

AIRPORT COMMITTEE

Time and Place: Wednesday, May 14, 2014 at 6:00 p.m. at the Wausau Downtown Airport Terminal Conference Room

Members Present: Mohr, Kellbach, Mielke, Abitz, Nagle (arrived 7:15 p.m.)

Members Excused: Gehrt, Pauls

Others Present: John Chmiel, Airport Manager, Tara Alfonso, Assistant City Attorney, Bill Duncanson, Director of Parks & Recreation

In accordance with Chapter 19, Wisconsin Statutes, notice of this meeting was posted and copy sent to the Daily Herald in the proper manner.

In absence of Chairman Nagle, Kellbach called the meeting to order at 6:22 p.m. Duncanson requested that "Discussion and Possible Action on Radtke Point Stabilization Engineering Request for Proposals" be moved to the front of the airport agenda since he had another meeting at 7:30 p.m. The airport committee unanimously agreed.

Discussion and Possible Action on Radtke Point Stabilization Engineering Request for Proposals (RFP) - Duncanson

Duncanson explained that in 2013 Schofield and Wausau had agreed to participate equally in the cost for engineering/design services required for the stabilization project on the river bank at Radtke Point Park. With the funding now available from both communities it is appropriate to create a selection committee made up of representatives from both communities. Both communities agreed to fund the engineering and design matching \$12,500 each. Abitz asked what the estimated timeframe for the project was. Duncanson stated that designs would not be completed most likely until fall, too late to begin the repair project in 2014. Spring 2015 would be the earliest that repairs would begin. The selection committee is NOT authorizing cost of construction, only selecting a engineering and design proposal. Duncanson stated the airport committee should select a representative to be on the selection committee. Chmiel was chosen. Chmiel stated that he did not have the expertise in engineering and design and felt he would be more comfortable if an airport committee member also be assigned to the selection committee and recommended Bill Nagle. Due to Nagle's absence the committee agreed that Chmiel and Nagle should be appointed to the selection committee contingent upon Nagle's agreement. Mohr made a motion to approve the RFP as presented and direct Parks & Recreation department to advertise for bids contingent City of Schofield approval. Mielke second. Motion approved 4-0.

Minutes of Previous Meeting

The minutes of May 12th, 2014 were reviewed and placed on file. Kellbach moved to approve the committee minutes as submitted, second by Mohr. Motion approved 4-0

Airport Manager's Report – Chmiel

Chmiel apologized to the new airport committee members for the intensity of the May airport committee agenda and stated that normally new airport committee members would be given an orientation tour of the airport prior to their first airport committee meeting. Chmiel, Abitz, and Mielke agreed to discuss a mutually agreeable day/time for an airport tour after the airport committee meeting. Mohr stated that he would also assist with the airport tour. Alfonso reminded the committee members that if 4 committee members were present during the tour that it would have to be an official airport committee meeting with a posted agenda. Chmiel explained the Airport Manager's Report for May 2014; and the report was placed on file. See copy on file.

Airport Budget Review - Groat

Groat was unable to attend the airport committee meeting due to interference with another City Department meeting. It was decided that the airport budget review would be tabled until the July airport committee meeting.

Wausau Downtown Airport Access Agreement Update - Chmiel

Alfonso stated that the City Attorney's office had not been able to work on the airport access agreement since the last airport committee meeting. The City Attorney's office workload from other City business demands had required them to prioritize their work load. Since there was no immediate request for an access agreement to the airport the Attorney's office decided to work on the agreement after catching up with the other legal demands of the City.

Chmiel stated that although there were no adjacent property owners who were immediately interested in an airport access agreement, there is an airport tenant who is interested in the City creating an agreement. Al Woldt has stated that if an acceptable agreement could be created it would increase his interest in purchasing property adjacent to the airport and execute an airport access agreement. He would then also build a hangar (a requirement of the access agreement).

Alfonso recommended that Chmiel discuss the situation with Anne Jacobson. Chmiel questioned if it would be helpful to the City Attorney's office to have Mr. Woldt and Chmiel create a rough draft agreement that the airport committee could review and modify. Alfonso stated that she didn't think that would be a labor saver and again recommended that Chmiel contact Jacobson.

Chmiel briefly explained to the new airport committee members a description of what an airport access agreement would allow. He explained that the BOA/FAA also stated that there would also be no way that airport land could ever be leased for residential use or development. Using airport property as a residence is strictly prohibited by the FAA. Chmiel stated that he felt that he was in favor of allowing private access to airport property, but only if construction of a hangar leased on airport property was part of the agreement. Chmiel went on to explain that the private property owner would have to meet similar requirements as are currently stated in accepted “through the fence agreement” RTTF in order to allow airport access. Chmiel stated that at a minimum, an airport access agreement should include the following FAA RTTF requirements: To gain access, the property owner is required to pay access charges; bear the cost of building and maintaining the infrastructure necessary to provide access to the airfield; maintain the adjacent property for residential, noncommercial use for the duration of the agreement; prohibit airport access from other adjacent or nearby properties; and prohibit any refueling on the property. Chmiel stated that a long term agreement would be necessary and that would be accomplished through the execution of a land lease agreement for hangar construction.

Chmiel stated that preparing an airport access agreement specific to the Wausau Downtown Airport that would take all affected parties into consideration could open future opportunities at the airport and if we start working on it now we will be ready when the opportunity presents itself. Chmiel reiterated that unless the airport access agreement was BOA/FAA endorsed there was no point in pursuing it any further. The committee agreed. No further action taken.

