Bill Hawley, Bill Winfield (County Rep.), Alex Borichevsky (Travel Council Rep.), Randy Martin, and Jason Taylor (Moab City Rep.). Laurel Catto participated on Zoom. Airport Director Tammy Howland was also present.
3. Members not present: Rachel Paxman.
4. Others present: Director's Assistant Tara Collins, Judd Hill of Lochner (formerly Armstrong), Rea Erwin (ARFF).

B. General Business

1. Approve minutes of November 4, 2024 (Regular meeting)
Tara asked about the highlighted question on page 3. Tammy said the phrase should be "NFPA". **Motion** by Randy to approve the minutes with the one correction, seconded by Alex, approved 5-0.

C. Citizens to be Heard - None.

D. Discussion Items:

1. Building codes regarding hangar spacing - Grand County Building Inspector Bill Hulse and Moab Valley Fire Inspector Brandon McGuffee.

Tammy said typically in the past, the spacing between our hangars has been 10 or 20 feet, depending on whether there is a propane tank there or not. That was based on them being designated as a commercial building. But there are actually some different codes and standards that apply to hangars housing aircraft. So we need to decide what spacing we want moving forward. Tammy handed out a few pages copied from the NFPA (National Fire Protection Association). Hulse said the NFPA deals with hangars from a fire standpoint. In the past, his predecessor treated hangars as an S-1 (Storage-1) building. But now, a footnote in the chart refers to another section that deals with aircraft-related occupancies. Hulse said generally, once you get 10 feet from the building, you're considered safe, and don't need any special constructions. If you go less than 10 feet, you would have to use rated construction and limit your openings. But, he said, section 5.5 says that for S-1 occupancies, anything less than 30 feet is required to have a 2-hour fire-rated wall. Which is different from any other occupancy or any other building classification.

But a metal building is difficult to fire-rate. Typically you would see a concrete or CMU wall, with a metal building frame coming off of that. So, you would need 60

feet between buildings, each building having 30 feet from its wall to the imaginary line (in the case of no property line). And for S-2 aircraft hangars, there's no middle ground, like a 1-hour fire-rated wall, for less than 30 feet but more than 10 feet. Anything less than 30 feet requires a 2-hour fire-rated wall. Tammy said currently the lease line is the outline of the building, so based on whatever that fire-rated wall is, and the one going in next to it, will determine what spacing is needed. Hulse said fire sprinklers gets you area [square footage], but it does not get you less fire-separation spacing between buildings. Hulse said the existing hangars that don't meet code are considered "legal non-conforming".

Tammy said we need to address this in our Minimum Standards. Because having 60 feet between hangars is not good for the Airport. We need to decide what we will require of hangars moving forward. Bill W. asked about sheetrock on the building walls. Hulse said that was possible, you'd have to add purlins and do 2 layers inside and 2 layers outside of the sheetrock. Hulse said the front of the hangar is not affected. Bill W. said: so you'd have to fire-wall 3 sides of the building. Bill W. said that this might cause people to choose a building site further away from existing hangars, so they don't have to incur the expense of all those fire-walls now, and then the effect will be that the extra cost of fire-walls will be pushed onto the next builder. Jody suggested that if we put in the Minimum Standards that builders must put in those fire walls, regardless of location, that would prevent that issue from happening. Tammy wants to avoid letting people build further away from existing hangars (except the one she's made an exception for), because then it starts limiting what can go in between.

Bill W. thought the board should decide on what the minimum spacing between hangars should be, and then stick with it, and then fire-walls will become mandatory. Bill H. suggested that we say 20 feet, maybe, between hangars, and then say that builders also have to conform to NFPA standards. That way, as the NFPA changes, we're always covered. Tammy and Randy agreed. Jody said 60 feet is too much wasted space. Judd said other airports are typically doing 5-25 feet between hangars. At St. George, big corporate hangars are 25 feet apart, smaller GA hangars are usually 10 feet. Bill W. wondered how they get around the code. Tammy said that codes are very jurisdictional. Judd said he did not know of any airport that has 60 foot spacing.

