

**GRAND COUNTY AIRPORT BOARD  
REGULAR MEETING  
MINUTES**

**March 3rd, 2025 @ 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 4:00 p.m.
2. Members present: Jody Patterson, Alex Borichevsky (Travel Council Rep.), Rachel Paxman, Randy Martin, Bill Hawley, and Jason Taylor (Moab City Rep.). Commissioner Mike McCurdy sat in for Bill Winfield (County Rep.). Laurel Catto participated on Zoom. Airport Director Tammy Howland was also present.
3. Members not present:
4. Others present: Director's Assistant Tara Collins, Rea Erwin, Howard Trenholme. Judd Hill and Eric Rivera of Lochner. On Zoom were Dan Wheeler and Stephen Stocks.

**B. General Business**

5. Approve minutes of February 3rd, 2025 (Regular meeting) - Not ready.
6. Announcement of the Airport Director's resignation.  
(Recording didn't kick in until the next paragraph).

Alex Borichevsky also announced his resignation from the Board. He said he was happy to keep filling in, and contribute on the marketing stuff. He's just too busy right now.

Bill H. asked if we could have an exit interview with Tammy, about our interactions, her experience with us, and how we could improve. Jody said yes. Tammy thought it would take at least 2 months to hire a new director. Jody said that in the past, the Airport Board Chair has always been on that selection committee, so we want to see if the County Commission is still good with that. He said there's a Resolution that says that there will be a member from the Airport Board on that committee.

**C. Citizens to be Heard - None**

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

1. CNY Airport Advertising Policy revisions made and submitted by the Advertising Subcommittee.  
Tammy said we went over the redlines at the last meeting. Mike McCurdy asked regarding the redlines, if the words "and the Airport Board" were removed? Tammy said yes, and then it was brought to her attention that she missed those words in one other place in the document. Mike said that in Bill W.'s eyes, he would hope that the Airport Board is still involved with the judgment of the final call with the Airport Director, and if not the Airport Board, he would like the Commission Administrator to be able to look at that, along with / or the County

Attorney, to be part of those decisions. Tammy said that the County Attorney is always part of any agreements. Mike said it just said subject to the judgment of the Airport Director alone, it didn't say County Attorney and/or CommAdmin, with that line. Bill H. said he would agree, he thinks there needs to be some oversight, with some checks and balances on what ads are accepted and run. There needs to be something, other than just the Director.

Jody thought that in February we had discussed that overall the discretion would go to the Airport Director, and whatever internal controls they have, like the County Attorney, etc. And that the Board would only become involved if there was some sort of protest against the Director's decision. Other members said "yeah". Mike said, speaking of the appellate board, or, the appellate being the Airport Board, he would like the County Attorney to be moved in with the Airport Board at that point. Or at least written in to be looped in at that point too. He said it's another checks and balances.

Bill H. said the question he had was that it was his assumption when he wrote this that there would be a contract signed with someone who was going to use digital advertising at the Airport, some kind of an agreement put in place. And it was his understanding that that would be brought to the Airport Board as an agreement that we would vote on. Just like any other contract that would be formed with the Airport. Jody said that was not the impression that he had gotten from reading it, it was just that, there would be an agreement that would be going through the Airport, but it would be so standardized that it wouldn't necessarily need to come to the Board every single time. He said if we all of a sudden get 500 advertisers, we're doing nothing but spending hours approving contracts for advertising. If we had the template in place, and the parameters of what's allowable and what's not allowable, the Director's discretion checks it off and signs off, and the County signs off on everything. He said, if there is a conflict or there's a disagreement on what that advertising is or says, and the Director says no, you can't do it, then they can come to the Board. Bill H. asked: When does that happen in the process? Jody said, we don't necessarily have a strict step-by-step process in line yet. But he would probably assume that it would come to our attention when the proponent, whoever wanted to put in the advertising, got denied by the Airport, would come to the Airport Board saying, "Why can't I advertise?"