Discussion and Possible Action on Kocourek Hangar Construction – Chmiel

Chmiel stated that Keith Kocourek is requesting to build a 100’ X 100’ hangar east of corporate hangar #4. The exact location had not yet been determined and would depend on whether utilities can be moved. Keith would like to be in the area 20’ directly east of corporate #4, but the cost of moving utilities in that area may require the hangar be built east of that area. Either location is OK with Chmiel. Kocourek has already been approved to build a hangar on these locations twice before. After approval, Kocourek had decided that not building the hangar was in the best interest of Kocourek and the airport, and Kocourek allowed the permits to expire. Kocourek operates 3 aircraft which are tenants in corporate hangar #4. Chmiel stated that Kocourek building a hangar was definitely in the best long term interest of the airport. It would hurt corporate hangar revenues in the short run. Kocourek was motivated to construct the hangar this time because he also had other construction projects taking place in Wausau and could save some of the costs because of the other projects.

Chmiel stated that the proposed roof shape of the Kocourek hangar was slightly different than the existing hangars at the airport. Chmiel presented a design picture to the airport committee showing the shape of the hangar which has a curved roof line. Chmiel stated that hangars on other parts of the airport were required to match the color of the existing privately owned hangars. Chmiel stated that the Kocourek hangar location should allow Kocourek two choices in

color since corporate hangar #4 is the only white hangar on the airport. The other color available to Kocourek would be the tan color on corporate hangar #3 which matches the color of the other existing private hangars on the airport. Chmiel also stated he believed that the cost of ramp installation would be Kocourek's responsibility, but that he would confirm that before council approval.

Chmiel reminded the committee that if the airport committee approved the proposal that the proposal would also have to be approved by the finance committee, have a public hearing through planning and also be approved by City Council. Construction of a privately owned hangar on leased land at the airport is good for the City. It allows for development of airport property at private expense, earns revenue for the airport through lease of airport property, and earns revenue for the City through property taxes assessed at the value of the hangar.

Mohr made a motion to approve the Kocourek hangar construction proposal with no changes. Kellbach second. Motion approved 4-0. Chmiel stated he would get the Kocourek hangar construction request on the next finance committee agenda. No further action taken.

Discussion and Possible Action on Airport Engineering Consultant Selection – Chmiel

Chmiel explained that most capital projects at the airport are funded with FAA and BOA financial participation. Most of the projects are 95/5 or 80/20 with the FAA shouldering the majority of the financial burden. Wisconsin is a block grant state which means that the FAA allows the BOA to act as its representative to determine prioritization of projects within the state and to ensure that projects are conducted within FAA requirements.

Part of this process includes choosing an airport engineering/consulting firm for the airport. Chmiel stated that in the past he felt it was part of his airport management duties to make this choice and in the past he had made this decision without consulting the airport committee. For the purposes of transparency, Chmiel felt that the airport committee should select the airport engineering company this year.

Chmiel explained that three companies had forwarded their letters of interest to the BOA about becoming the airport engineering/consultant for Wausau Downtown Airport. The companies expressing interest were: Becher/Hoppe of Wausau, Omni Associates of Appleton, and MSA of Middleton. Chmiel explained that the information package describing each company had been included in the information package for the airport committee meeting. Chmiel went on to explain that Becher/Hoppe has been the airport engineering/consultant for the Wausau Airport since before he became the airport manager in 1992. During that time he has not had any complaints about the work they have done for the Wausau Airport. Since their offices are located minutes from the Wausau airport it is easy to consult them in a timely manner on current

and future projects at the airport. For these reasons, Chmiel stated that Becher/Hoppe would be his first choice. (Nagle arrived 7:15 p.m.)

Alfonso questioned whether Becher/Hoppe was the lowest bid or offered the lowest rates for their services. Chmiel stated that he did not know and that he was not sure how that could be determined. Chmiel explained that the choice was not typically made based on cost of services but on qualifications. Since the FAA/BOA pay the majority of the cost for capital projects that the City did not typically decide whether the cost of services was reasonable and that the BOA made that decision. Alfonso questioned if allowing the BOA to make that decision fit within the City policy. Alfonso questioned how the City could determine that Becher/Hoppe offered the lowest rates of the 3 represented firms. Nagle questioned Chmiel about what projects are planned for the airport. Chmiel stated that a crack sealing project on all surfaces at the airport was planned for 2014. Nagle asked what the cost would be. Chmiel stated that had not been determined yet and therefore no engineering/design costs could be determined. Nagle explained to the committee that engineering/design rates are typically based on the project and that since no projects had been enacted at the airport that there would be no way to determine how the engineering/design firms would charge for their services. Alfonso reiterated how the City needed to determine whether the process allowed the airport to follow City policy.

Mielke stated that he was comfortable with Chmiel's recommendation because Becher/Hoppe was a Wausau company. Kellbach and Abitz both stated that that was precisely a good reason and a bad reason to choose Becher/Hoppe. Alfonso reiterated that it also does not address the cost for services. Mohr, Mielke, and Abitz stated that they would like more time to review the letters of interest from each company. Abitz concluded by saying that since the airport committee members would need more time to review and consider options, and that since Alfonso would need more time to research City policy and BOA policy for choosing the engineer/design firm that a special airport committee meeting should be called soon to decide on this matter. Abitz questioned Chmiel about the urgency of the decision. Chmiel stated that he had hoped a decision could be made tonight so the BOA could choose a firm and start on the crack sealing project ASAP. Chmiel questioned if the committee would be comfortable with approving Becher/Hoppe contingent upon Alfonso being satisfied that City policy would not be violated after conferring with the BOA. Alfonso was not comfortable with having the committee make the decision until after she had conferred with the FAA.

Mielke made a motion to call a special meeting on Monday, May 12th at City Hall at 4:30 p.m. Mohr second. Motion passed unanimously 5-0.

Mielke moved to adjourn the meeting, second by Mohr. Motion carried unanimously and meeting adjourned at 8:05 p.m.