GRAND COUNTY AIRPORT BOARD
REGULAR MEETING
MINUTES

February 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: Bill Winfield (County Rep.), Alex Borichevsky (Travel Council Rep.), Rachel Paxman, Randy Martin, and Jason Taylor (Moab City Rep.). Chair Jody Patterson participated on Zoom. Airport Director Tammy Howland was also present.
3. Members not present: Bill Hawley and Laurel Catto.
4. Others present: Director's Assistant Tara Collins and Judd Hill of Lochner. On Zoom was Eric Rivera of Lochner.

B. General Business

5. Approve minutes of January 6th, 2025 (Regular meeting)
Motion by Randy to approve, seconded by Rachel, approved 5-0.

C. Citizens to be Heard - None

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

1. Airport Garage Co. location.

Jody recapped where we left this: Last month it was tabled, so members could think about whether or not they were okay with approving the location move into the existing parking lot area as Prather proposed. Jody is okay with it since the lease says that if they needed to be moved, Prather will cover the cost of moving them. Tammy said he will need a drainage plan, which he complied with for the former location. Tammy spoke with Amy Weiser (Planning), and they worked out the issues she had (ALP, setbacks). Bill W. said the biggest concern is elevation, if we did pave that parking lot in the future, to make sure we're not sticking him in a hole in that location. Judd said that lot was roughly built to grade for drainage from west to east. Also, he said for the FAA, it still needs to have environmental compliance, so a cat-ex (categorical exclusion), and airspace clearance. Tammy said the cat-ex has been done for that spot. They did the 7460 for the previous location, so they'll have to submit another one. Since it's so close to the previous location, she thought another soil test would not be necessary.

Rachel asked if the Planning Department was okay with this location. Tammy said yes, Amy was fine with this proposed location. Rachel **moved** that we should move forward with this plan, then. Randy suggested motion language that we approve the plan as submitted to the Planning Department. Alex seconded the motion. Tammy verified on the map that we are approving it in this orientation - west to east. Approved 5-0.

2. CNY Airport Advertising Policy revisions made and submitted by the Advertising Subcommittee.

   Bill Winfield said that he and Bill Hawley worked on this redline. Tammy said her only concern was there was one section that contradicted another section, the place where it said ads had to be approved by the Airport Board, but then it wasn't changed later in the document. Rachel had a question about that same thing, under general rules. She wondered whether signs and ads had to be approved by both the Airport Board and the Director. Jody said that's the way he read it, and he doesn't think the Board needs to approve the individual ads, as long as these standards are in place and adhered to, although if there's an advertising lease, that would go through the Board. Rachel agreed, saying that as long as they're following the policies, then there's no need for our approvals.

   Tammy found the section 3 where it says "Airport Director and the Airport Board", and said the 'and' could be changed to 'or', if that's what everybody is referring to. Bill W. said that's also in section 1. Tammy pointed out the contradiction in the next paragraph of section 3, where removal of ads is up to the Airport Director only. Rachel suggested to change the word to 'or', or else you just take it out. Tara pointed out that if you make it 'or' then you have the potential of removing the Airport Director's say on it completely. Rachel agreed and said she would just take 'and the Airport Board' out, and just let the Airport Director approve things. Bill W. said you also, if you leave it in, you have the potential if there isn't an Airport Director at that time, then the Board can still move things forward. Randy said: and it gives the advertiser the right to appeal. Jody suggested that we take it out (AB), and then have a standard in there that if there needs to be an appeal based on the Airport Director's decision, then it can come to the Airport Board as an appeal process. Tammy said she looked at dozens of these from other airports, and in all of them the decisions are on the Airport Director. Bill W. repeated that he still thought we need something so if there wasn't an acting Airport Director, they could still move forward. Tammy said there will never not be a Director, even if she's gone, they would put in an interim Director. Bill W. brought up the issue with Lion's Back advertising. Tammy said she thinks the struggle with Lion's Back was that we didn't have any policies, so we were making it up as we went along. Jody asked if the Advertising Subcommittee could go in and revise it into that hierarchical ordering: leave it to the Airport Director, and then if there's an issue, that it can come back to the Board for review.

