



# ROCK COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

*Airport - Highways - Parks*

3715 Newville Road, Janesville, WI 53545  
Phone: (608)757-5450 Fax: (608)757-5470  
www.co.rock.wi.us

Ad Hoc Committee on Airport Future Minutes  
Wednesday, June 27, 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 12:05 p.m.

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

Committee Members Absent: Larry Squire, Aimee Thurner

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

Approval of Agenda. Sherri Stumpf and Jim Freeman moved the Agenda. MOTION CARRIED.

Review & Approve May 30, 2018 Minutes. Mark Gunn and Larry Barton moved to approve the minutes. MOTION CARRIED

Citizen Participation, Communications and Announcements. None

Review and Discussion on Committee Scope

A review of the implications of FAA 139 Certification (importance of being authorized to provide public passenger service, effect on businesses operations, need for fire suppression function, and impact on County operational activities)

Benefits outweigh negatives. Mr. Terronez reminded the Committee that there were four areas of the original Resolution that made up the scope of this Committee. The first was to make a recommendation regarding maintaining the airport's Part 139 certification. He feels the Committee can make an official motion on whether or not to maintain the Airport's 139 certification. Chair Fox called for a motion regarding maintaining the Part 139 certification either in favor of it or against.

Larry Barton made a motion that the Southern Wisconsin Regional Airport maintain its FAA Part 139 certificate. Ryan McCue seconded the motion. Chair Fox opened up the floor for discussion on the motion.

NOT OFFICIAL UNTIL APPROVED BY COMMITTEE

Mr. Terronez briefly reviewed previous discussion in which it was determined that the benefits of the 139 Certification outweigh the negatives.

Compliance Expenses Not Exorbitant. The cost to maintain the certificate is not exorbitant, about \$16,000 per year.

Joint Use Fire Station. Maintaining the Part 139 may lead to the possibility of a joint use fire station.

Chair Fox asked if the 139 certificate will have an effect on funding. Mr. Cullen stated that in the last meeting Mr. Menon of the Wisconsin Bureau of Aeronautics stated that he felt that it did, and while Mr. Menon is a former FAA employee, our District FAA office said that it does not, airports without 139 certificates are on the same list as airports with it. Mr. Redders stated that he feels that having the Part 139 certificate has a marketing value for attracting other tenants and businesses.

Mr. Gunn asked Mr. McCue where the City is on the joint fire station. Mr. McCue said that it has been discussed and they are for it but the sticking point is being able to staff it. They know there is a need.

The fire service is already on the field, but that will slowly go away if the 139 certificate goes away.

Chair Fox called for a vote on the motion. MOTION CARRIED.

Economic Development Opportunities:

Economic Impact Study (Pending). Mr. Cullen stated that he had spoken with the Bureau of Aeronautics regarding the pending economic impact study they are preparing for us. They will have it done very soon, but could not complete it in time for this meeting.

T-Hangar Development Potential. Mr. Terronez stated that under economic development one of the things this Committee is looking at is t-hangars and the future of county run management and development. Mr. Fox asked if anyone wanted to make a motion regarding public vs. private management either for or against. James Otterstein made a motion for the Airport to pursue investigation of the feasibility of private sector hangar management and development. Chair Fox seconded the motion. Mr. Barton asked if this is a recommendation for private management. The answer is that it was implied but not specifically recommended. The key word in the motion was investigate. It was then stated that if they wanted to recommend private, it needed to be specified but that it would be pending the research. Some discussion on whether or not to recommend private development/management took place but the motion was not amended. MOTION CARRIED.

Innovation Drive Extension. Chair Fox informed the Committee that the Public Works Committee voted 5 to 0 to submit this matter to the Wisconsin Bureau of Aeronautics and the FAA for their determination on the land release.

Mr. Cullen discussed the location of the land involved, it is across Highway 51 and it is currently protected as URPZ for runway 04/22. We are willing to release the land in order for the City to develop it as another access in the Dollar General area. The Public Works Committee voted on this matter on April 24, 2018. Right now we are waiting for the City to give us the exact dimensions needed. There

are two options for the land release, but the most optimal is to give the City the land so they can build and maintain the road. Mr. Cullen stated that he has been informed that if the County approves the land release, the State and FAA will probably follow.

Mr. Barton asked if there was a downside and Chair Fox replied that the downside is that we would never be able to develop a precision approach for Runway 04, but since we already have two precision approaches, the benefit outweighs the detriment. There is no benefit to the airport directly, the benefit is to the community.

Mr. Terronez stated that this committee has already taken a position on this matter to recommend to the Public Works Committee that this matter be explored.

Mr. McCue stated that there is a benefit to the airport in marketing as the new road would provide easier access to the airport.

#### Management Structure (s):

Governance Options. Chair Fox introduced Rock County Corporation Counsel Richard Greenlee. Mr. Greenlee gave a Power Point presentation (hard copy attached to these minutes) to the Committee. In the presentation Mr. Greenlee explained the difference between a formal Airport Commission formed under Wisconsin Statutes §114.14(2) Commission and a structure that is not an Airport Commission but is set up as County Board / County Administrator oversight and supervision.