Bill H. said he was thinking of the opposite direction, where there needs to be some kind of check that says, okay so... Bill H gave a scenario: Let's say we have 10 advertisers and they want to advertise, and we have space for 2. So somebody has to decide which ones we pick. And he understands there may be dates or something, some kind of list. But then if this person or their designee (when he wrote this he added "designee" because it may not be the Director but some advertising group who's making this decision.) And that even makes it worse from the standpoint of no oversight if some designee makes the decision, as opposed to the Director. So he put in the designee thing because he thought, it's going to be hard for the Airport Director to maintain this software or put things in or accept things. There may be some designee watching it, like Loves, or a communications company. So, he thought it would be useful to have someone else, maybe this Board, or an administrative member take a look at it and say

“Yeah, let’s go with it.” He just didn’t want to have it all on the Director or the designee.

Tammy said that all of what Bill H. suggested will clog it down. It will take 2-3 months to get something approved. She gave as an example the shuttle companies: right now, the way it works is, they come in, they provide their documentation, they pay their fee, and their free to operate at the Airport. There are ways to put things in place to keep it from getting so bogged down. Rachel said she remembered that at the last meeting, they had discussed that if the agreement was put in place, and all the checks and balances were there, the Board wouldn’t have to see every single applicant, or decide on each applicant. Rachel said, if they had all their ducks in a row, then the Director can make that decision. There may be limited amount of spaces to advertise, but she’d be surprised if we’d be turning anyone away. She said we should be trying not to micromanage the department Director. Bill H. said, how about just the Administrative person, instead of the Board, then. They can see it immediately. Tammy asked if they were bypassing the Director, and Bill H. and Mike said no: both. Bill H. said maybe the Director would recommend it to the Admin., they’d be the gatekeeper. Jody didn’t see an issue with that. Rachel wondered how long that would take, though, and Bill H. said it would just be an email. Mike said if any form of liability happened, it would flow uphill quickly, to Commission, with the CommAdmin involved, direct communication. He doesn’t want that weight of liability on one person. And, he said, the Commission Administrator will involve the County Attorney.

There was discussion about where in the document to add “and Commission Administrator”. Alex wondered if advertisers would still have the right to appeal to the Airport Board. Bill H. and others thought yes.

**Motion** by Alex to approve the Airport Advertising Policy with the addition of “and Commission Administration” with the Airport Director under #3 Terminal Building. [TC: it also needs to be changed in #1]. Seconded by Jason, approved 7-0.

2. Airport Board Bylaws revisions made and submitted by the Bylaws Subcommittee.

Bill H. said there weren’t any redlines in it that he saw. Tammy said this was the copy after all the redlines, so this is the clean copy, that she sent out [Feb. 27]. Bill H. asked, so this is after the redlines. Tammy nodded. Bill H. said he read it over and he thinks it’s fine. **Motion** by Bill H. to accept it as presented, pending the County Attorney’s review.

Laurel said she didn’t get the redlines, so Jody re-capped the Board’s latest decisions. He said they were changing the voting members, they opened it up to 2 new non-voting members, to hopefully bring in folks from Emery and San Juan County.

Rachel seconded the motion, approved 7-0.

3. Letter to Commission Administrator requesting the Airport Board chair participate in Airport Director Selection, in accordance with resolution 2802 section 3.

Jody said he wanted it in there to make sure that the Commission and the County was aware that there has been precedent set that the Airport Board Chair has been a member of the selection committee and that we would like to continue that tradition in the future, so that when we do hire a new Airport Director, that we'll have a little input into that as well.

Mike said that was fine, he just wanted to point out that Resolution 2802, section 3, no longer has authority. Tammy said that Resolution is on the County website. Mike said, that's another argument to be had. He said Res. 2802 doesn't exist, or carry authority, but just check with the County Attorney. Jody asked Mike if it would be beneficial for the Airport Board to send an official letter to the Commission requesting their participation? Mike said yes, but, as long as it goes to the County Attorney, we're good. Jody said he would write the letter. Jody asked if anyone here did not want the Board to participate?