   Motion by Randy that we take out the "and Airport Board" reference in those couple places in the policy, and then add maybe a paragraph 8, to be titled as "Appeal", allowing the advertiser to appeal to the Airport Board should their initial advertisements be denied by the Airport Director. Seconded by Jason. Randy asked "can you write a couple sentences in that regard?", and Jason answered "Yeah". Randy said then it will be set. Approved 5-0.

   Tammy asked Jody, do we want to bring that back with a clean copy to the next meeting? Jody said yes, we want to see it one last time before we send it to the Commission. Tammy said she would also loop in Stephen on these latest revisions so he can give his review.

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

   Jody's concern is that in going from 7 members to 9 members, that complications might arise from scheduling to get a quorum. Jody suggested to keep the voting membership at 7, but increase the ability of people from San Juan and Emery Counties to participate. On Historic Preservation, they have a seat open for someone from Emery County, but it doesn't necessarily have to be filled. If we open it up, we can expand the areas that can participate, particularly from Spanish Valley and elsewhere. Rachel agreed, and said that 9 is a lot of people to get a quorum. Bill W. thought we should open it up to the other counties, since they rely on our Airport. Jody pointed out that the quorum rule applies only to voting members, so if we opened it up to Emery and San Juan as non-voting members, there wouldn't be a quorum issue. Bill W. thought that would not give them any input, there's no incentive for them to come to a meeting if they don't have any meat in the game. Jason saw the benefit of having these counties represented here, for the air service point of view, but maybe not so much for the garages and Bylaws, etc. Bill W. suggested opening it up as non-voting members, and see if we need to expand on that. He said, then the wording of that redline section would need to be changed. They discussed sending notice of these new openings to County officials at Emery and San Juan.

   Randy said the only other changes in the redline are to Section 2 (Duties of the Board). Jody found the language in 2.a.i. too vague, "projects at the airport" seemed to be a very broad thing, are we going to prioritize daily operations projects, like weeding? Tammy suggested changing that to "capital improvement projects", and Jody said he liked that much better. Bill W. noted the typo in ii.: should be "prioritize".

   Randy questioned the meaning of "recommend and prioritize marketing plans". Does that mean the TCAB is going to join our meetings, or are we going to be getting marketing dollars from TCAB for marketing. Bill W. didn't think there was a financial aspect to it, he thought it meant we would have some idea of what was going to happen as far as marketing the Airport. Tammy saw the benefit in having the Board have a say in marketing, because it's kind of a daunting task for one person to figure out marketing, to have at least a general plan. Bill W. thought the Travel Council would weigh in. Jason pointed out that we just gave the Contour advertising money to TCAB, so it would be nice to have the Airport Board be part of that direction.

   Randy had earlier clarified that we want 5 voting members from Grand County, and 1 non-voting member each from Emery and San Juan. He clarified that we were changing 2.a.i. to "capital improvement projects" and fixing the typo in 2.a.ii. Bill W. said we also need to change #9, the wording for the quorum. **Motion** by Randy to approve the Bylaws as presented with these changes (above), seconded by Rachel, approved 5-0. Tammy asked who would make the revisions, and it was decided that Tara would do so, and bring it back to the Board.

4. Effect of Packet 2 weeks early - Minutes - maybe just send docs.
   Tammy asked if the Board was okay with receiving pertinent documents ahead of time, rather than finalizing the whole agenda/packet 2 weeks in advance. Jody was fine with that, especially for action items to be voted on, so they have more time to review them. Jason and Randy agreed; Jason said he didn't think any board gets documents 2 weeks early. Jody asked if everyone was on board, all members were ok with that.

E. Discussion Items:
   1. Repair work to fix terminal foundation and affected interior walls - updates.
      Tammy shared the soil test with Bill W. No other updates. Jody said that was something they will definitely look at when they all come up to the Airport March 3 for the Board retreat.

   2. FAA Required Title VI, CPP and DBE - approved by the commission and submitted to the FAA.
      Tammy said the Commission did approve that, but she has not received the signed copies. Bill W. said he had signed them. Tammy will ask Alishia. Jody asked about the DBE, given the current federal administration. Judd said he spoke with John Sweeney, the head of planning with the Denver ADO, about that. Last week they had their meeting. He gave his FAA update as: "I don't know." They are very much in limbo. Our engineer is Eric Trinklein with the FAA, who said last week: continue as you are right now, it is an eligible expense to be tied to federal funding, for when the grant application was submitted.