Mr. Greenlee explained the four options that are available as options for Airport governance.

At one end of the spectrum we have an Airport Commission under Chapter 114.14 this is a formal independent operational authority. The director would report directly to the Commission not the County Administrator or County Board. The Commission members would be appointed by the County Administrator and confirmed by the County Board. It has some independence in regards to contracting and policy.

At the other end of the spectrum is the status quo which is the airport as a subset of a county department. The Airport Manager reports through the department to the County Board and administration and they have oversight of all aspects of the airport.

In the middle of these two ends of the spectrum there are two other options. The first is the status quo with a Citizen Advisory Committee. This committee would have members that have expertise in the subject matter and would advise, but have no formal authority on decisions or policies. The County's Parks Department is set up this way.

The last option is a Standing Airport Jurisdictional Committee. This would necessitate forming a committee which would be another subcommittee of the County Board that would exist specifically for airport policy oversight and governance. This committee would be made up of county board members but could also have citizen members. The Human Services Board is set up this way. This committee would have more direct budgetary authority and it would flow through the ordinary county budgetary

process. This would require the airport to be its own department and the Airport Director to be a department head.

Chair Fox asked what the most common structure for comparable airports in Wisconsin is. Mr. Greenlee advised the Committee that some airports refer to their governing committees as commissions, but they are not true Commissions formed under Wisconsin Statutes, so the most common structure is the way the airport is currently set up.

Mr. Greenlee then explained in more detail how this airport is owned and operated by the County and tax revenues make up about 50% of the operational budget. The Airport's current governance is set up by Wisconsin Statute and County Board Rules. The County Administrator is in charge of all administrative and management functions. The Public Works Committee is responsible for policy supervision over the Department of Public Works and the airport is set up as a subset of The Public Works Department. The County Board approves the budget and purchases larger than the \$25,000.

If the airport governance became a true Commission, then the Commission becomes the authority. The Airport Director will not report to the Public Works Director or the County Administrator but directly to the Commission. This would not give the Commission authority to levy taxes for budgetary purposes. This would still have to go through the County Board. Some HR functions would be taken away and contracts would not have to go through the County Board. A Commission would be created by County Board Resolution or by Ordinance. Mr. Greenlee would recommend that if this is the option pursued, it be done by Ordinance. The Commission would be appointed by the County Administrator and approved by the County Board and should be made up of people who have an interest in the airport.

If this Committee recommends anything other than the current status quo, it will require County Board action. This includes the other two options of a Citizen Advisory Committee and a Standing Airport Jurisdiction and spinning off the airport to be its own department.

A Citizen Advisory Committee would be defined by the County Board and doesn't usually contain county board members.

Chair Fox asked if the airport went to a 114 Commission could there still be a Citizen Advisory Committee and Mr. Greenlee replied yes. He went on to say that a citizen advisory committee would offer opinions and advice but have no authority. The airport would still fall under the Public Works Department.

Mr. Greenlee then explained what would be required for the airport to go to a Standing Airport Jurisdiction. This would require an amendment of the county board rules to create a new standing committee. This would require a 2/3 vote of the County Board. The Committee could contain County Board Supervisors and it could contain citizen members with expertise in the subject matter but it doesn't have to. There are no rules about who would have to be on the committee and this committee could recommend who would be on the Standing Jurisdictional Committee. The committee would have policy oversight and budgetary authority over the airport. This would require the airport to become its own department.

Separating the airport into its own department away from the Public Works Department would be accomplished during the budget process because there are budgetary implications. The Airport Manager would become a department head appointed by the County Administrator and subject to the approval of the County Board. This would create a more direct line of supervision. There would also need to be a separation of the budget from the Public Works Department.

Chair Fox stated that the Standing Airport Jurisdictional Committee is an interesting possibility to him. The current model currently works but as a governing body they don't go far enough because they also deal with Parks and Public Works and also serve on other committees. Having other people from the community would serve the airport interests. He feels the airport deserves more attention than it gets being buried in another department.

Lengthy discussion on whether the airport should be governed by an Airport Commission or a Standing Airport Jurisdictional Committee took place. Discussion topics included:

- Pros and cons of both the Commission and Jurisdictional Committee
- Policy authority of each type of governance
- Budgetary authority of each type of governance
- Contract authority of each type of governance
- Decision making authority of each type of governance
- How some other public departments are set up i.e.: Library Board
- The willingness of people to serve on each type of governance
- The process of separating the airport into its own department
- The County Board's acceptance of recommendations from a committee with citizens on it
- The number of people on, and the make-up of, a jurisdictional committee

After much discussion, Mr. Barton made a motion that was revised several times but in the end stated: That the Ad Hoc Committee make a recommendation to the Rock County Board that the Airport be governed by an Airport Board made up of 9 people of which at least three will be Rock County Board Members and the remaining committee members will be community members with aviation related knowledge, and a vested interest in the airport. The motion was seconded by Mr. Freeman. MOTION CARRIED.