**Motion** by Bill H. that Jody write the letter, seconded by Randy, approved 7-0.

4. Discuss the current FSO - Airport Board Chair.

Jody said he would like to make sure we're all aware of what's been going on up at the Airport, and how that might be impacting our Airport grant assurances, with our local FBO. This is just discussion, there's no real action. He wanted Tammy to give us a brief run-down of the requirements that we have for the FBO, what's required by the FAA within that matrix, just to make sure that we can keep on top of it, as we go forward, if we need to take any actions on the existing contracts and agreements that we have with the FBO, to make sure that we don't lose as an Airport, any of those FAA assurances. He said the big one was the fueling issue. He asked Tammy to fill us in. Tammy said she doesn't know if she's allowed to, in this venue. Jody rephrased the question. He said, what are the requirements of our existing contracts in relationship to FAA assurances, to make sure that we don't lose them. In other words, he said, what is the Airport supposed to be doing, and monitoring, in pursuit of maintaining those airport assurances.

Tammy said the FAA, in order to stay compliant with grant assurances, they want us to create Minimum Standards. So we've done that. And so, in enforcing our Minimum Standards, therefore, we are staying in compliance with our grant assurances. If we're not enforcing our Minimum Standards and our contracts, there's a potential for an issue coming up with violating those grant assurances. So if a Tenant or an Airport user is in violation of their agreements, in violation of the Minimum Standards or Rules & Regulations, and the Airport does not act on it, then we're now responsible for that. Jody said Okay. Jody said, can you please correct me if I'm wrong, and I'm assuming, if I'm recalling it correctly, that the County's contract with the FBO requires 3 main levels of service that are provided, and those being: fueling, maintenance, and instruction? Tammy said yes, those are all required, as an FSO. Jody said regardless of whoever the . . . (and looked up at the screen). Mike said: Okay, yeah. Alex asked, what is an FSO? Tammy said Full Service Operator. Tammy said, well, in our Minimum Standards, we list out all of the requirements for an FSO, an MSO, an SSO. Jody

said: Yeah, I guess an FBO, it could be anybody at the Airport, operating out of there, commercially, or offering services. The FSO itself can (can't?) be an FBO, but it could be beyond that as well. Randy said: Right, different priorities. Jody said, FBO is the typical pilot jargon, and FSO is probably the Airport jargon. Tammy said: they're kind of synonymous with each other. Mike asked: Are they held to the same standards? Bill H. asked: So is our FSO contractor not doing what they're supposed to be doing? What are we talking about this for? Jody said: Well, we were talking about this because we were informed that the FSO was having difficulties providing fueling services, not only to our Essential Air Service providers, but anybody coming in requiring fuel, other than self-serve. To the point where, again, correct me if I'm wrong, we had to put out NOTAMs to the effect that fuel was not available at the Airport. So overall, that could be keeping potential visitors from coming to the Airport, because they can't get fuel. Bill H. asked: What was Redtail's response? Tammy said: they are now in compliance, they've got enough staff trained. Tammy asked Dan Wheeler if he wanted to speak. Dan said: Yeah, it's our belief we were never out of compliance. Tammy said: You're out of compliance with Minimum Standards. Dan asked: In what regard? Tammy pulled up the Minimum Standards to the Fueling sections. Randy said: \_\_ a simple one: Certificates of Insurance. Do we have those yet? Tammy said: I don't know if I'm allowed to discuss that here.

Stephen Stocks jumped in, he said: I think, if there are particularized questions on some of these, I think it would be a good idea, but, I understand that the Board may want to discuss some of these things. I think generalities, you can discuss what some of the obligations would be. But the County doesn't take a position of . . . , well, essentially the County's not going to go through all the merits of this issue. I think if the Board has concerns and opinions that they want to express, that's great to hear, but from the County's position, we're not going to go into every element of it. That's my recommendation for the County. Now the Board is free to speak its mind, and go through these items that they'd like to go through. But from the County's perspective, that's kind of what our position's going to be.

Bill H. said: So, has someone met with Redtail, and gone through these issues, and talked them out, so we understand where we're all at? Tammy said: I have, I met with Dan. Jason said: If I'm understanding this right, and I don't know what the issues are, there's issues at the Airport, or I should say, there's the perception of issues at the Airport with Redtail, but we can't ask what those issues are? Stephen said: No, you're misstating it. I've said, from the County's perspective. So, the Board can go through and ask questions, but whenever a County, you know how the City Council works, you can't come out and say somebody's deficient on something, without giving proper notice and a hearing. Jason said: I know, I'm just saying, Randy said do they have their Certificates of Insurance? Stephen said: Sure. And Randy can discuss things and chat about those things, but I'm saying the County shouldn't take a position today, on those items. Rachel said: So you asked him [Randy asked Dan]. Randy said: So I asked, but I can't get an answer (chuckling).