Hulse had an idea: if we required every new hangar to build a fire-wall only on the south wall, then the next hangar could be 30 feet away, and they would need a fire-wall only on their south wall, and so on.

Judd and Bill W. thought that if we're going to require a fire-wall for less than 60-foot spacing anyway, we might want to go even closer than 20 feet, and maximize our use of airport land. But Bill H. thought that 20 feet allows some working space between them, and that anything less than 20 feet gets to be hard for lifts and tractors, etc. Judd said the current hangars are 20 feet spacing, on the sides and back.

Jody said that at least in the area of T-hangars, we might want to put them closer together. Tammy mentioned that T-hangars were supposed to be the affordable option for some people, so, she wondered if putting the fire-wall requirement on them, is it even still affordable?

E. Action Items: Discussion and Consideration (some for Recommendation to County Commission with approvals subject to limitation):

1. Choose area for T-Hangars (a subject stemming from prior language revisions for minimum lease parcel size & hangar size in Minimum Standards).

Tammy said there was a request for some drawings for this. She explained that to maximize space, the T-hangar doors would rotate in which direction they faced. So to designate an area, they would need to have taxilanes on both sides of that row of hangars. Judd went to the digital display of the ALP, and pointed out the area designated for nested T-hangars. Judd said that while hangar 136 has 7 T-hangars, you could potentially have 30 in there. Jody liked the area that Judd pointed out. Bill H. said T-hangars are a better use of space, and Tammy agreed.

Tammy proposed a new way to measure the lease parcel size, to calculate for the minimum lease parcel size requirement. Judd said, as it is now, the lease size is the footprint of the building, which is not consistent with a T-hangar because it's the shape of a 'T'. So, he said, what Tammy came up with is that, instead of the footprint of the hangar, the parcel size should be the longest width dimension by the longest depth dimension; that that equals the square footage. Judd questioned, for example with Ben Byrd's hangar with the wings, whether we should include the measurement of the open doors. Because building a hangar next to that, you would need to consider and incorporate the width of those open doors. Tammy agreed, saying that the open doors make that area unusable. Bill H. thought Tammy's proposed measuring was a good idea, but also wondered if they should just go back to the original 2,000 sq.ft. minimum.

Jody asked what was the smallest possible T-hangar. Judd said they are designed for those small aircraft. Tammy thought the most recent small T-hangar proposed was 60' by 40', and with the length of the open doors, and 40 feet deep, that's 2,400 square feet. Judd said if you put a stand-alone T-hangar in a row of nested T-hangars, you have now forced the next hangar builder to build the exact same size hangar. He explained that a smaller, stand-alone T-hangar is treated like a box hangar. Bill H. suggested we leave the 2,000 sq.ft. minimum as it is, and then we just have to designate an area for stand-alone T-hangars. There was discussion about the consistency of the fronts of box hangars being more important than the depths. They looked at the south-most 18 parcel to designate for stand-alone T-hangars.

Motion by Bill H. to designate the south-most 18 parcel as the area for stand-alone T-hangars, and work our way south, seconded by Randy, approved 5-0.

A different motion by Bill H. to take Tammy's suggestion and use the maximum width and maximum depth to measure square footage (not including the open doors), and keep the 2,000 square foot minimum hangar size requirement. Seconded by Jason, approved 5-0.

2. Review proposals to RFQs for Planner-of-Record and for Engineer-of-Record, and recommend an applicant to the County Commission.

Tammy said we received 2 proposals for Engineering, one from Lochner, one from VBFA. She reviewed VBFA's qualifications, and thought most of their experience was with buildings. In response to a question about cost, she said for this process, there is 0 cost. They get paid when we do projects. They will give us their cost estimate, and then those go out for an independent fee estimate, and the fee estimator will determine whether their proposed cost is within 10% of the FAA fee allowed. So, the FAA accounts for their planning & engineering services in our AIP grant money. Judd said yes, their payment is constrained by what the FAA will allow, so this process of choosing a consultant company is qualification-based, not cost-based.