      Bill W. mentioned that there was something coming out of the White House around the EAS program as well. Tammy said yes, EAS and AIP will be affected. Judd agreed, he and Tammy both just received emails about this. Judd said with the federal executive order there was a 90-day suspension, which means no grants until April. Randy asked how this would affect EAS, Tammy said she's waiting to hear on that, she spoke to a DOT rep., who said all funding was stopped. So the money we receive to pay Contour would stop, but since then she's heard that if it's an existing grant, they're still paying them out, still waiting for the official word on that. Randy surmised that our agreement with Contour means the County would be on the hook for those payments. Jody asked if we could stop the flights? Tammy said we would meet with Contour and see what their options and preferences were. Jody thought that without those subsidies the flight prices would skyrocket, Tammy said maybe not if they want to fill their seats. She has not heard from the DOT on this yet.

   3. Land Use Code - Airport Limitation District - HB 206 requirements.
      a. Working with P & Z and County Attorney to bring the land use code into compliance with HB 206.

      Tammy said this was enacted in 2023, but took effect 1/1/2025. She and Amy (P&Z) have reached out to the County Attorney, but no movement on it yet. The current Airport Limitation District is pretty close to what the new requirements are, it just needs some new language. She will update the Board as it moves forward. Bill W. clarified that this was the overlay.

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? Engineer's Estimate - $54,670.50
    a. Leave the pavement as is and hope for the best?
    b. Require Redtail to fund the project?
    c. Seek funding from Grand County?

    Eric at Lochner supplied the expense estimate. Eric said the area where the apron will be reconstructed does not include this area at issue. He said it would be put out to bid as part of the apron reconstruction project, but set aside as a locally-funded bid schedule, so it's up to the County whether to award it or not. With the bulk price along with the other project, it would be a lot cheaper to fund it along with this larger project than on its own. Tammy said this would be a 2026 project. Bill W. asked about the large sinkhole just outside the drive-through gate, Tammy said that hole is not included in this project's boundary, this is just airside. But she said we could look at including that landside hole in this project. It's up to the Board. Eric said he could make another estimate to include the landside hole by the gate.

    Bill W. said we could reach out to see if Redtail would participate. Alex asked if that pavement was crappy because of the fuel trucks and the fuel, Tammy said yes, in that specific spot. Concrete would be better under those trucks. Leaving the pavement as is, is out of the question, but there's nothing in writing that requires Redtail to pay for replacing the pavement. They have incentive to do it now, while we're doing this big project, it would be cheaper. Tammy said some of the cracks in front of those Redtail hangars are really holes. She said that right now that pavement is the oldest on the airport. Jody asked about grants, Tammy said CIB is always the first that comes to mind. Bill W. thought we should get all our estimates lined up, including in front of the hangars and the sinkhole, it would be more CIB-ready.

    Bill W. asked about the terminal parking lot. Tammy said it was not AIP-eligible, but it could be CIB-eligible. But first we would need to hire an engineer to design that parking lot, that's not part of Lochner's obligation. Bill W. thought we could find some money in the budget to do that, because then it's more presentable to the CIB, and more likely to be awarded. Tammy said we could do a parking lot design and have it split out in phases, Phase 1 is in front of the terminal, Phase 2 is where the rental cars are, and Phase 3 is the big lot, but you have those all in one design. Bill W. agreed, saying that taking it to the CIB without the engineering plans is a waste of time. Eric said there are layers to that, they could do high-level preliminary planning type numbers, we do the layout, without putting a whole design packet together, but at least have a layout and an associated estimate with it. Then we could present those numbers. Bill W. said the CIB has planning grants and they almost always give them out as grants [not loans], so maybe we should ask for that funding. Judd said they could easily give a hard estimate number for the design cost. Judd also said their contract with us says they do FAA-funded projects, but they can also do non-FAA projects. Tammy said the entrance road into the Airport is already on the CIB list. Judd said the entrance road is eligible for federal funding.

Tammy said she brought this up to show the construction of Taxi lane F, it's estimated at $405,308 (below, Item 5). She showed the ALP map. Lane F is not federally funded. Then she showed the Taxi lanes that are federally funded.