Stephen said: Well, you've got somebody from Redtail here. So essentially, from the position of the County, we're not going to litigate this issue in this Board

hearing. Now if you guys say hey, we'd like to see their insurance certificates, hey we'd like to see their fueling logs, hey we'd like to see these things, these are things we're concerned about, then I think it's very proper to say hey, as the Airport Board, we want to make sure these things are in compliance, we want to make sure that these things are addressed, and if they're not, we're going to be very concerned. What is going to be harder for the County to do is say, hey make a decision on whether they're deficient and breaching their contract, because then you're going to make the County say that they're out of compliance, and that's going to trigger issues from Redtail and the County. So I understand that the concern is: are they meeting their expectations? Happy for you guys to list out the things you're concerned about, but the County's not going to make statements that they're in breach of their contract in this setting. Does that make sense? Bill H. said: But unfortunately we don't know what questions to ask. Tammy said: Those were presented to you, those were sent to you in an email as well as to CommAdmin. A couple weeks ago.

Jason said: My question is, is Redtail able to service the Airport? Tammy said: They are now. Jason said: Perfect, let's move on. (Laughter). Jody said: I guess the only thing I would want to add, well I have 2 things, one's a question maybe for Stephen is: what mechanisms does the County have to monitor compliance with the existing contracts and agreements that are in place. Stephen said: So the Airport Director is the person that reviews these things, and then makes action based on what the Airport Director would like to see, in conjunction with the County Administrative office. Now if it raises to the level of deficiency, then that issue is going to be brought before the Commission, and the Commission indicates to me what I should do, be it litigation etc. But before all of that, we hope that we can have a meeting with Redtail. I can state that we did have a meeting with Redtail, we discussed these issues, and my understanding now is that they're compliant with the items. And if you have additional follow-up questions, please, I might have talked around the question, but I want to make sure you understand it.

Jody said: My second question is there seems to have been, the Airport Board received an email from the Airport Director, regarding the issues of fueling that the Airport was having. And there was a limited exchange amongst us in general, with ideas that providing that factual information from the Airport Director to the Airport Board was somehow potentially liable - could result in litigious action somehow. Can we get clarification from you, Stephen, on the type of information that we're allowed to have, even though, it had to be put out on a federal notification board that that was happening, so I don't see where the issues or the incongruencies in the information that was provided to the Airport Board, which we've asked the Airport Director to provide to us. I mean, is there a set of specific information that we're not allowed to get, relating to that? Or how does that play out.

Stephen said: The difficulty that the County wants to make sure is that we're not making statements, um. There was a disagreement. To basically put it, and Dan's on here as well, there was a disagreement about the level of services that were being provided. That disagreement triggered a conversation. After that

conversation, things were addressed and remediated. Regarding information that the Board can have, yeah, the Board can have information, it can request that information, it can get that information. The difficulty is when the County, um, we just want to be very careful on the statements that the County makes, in regards to whether partners are breaching or complying with their contracts. Because if we're stating that they're breaching their contract, that \_ could be actionable, if they believed that they were meeting all the terms of their contract, and then we're putting out a publication that says they're not. That's kind of the hiccups that we get. And that might not be a satisfactory response, but, sometimes we have to kind of walk a tightrope on some of these issues. Jody said: Okay, thank you. Jason said: I think it's super important, especially with Redtail, we work with Redtail. Because I think the County and the community, we're partners with Redtail, and I think every business is having some ups and downs. \_ \_ \_ to support Redtail, it's pretty important, but also making sure that services are met at the Airport. So, trying to find that balance of working with them.