Tammy had reached out to some other firms for these RFQs, firms that had approached her with interest in the past, and Bill W. had also been approached, and she did not receive any other SOQs, which surprised her. Tammy said we'd been with Lochner for 38 years, and have had a good experience with them. Jody suggested going through and evaluating the 2 firms. Jason thought this criteria hard to judge, Bill W. agreed that to go through and score them would be hard. Jody said he didn't see a lot of civil engineering with VBFA. Tammy said that VBFA had listed that they'd done some projects in Moab.

Motion by Jason to recommend contracting with Lochner for Airport Planning services, seconded by Randy, approved 6-0.

Motion by Jason to recommend contracting with Lochner for Airport Engineering services, seconded by Randy, approved 6-0.

3. Land Gate - is there interest to contract with them for solar?

Bill H. suggested that it go through attorney review, and Commission review, before we propose contracting with them. Tammy said this firm is like a real estate agency, and at no cost to us, they put our available property out there, and then any investors who are interested can contact us. Bill W. agreed it should wait a bit because there will be a new Commission next year, and also it needs some review and research. He thought that the correct avenue would be to give it to the new Commission Administrator, and then it can go before the Commission as a discussion item.

Motion by Bill H. to refer it to the County Commission and the County Attorney for their review, seconded by Randy, approved 6-0.

F. Discussion Items:

1. 2025 Proposed Airport Budget (& 2024 Budget details)

Tammy said this year County revenues have been down. She showed on her spreadsheet what she had requested for 2025 budget, after she and the Budget Advisory Board had gone through and made some cuts. She showed what has been spent so far in 2024.

She said that because of all the CARES and CRSA and ARPA grants, that for the last four years, the majority of our revenues for the Airport have been unspent. So the Airport is sitting on \$1.3 million in revenue that can only be spent on the Airport. For the first time, the Airport budget is in the black. So if you want to say that that money has to go toward projects, then you have to put that in writing, or the FAA is going to say: why do you have excess revenue in your account? The grant money has been paying for our operating budget expenses, so our actual Airport revenue is unspent. That \$1.3 million would cover all of our matching costs, the operating budget, including payroll, and our capital building projects that were requested.

That \$1.3M doesn't include our 2024 revenues, which are about \$402,000, and which will roll over to cover 2025 expenses. Tammy told Bill W. that that helps other departments as well, with the General Fund. Bill W. took a hard copy, so he could mention it in his Commissioner report.

Tammy said we need security cameras, and there are some grants that cover that, but the terminal foundation and roof are higher priorities, as well as the water pump. There are huge gaps under the terminal walls. Alex asked if the terminal was sitting on expansive soils, and Tammy said emphatically: oh yes. Judd said the entrance road is on the FAA Capital Improvement list for 2026.

2. Project Reports

- a. Taxiway A1 Relocation - Construction to start in the spring.
- b. Drive through gate replacement (FEMA Grant) - waiting on the gate.
Tammy will be sending emails to all the tenants so they can coordinate access while the gate is being installed.

G. Reports:

1. Airport Monthly Data Report & Virtower Data - November 2024
2. Any questions on Director's Report for November 2024
3. County Commission - Bill W. was gone by then.
4. City of Moab - Jason said that Mill Creek Drive is paved. They will have a big retreat in January. There was discussion about Uranium Drive.
5. Travel Council - Alex said they submitted their budget to the Commission. They are trying to get some money for EMS, for an ambulance, and for the Rec. Center.
6. Solar Committee
7. Other reports for Airport Board

H. Future Considerations

Bill H. said he wanted digital advertising for the terminal put on the January AB agenda. Jody said yes, we're letting Lions Back do its thing while we come up with our standards for what's going to be required. So we need a discussion.

Randy asked about the \$25,000 advertising money offered by Contour. Tammy said she met with Contour, and they will pay a third party. I.e. they don't necessarily have to do the reimbursement method. She met with Mick and Allison, and they've put together a project with Travel Zoo, that will reach about 1.5 million people. And we have until February to spend the 2024 money.

There was discussion about the EAS contract. Tammy said it will expire in September, 2026. She said the Board will want to discuss EAS and AEAS, and a 121 versus a 135 carrier. Tara will put it on the May, 2026 agenda.

I. Closed Session, if necessary

J. Adjourn - 5:55 p.m.