Randy thought we should ask Lochner for a proposal for the engineering costs, and Bill W. said yes, then we submit it to the CIB. Judd said they could put together an estimate of the design and engineering costs for the entire parking lot, with different phases, with high-level preliminary cost estimates of construction. He mentioned that the CIB process is not a fast process.

5. Discuss alternative funding options for Taxi lane F - FAA will not fund. Engineers Estimate - $405,308.50
   a. Continue enforcing the Minimum Standards - put the cost on the developer?
   b. Grand County to provide funds for the project?
   c. Seek alternative funding sources - CIB, loans/bonds, investors?

   This was discussed in the above item about paving.

6. Project Reports
   a. Taxiway A1 Relocation - Construction to start in the spring.
      Eric said that's already under contract with LeGrand Johnson, and funding is in place for that. Construction will start in March. That will involve some nighttime runway closures. Tammy clarified - only during the prep work (runway markings and lights). Once that's configured, the runway will remain open. The runway will be shortened for this project. Eric said there probably won't be access to the crosswind runway during construction.

   b. Ramp expansion and Taxi lane - late summer/fall.
      Eric said they will lump that in with discretionary funding. They will bid that out. This will be paired with Apron construction. They discussed NOTAMs.

   c. Taxi Lane E, J, G, project can go out for bids right away.
      i. Discuss the proposed borrow site for Taxi lane fill.

      Eric said they are potentially looking at the area near the sewer lagoons, for the borrow site. They need to clear that with the EPA. This project has had a cat-x (categorical exclusion) that clears it environmentally, so it fits the footprint. They will put these out to bid around the same time as the Apron expansion. The funding is separate (BIL), so different than discretionary funding: both FAA, but a different pot of money. So, it could be 2 different contractors.

   d. Drive through gate replacement (FEMA Grant) - half installed.
      Tammy said the prep work is done. Ready to plop into place.

   e. Contour Airlines advertising - we need a marketing plan.
      Tammy said we touched on this, we can save that for our workshop in March. She said we would need to work with economic development and Chamber of Commerce to make sure we're targeting the right markets. It's $25,000. Rachel said we will want to piggyback on what the Travel Council is planning for marketing. Jason thought a sit-down meeting would be good. Rachel said

when it was SkyWest, they had advertising in Denver in their airport. We could do advertising in Phoenix. Tammy said the advertising money ($25,000) re-set Feb. 1, so it's available now.

The notion of a marketing subcommittee was offered: Jason, Rachel, and Randy. (or Alex ?)

f. Economic Development is assisting with creating entrance sign for CNY - possible grant funding available through the state.
Tammy said Loves Communications reached out to her, but we don't have a design yet. She thought maybe we should do a contest. We get 10 tickets per year from Contour, so maybe do a contest, and give away some tickets. That might be better than relying on the County.

There was discussion of a sculpture contest which happened under Judd. The Board chose a sculpture, but the funding never came about, because it would have been $10,000 to $20,000. Tammy said the State Revitalization Grant could cover this item now. It will be available again at the end of June, so we could re-apply.

Alex asked about the entrance sign - is there an idea what we want size-wise, material-wise? Judd described the many viewpoints on that in the past. Tammy suggested we get with P&Z about current restrictions on signs. Alex said this is such an artistic town, it would be great to have a local artist design it.

F. Reports:

1. Airport Monthly Data Report & Virtower Data - January 2025 - no data yet.
2. Any questions on Director's Report for January 2025 - not this month.
3. County Commission - Bill W. said it was important to identify projects for the CIB list.
4. City of Moab - Jason said they're following bills up in the State.
5. Travel Council - Alex said they have 3 new members. They will choose a Chair and Vice Chair. They're working on the new discovermoab.com website. Hope to release it in the middle of June.
6. Solar Committee - Bill H. absent.
7. Reports from the new Subcommittees - None
8. Other reports for Airport Board - Rachel said the flight schedule is set through September. But they will take input now for flight times after September. The new president is very receptive. Tammy will also take input on flight times, and get with Contour about that. Also, United Airlines is now active, as far as booking (Denver).

G. Future Considerations - None

H. Closed Session, if necessary

I. Adjourn - 6:11 p.m.