Stephen said: I think one other good thing from the conversation that was had is I think Redtail now understands that there's a strong desire from this Board and from the community to make sure that they're evidencing that they're meeting their expectations, and that they need to document that, they need to communicate. Our hope is that going forward they'll have better communication, we'll have better communication, and that can help avoid some of these headaches in the future. One more thing: if you guys want to ask for documents, if you want to have documents, it's perfectly fine. One of the hard things is triggering - conversations via email, I always encourage my Commission to bcc folks, so people don't create an Open and Public Meetings issue. And then if there are certain documents that you would like, and the County says no, you have the right to follow up with me and say hey why aren't we getting this document? Certain documents are protected, others are not.

#### E. Discussion Items:

1. Repair work to fix terminal foundation and affected interior walls - updates.  
Tammy said (sounded like "Taylor Holt"?) came out and looked at it, and he recommends that we do the water ball test thing for a while and see what's happening with expansion and contraction. He was supposed to send her a report, but she hasn't received it yet. He's with Moab Geo Tech Services. It's the same test they recommended for the MARC. It's something that our staff can do over several months. In the summertime, the gap is bigger, she assumes because there's less moisture.
2. FAA Required Title VI, CPP and DBE - approved by the commission, waiting for Commission Chair signature.  
Tammy said the DBE didn't get signed yet. Jody asked whether the DBE is something the FAA is still requiring. Judd said it's truly unknown whether these federal programs will continue. So we're going under the assumption that they will. The FAA told Judd to proceed with caution because they're not sure with [Trump's] executive orders if the Title VI program is still valid or not.

3. Land Use Code - Airport Limitation District - HB 206 requirements.
  - a. Waiting on County Attorney to bring the land use code into compliance with HB 206.

Tammy asked Stephen about this, he hasn't looked at it yet. Judd said the Santa Monica airport is closing, because it was built in an area that now has houses all around it. Utah, being proactive, said we'll pass a State law to put a protective zoning around airports. So, for the part 77 surfaces, the protective airspace surfaces surrounding an airport, you can't build in there. So each entity has to adopt relevant zoning to protect it. CNY is so isolated already, it's already the most protected in the State. Jody asked if it targeted specific types of developments. He cited the SITLA land by us. Judd said that SITLA land would be in a transition zone. An easy way to look at it is to put a 5,000 foot circle around every runway, and within that zone you want compatible land use: agricultural, light industrial, recreational. You don't want crops that would bring birds, though. We're in good shape for compliance, we just need some language in the land use code.

Tammy asked about easements. Judd said if you have non-compliant places, you can't purchase navigation easements for those. Those are much like utility easements - you're paying to take away the use of the air over a particular piece of property.

4. Discuss county funding for pavement in front of FBO hangars. Should the area where the fuel trucks are parked and the drive through gate be repaired during apron reconstruction? Engineers Estimate - \$54,670.50
  - a. Funding source? Redtail portion for fuel trucks?

Tammy said this estimate does not cover the area where the sinkhole is by the gate, landside. Bill H. asked what happens if we don't do this paving? Tammy said then we have sub-standard paving. Bill H. thought we could use BIL money, he thinks it's an applicable project, as well as for item 5, the Taxilane F paving. Eric said the BIL is another part of the AIP funding system. Taxilanes have come up [higher] on the list, because generally there are a low priority for most airports. Eric said it still has to meet eligibility requirements to use BIL money. Tammy said the available BIL money we have is being used on Taxilane E and G. Judd said FAA money and BIL money are one and the same. AIP money comes from the aviation fund of the U.S., from fuel taxes on airlines. Then a couple years ago they passed the BIL, that allocated 5 billion dollars (1 billion per year) to the FAA. The source of that money is different from AIP.

Judd said the BIL money is more liberal funding, but that is reduced by being a primary commercial service airport. Taxilanes E & G have been deemed public by the FAA, whereas lane F has not. Bill H. asked how we could appeal that. Eric said we could have a meeting with them if we want. But they explicitly said that lane F does not qualify. Judd went through all the BIL funding we are receiving for current projects, which comes to roughly \$5 million, in addition to AIP funding on top of that. Eric said, simply, it's not an issue of BIL funding being available for lane F, it's an issue of eligibility: whether the FAA will approve funding. He has gone back and forth already with our PM at the FAA about

lane F. They've gotten pretty particular about certain things, but he's willing to have another conversation with them. Judd said they could ask for that Thursday at the UAOA Conference. They went over some more money numbers.

