



Ad Hoc Committee on Airport Future Minutes
Wednesday, May 30, 2018 – 12:00 p.m.
Southern Wisconsin Regional Airport Conference Room
1716 W. Airport Rd.
Janesville, WI

Call to Order. Chair Fox called the Ad Hoc Committee to order at 12:04 p.m.

Committee Members Present: Chair Fox, Sherri Stumpf, James Freeman, Bonnie Cooksey, Evan Redders, Mark Gunn, James Otterstein, Larry Barton, Aimee Thurner, Ryan McCue, Larry Squire

Committee Members Absent: None

Ex Officio Members Present: Greg Cullen, Duane Jorgenson, Mark Graczykowski

Others Present:

Randy Terronez	Assistant to the County Administrator
J. Russell Podzilni	Chair, Rock County Board
Mary Mawhinney	Vice-Chair, Rock County Board
Cynthia Hevel	Airport Specialist
Michael Menon	Wisconsin DOT, BOA

Approval of Agenda. Sherri Stumpf and Larry Squire moved the Agenda. MOTION CARRIED.

Review & Approve April 25, 2018 Minutes. James Otterstein and Larry Barton moved to approve the minutes. MOTION CARRIED

Citizen Participation, Communications and Announcements. Mark Graczykowski introduced Michael Menon from the Bureau of Aeronautics and Chair Fox welcomed County Board Vice-Chair Mary Mawhinney and County Board Chair Russ Podzilni.

Review and/or Discussion.

Part 139 Certification: Inspection Update. Mr. Cullen gave the Committee an update on the airport's Part 139 inspection which took place on May 9th and 10th. These inspections take place every two years. During the inspection there were some items discovered that were not in compliance. These items mostly focused on training and documentation. Because these same items had been noted in the last three inspections, instead of giving the airport a Letter of Correction, the airport was issued a Letter of Investigation. Mr. Cullen, Mr. Jorgenson, and Mr. Terronez will be attending a meeting at the FAA office in Illinois next week regarding the inspection.

Some other items noted as discrepancies during the inspection were pavement markings, signage improvements, Runway 18/36 and its condition. The sealcoating on Runway 18/36 is breaking apart and as a result, to prevent additional write ups, we removed Runway 18/36 from commercial service.

NOT OFFICIAL UNTIL APPROVED BY COMMITTEE

The runway is still open and useable, just not for commercial service. Some of these items particularly the signage issue, is already in the works for being remedied. In addition the inspector wrote up the farmland setback. Since the inspection, Mr. Cullen has found where the standard used for the write up has been changed, and there may not be any issue there.

Part 139 Certification: Part 139 Expenses. Mr. Cullen went over a handout that was in the Agenda packet. He explained that the Dekalb airport in Illinois is in the process of trying to obtain their Part 139 certificate. They provided Mr. Cullen with the information they have put together on the costs associated with obtaining their certificate. On the high end it could be as much as \$6,000,000.

Mr. Cullen then went over the list of current Southern Wisconsin Regional Airport expenses that can be directly attributed to maintaining the Part 139 certificate. These include wildlife training, night inspections, ARFF training, Part 139 training, maintenance of the ARFF vehicle, painting and marking, and calibration of the airport Bowmonk equipment. Some of these things have to be done regardless of the certificate, but the costs would be less. So to keep what we have is around \$16,000 plus the cost of personnel which we will hopefully have regardless of the Part 139.

Chair Fox asked what the requirement was for the 40 hour ARFF School and Mr. Menon responded that each new employee must attend the school one time before they perform ARFF duties, but after that they are only required to attend a live burn one time a year to stay current. Mr. Menon also agreed with Mr. Cullen's expectations of the cost to maintain the Part 139 certificate. Mr. Menon also indicated that it is difficult to get a certificate back after letting it go.

Chair Fox asked what would motivate a governing body to give up a Part 139 certificate and Mr. Menon replied failure to understand what is actually required. For instance, since Southern Wisconsin Regional Airport doesn't have commercial service, we don't need a fire department. Is it a good idea? Yes. Does it make a difference to our operators? It could. But these are the kind of things that he is talking about. There is no actual cost to have the certificate, there is no charge from the FAA. The cost comes from being in compliance with the standards, but to have it and maintain it is a plus to all in his opinion. In Athens, GA they lost their air carrier so they pulled out of the Part 139. They are now looking at getting service again, but they don't have their certificate.

Chair Fox stated that he feels it is the general consensus of the group that the chances of getting Part 121 carrier service here again is low, but for the Committee to take a hard look and make a recommendation that we need to keep Part 139 certificate, we need to tell them why. He wants to be able to quantify funding.

Mr. Menon said that it does move our airport up on the list for Airport Improvement Program funding for safety items if there are discrepancies. He actually knows of airport managers who have taken deliberate discrepancies on inspections just to get higher priority funding.