Jody said if the FAA won't approve the funding, we're back at looking at CIB. Bill H. said: there's a regulation that if FAA doesn't fund it, that you can use State requirements for road-building or taxilane-building. Several people said "correct". Eric said it wouldn't be practical to tell LeGrand Johnson to use state mix on this, and use FAA mix on the other area, it's not big enough to justify multiple mixes, so there's not really a cost savings. Now, if we put this together and packaged it as an individual project, then you could dumb everything down a little bit. Judd said they do that often, where they design something to state standards. There was more discussion about state standards and FAA standards.

5. Discuss alternative funding options for Taxi lane F - FAA will not fund.  
Engineers Estimate - \$405,308.50
  - a. Funding source?  
See above in #4.
6. Project Reports
  - a. Taxiway A1 Relocation - Construction to start March 10<sup>th</sup>.  
Eric said they had a pre-construction meeting today. They will shut down the runway for the night of March 10, move the threshold upward, re-mark everything in a temporary configuration with new lights, and put barriers up on Alpha 2. It's a 38-day project. We'll set the thresholds back, and then we'll have a new Alpha 1, aligned with the end of the runway. Alpha 1 was awarded, but the apron expansion has not been awarded yet. Those two will likely be paired together with a discretionary grant.
  - b. Ramp expansion and apron reconstruction - late summer/fall.  
Eric said we can't award that bid until we get funding (see above in a.)
  - c. Taxi Lane E, J, G, project can go out for bids right away.
  - d. Contour Airlines advertising - progress on marketing plan.  
Jason said they had an initial meeting. They decided to bring Love Communications in. He said they asked the Moab Office of Tourism (formerly Travel Council) what their recommendations were for getting the biggest bang for our buck. So they are going to talk to Love. They talked to MOOT about maybe getting some matching funds, to make that \$25,000 go a little further. They talked about the banner - discovermoab, some other billboard things, paper ads, including San Juan County, and some social ads. They are meeting again with Love. Rachel said it was a good meeting.
  - e. Loves communications is assisting with creating entrance sign for CNY - possible grant funding available through the state.  
[inadvertently skipped at meeting].

F. Reports:

1. Airport Monthly Data Report & Virtower Data - January 2025
2. Any questions on Director's Report for January 2025

There was discussion about flight schedules. Rachel said starting April 1, we'll have a flight go to Phoenix in the morning, come back to Moab at 2:00, and at 2:50 it will depart for Denver, and then return to Moab at 7:15 p.m. Tammy had discussed with Contour that the late night flight to Moab was not benefitting the community, as much as it was costing everybody. So part of wanting to eliminate that RON (Remain Overnight) was to eliminate that late-night flight. Contour is going to put together a report to address that. And she wants to flip the Phoenix and Denver flights. She wants to narrow down the flight times, so they're not so spread out over the day. Jason said the SkyWest flight times worked really well. Tammy said she had discussed that with Contour, to look at the SkyWest flight times. They also discussed adding some flights. Rachel asked Howard about the train, he said Moab departure time is still 2:30.

They discussed the helicopter incident, the NTSB deemed it an incident. There were no injuries.

3. County Commission - Mike said Bill W. would be back for the next meeting.
4. City of Moab - Jason was in D.C. with the Outfitters, America Outdoors. He said the contract for Kane Creek road work is for 16 months, so we are 13 months into it.
5. Travel Council - They are getting more organized, after the transitions. Alex spoke to the Chair about resigning the Board and getting a replacement.
6. Solar Committee - Bill H. said we have a new Commission and a new Admin. So he hopes to work with Bill W. to reintroduce the solar project, to gather an RFP for it.
7. Other reports for Airport Board

G. Future Considerations

1. SITLA land swap - Mike said they've spoken to San Juan County. The idea is still up in the air, but it's ongoing. This is the 40 acres by the motocross track.
2. Airport water rights transferred from the county.

H. Closed Session, if necessary

I. Adjourn - 5:53 p.m.