Some discussion on chain of command during an aircraft accident and how often there are training exercises took place.

T-Hangar Development: public vs. private ownership.

Options/examples of private ownership/development (Other WI. Airports, condo development, etc.).
Mr. Cullen reported that he recently met with President and Vice-President of Erect-A-Tube. They are

a company that builds t-hangars and who has been leasing land on Southern Wisconsin Regional Airport for t-hangar development since 2009. They discussed the possibility of Erect-A-Tube taking over managing our hangars or developing their own. He received a letter from them yesterday. To summarize, they like the airport, but they are concerned about the fact that there is no waiting list and before they would build, they would want to see about a 60% committal list. Currently the airport charges from the low to mid \$200s for hangar rent. For Erect-A-Tube to build they would charge from the low to mid \$300s for rent. They recommended that the airport do a feasibility study to basically see if we went down the path of building better quality hangars in the hopes of attracting clients that would spend that much, would there be an interest. They also recommend that we work with an engineering firm to see what the possibility is of getting that occupancy rate. It was also discussed that general aviation has declined in recent years. What is the possibility of an uptick to get that interest, also what style would we put in?

Mr. Cullen also mentioned that he had received information from a company called Daily Hangar. It basically works like putting your house on line as a vacation rental. We would put our available hangar space on the website and people that are traveling here on a temporary basis could rent the hangars for a little while.

Mr. Fox asked Mr. Cullen to rate our available t-hangars on a scale of 0-10 with zero being the worst and 10 being the best. Mr. Cullen replied that it would be an optimistic 4. He knows that some tenants are covering their planes with plastic to protect against the bird droppings, the doors are very old and don't always work, and roofs are rusting through. Mr. Barton suggested that when considering this Daily Hangar opportunity, to remember that our FBO offers the same service.

Consolidation of current county-owned hangars/tenants. Mr. Cullen told the committee that we could eliminate one of the old t-hangars right now by moving the tenants in the old hangar to the other hangar and tear down one building. Mr. Barton asked why wouldn't we do this? He feels that these hangars are not creating a good first impression. Mr. Squire asked what is the cost of maintaining it when, if you can combine all of the tenants in one building, then the other building is creating no revenue. Chair Fox stated that if you tear down one of the buildings you then have 90% occupancy and create demand.

Ms. Thurner departed at 12:50 p.m.

Discussion on what would be necessary to get the hangar torn down took place. County Board Chair indicated that this committee's recommendation would be vital to that decision. Mr. Gunn asked Mr. Cullen if he thought the building should come down and Mr. Cullen responded that he does. Chair Fox stated that at the next meeting each topic addressed in the original resolution would be discussed, recommendations would be made and reasons for those recommendations would be given. This committee added the t-hangar discussion points and Chair Fox felt that putting the t-hangar issue on the June meeting Agenda is appropriate.

Governance – Management Alternatives. Mr. Terronez reminded the committee that one of the issues this committee has been asked to discuss is how the airport is to be managed in the future. There are three options for governing an airport, Municipal or County (or combination), Authority or Commission, and Privatization. Wisconsin airports are governed by Municipalities or Counties. Some airports outside of Wisconsin are governed by Authorities or Commissions he cites Waukegan National Airport as an example. Privately governed airports are rarely used. There are some contract

management airports such as one in New York. There are several firms that provide management services. If the County were to go that route, we would issue an RFP (Request for Proposal) and then go through a selection process.

Mr. McCue said that when he was in Milwaukee they looked into privatizing and they came to the conclusion that it was a bad idea. He knows of two airports that have done it. One went back to the old way and the other was in Puerto Rico. This is not even worth talking about in his opinion. If you want to privatize things, you can privatize items like mowing or snow removal. When he was in Cudahy, they contracted out their snow removal and they saved a ton. He doesn't want to see people lose their jobs, but they could be absorbed through attrition.

Mr. Cullen stated that he spoke with a peer that does contract out their snow removal. The quality and level of service and attention is mixed in with residential and commercial properties, they get there when they get there. Mr. Cullen's staff is dedicated to the airport; that is what they do.

Mr. Jorgenson added that snow removal operations at the airport are not the same as a guy jumping in a truck and plowing a driveway. There are other things to consider, like airport communications, signs, lights and hangar doors. There are instances where even our guys have incidents and they know where stuff is.

Mr. Squire asked in a five year period how many heavy snows do we have that would change the revenue if it didn't get plowed. Mr. Redders replied that it is dramatic. When there is bad weather at O'Hare, their business spikes. Their business is saving peoples business trips. Southern Wisconsin Regional Airport does a great job and it allows them to do a great job. Mr. Squires stated then there is a revenue component for maintaining staff to provide at least the snow removal.

Mr. Menon stated that the Part 139 certificate requires Southern Wisconsin Regional Airport to operate under a snow and ice control plan. When you start putting different people in there every year, you are going to lose that efficiency of having people familiar with the airport and how it operates.

Chair Fox asked the committee if they felt that they have enough information from what they learned to make a recommendation at the next meeting on either maintaining the current management structure or looking at other options. He wants to make sure everyone has enough information because this is something that will be decided at the next meeting.

Discussion on what the effect privatization would have on the condition of the airport. It's like loaning out your car, you don't know what kind of condition it will be in when you get it back. Mr. Terronez stated that some contracts are for up to 25 years.

Mr. Gunn asked Supervisors Podzilni and Mawhinney if they felt the airport was a drain to the budget of the County. Chair Podzilni stated that he feels the airport is an asset and its benefits to the community far exceed its budget. Mr. Fox stated that he feels the airport under performs from an economic development standpoint.

Supervisor Podzilni stated that what he thinks the County Board is looking for in part, is a recommendation from this committee on how we can improve the airport so that it would improve the quality of everybody that uses it now and into the future.

Mr. Squire asked if the Committee could be provided with a good statement of how the airport is currently governed in order to better understand exactly what we have. Chair Fox asked Mr. Cullen to provide that. Mr. Squire also asked exactly what it is they are looking on to vote on. Chair Fox replied that we are deciding on how to manage the airport whether it's with county staff oversight by committee, things of that nature.

Mr. Otterstein asked how the seven airports Mr. Terronez used for governance comparison handle their t-hangars. He wanted to know if we could do a comparison of those seven airports with the information we discussed.

Mr. Barton asked if it would be beneficial for the airport to have some type of committee who have aviation knowledge and are not necessarily county board members.

Mr. Gunn asked what the current process is now and Mr. Cullen explained that he reports to the Public Works Director, then the Public Works Committee and the County Board. Chair Fox stated that he is on the Public Works Committee and he is the only one with aviation experience. He also stated that this committee could make a suggestion that the Airport doesn't report to the Public Works Department and that it have its own commission or committee that is separate from Public Works, but there are costs associated with that.

Mr. Jorgenson mentioned that the Parks Department has an advisory committee, they are very well versed on matters and are not voting members, but their voices are heard in the meetings. The airport could do something of that nature.

Mr. McCue departed at 1:16 p.m.

Mr. Squire asked within that governance, who is trying to take the best interest of the aviation group. What are the roles and responsibilities? If everybody knows how they are accountable and for what, that's where that governance comes in.

Mr. Cullen stated that he would not like to add layers that he has to go through to get things accomplished. Mr. Barton and Mr. Squire both said they were really talking more about removing layers.

Joint Use Fire Station.

Chair Fox asked Mr. Cullen to talk about the Joint Use Fire Station. Mr. Cullen went over the hand out provided in the Agenda for a joint use fire station. He spoke with the airport director in Bloomington, IL where they have successfully had a joint use fire station for several years. Like Oshkosh, they have city employees in a station built on land the County donated to the City for the station and the County provides the budget for training and ARFF vehicle maintenance and upgrades. The firefighters respond to structural fires off the airport, but always leave two personnel behind to cover the airport. The building was built with 95/5/5 funding.

Mr. Menon said that the last airport he was at was exactly the same as this example. He will get a copy of the contract they used and provide it and some other information to Mr. Cullen. Many airports are going to this model and the funding is allowable.

Minutes of the Ad Hoc Committee on Airport Future
May 30, 2018

Mr. Barton asked if this was something that we were looking to recommend. Mr. Gunn stated that he has spoken with City of Janesville Fire Chief Randy Banker and they are very interested in pursuing this. Mr. Podzilni said that we are in discussion with the City of Janesville on this matter but it has not been determined how it could be paid for.

Mr. Graczykowski said that funding could be available from the FAA on a 95/5/5 basis, but only for the airport's portion of the building.

Mr. Gunn stated that this would also serve the whole area, so it is a win, win for both the County and the community as a whole.

Mr. Fox stated that whether to recommend pursuing a joint use fire station will be an item on the Agenda for the next meeting

Mr. Otterstein said something that was not called out by name but was kind of implied was that perhaps the minimum standards should be reviewed. Mr. Fox agreed that they may need to be looked at and that could be addressed in the recommendations that are made.

What's Missing – Next Steps. Mr. Cullen asked then, that we need to put the fire station on the next agenda. Chair Fox replied that we need to add it to the scope of issues.

Next Meeting Date – Noon, Wednesday, June 27

Mr. Barton and Ms. Stumpf made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 1:27 p.m. MOTION CARRIED

Respectfully Submitted,

Cynthia Hevel
Airport Specialist