Management Options. Mr. Greenlee stated by restructuring the airport per the recommendation, the role of the airport manager position will become a department head and will revert to a director position so there is no need to discuss or make a recommendation on this.

Mr. Fox asked how quickly this restructuring could take place and Mr. Greenlee responded that it would take place during the budget process. We are currently in the budget process right now so it could happen pretty quickly.

Operational and Facility Functions. Mr. Fox stated that based on the management structure recommendation, any Minimum Standard Review needed would be looked at by the new board, therefore, there will not be a need for the Ad Hoc Committee to make a recommendation on this.

Additional Issues Identified by Committee. Mr. Cullen discussed an article that was included in the Agenda regarding general aviation trends for the Committees information.

Next Steps. Chair Fox stated that he felt this Committee satisfied the objectives that were presented in the Resolution. Mr. Terronez stated that he will draft a report outlining the recommendations of this Committee and forward to the Committee for their review-input. Chair Fox will present the final report to the full County Board meeting of Thursday, August 9, 2018. The meeting starts at 6:00 p.m. Committee members were encouraged to attend.

Next Meeting Date. This should be the last meeting of this Committee. The Committee will be dissolved with the submission of the report to the County Board.

Sherri Stumpf and Bonnie Cooksey motioned to adjourn the meeting at 1:34 p.m. MOTION CARRIED

Respectfully Submitted,

Cynthia Hevel  
Airport Specialist

# County Airport Governance

2 Basic Models:  
Airport Commission v. Not-Airport  
Commission

**Formal Airport Commission  
under Wis. Stat. § 114.14(2)  
Commission**

**County Board / County  
Administrator Oversight and  
Supervision**

## Airport Governance Options

Status Quo	Status Quo plus Citizen Advisory Committee	Standing "Airport" Jurisdictional Committee	Airport Commission under Chapter 114
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Airport Manager reports to Director Public Works</li> <li>• Public Works is the policy and oversight committee</li> <li>• County Board / Administrator is the ultimate governing authority</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Group of citizen members selected for expertise in subject matter</li> <li>• Don't have any formal decision making authority, but function to inform and influence policy making</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Formal subcommittee of the County Board</li> <li>• Could have citizen members, but doesn't have to</li> <li>• Would have policy making, some governance and oversight authority.</li> <li>• Make Airport its own Department</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Formal independent operational authority</li> <li>• Airport Manager would report directly to the commission.</li> <li>• Commission members appointed by Admin/County Board</li> <li>• Has some independent powers</li> </ul>

## County Board / Administrator Oversight

- ▶ Airport is owned and operated by County. County Tax Revenues make up ~ 50% of operational budget.
- ▶ Airport Current Governance Model is set up by Chapter 59, Wis. Stat. and the County Board Rules.
- ▶ Under Wis. Stat. §59.18, County Administrator is the chief administrative officer of the County, charged with coordinating and directing all administrative and management functions of County Government.
- ▶ County Board Rule V(M) – Public Works Committee shall have policy supervision over Department of Public Works that includes highway, airport, parks, and motor pool operations.



- ▶ Airport functions as a subset of the County just like any County department, e.g. Highway, Human Services, Public Health
- ▶ Airport is a subset of the Public Works Department both for purposes of administrative supervision and budgetary
- ▶ County Board must approve budget, purchases larger than \$25,000.
- ▶ Public Works Committee serves as to make policy, inform the operations of the airport, and approve certain contracts and transfers

## Airport Commission

- ▶ The County "may vest jurisdiction for the construction, improvement, equipment, maintenance and operation of the airport in an airport commission."
- ▶ Shall have "complete and exclusive control and management over the airport for which it has been appointed."
- ▶ Takes Administrative Supervision out of the hands of the County Administrator, and the County Board, and puts it into the Commission.
- ▶ BUT not the appropriative power. County Board would still appropriate money for operations at its discretion.

## Commission Powers

- ▶ **Wis. Stat. § 114.14(3)(a)**
- ▶ **1.** Employ a manager, who may be a member of the commission, and fix the manager's compensation.
- ▶ **2.** Employ and fix the compensation of employees other than a manager that the commission considers necessary.
- ▶ **3.** Make contracts or other arrangements that the commission considers necessary for the construction, improvement, equipment, maintenance or operation of the airport.
- ▶ **4.** Contract with the United States or any agency.

## Forming a Commission

- ▶ Created by County Board action, either ordinance or resolution. Better if its by ordinance.
- ▶ Number, terms, and compensation of Commissioners set by County Board.
- ▶ Appointed by the County Administrator, subject to the approval of the County Board.
- ▶ Commission elects chairperson and secretary. Responsible for reporting proceedings and transactions to the County Board.

## The Not-A-Commission model

- ▶ Anything other than the status quo will also need action by the County Board
  - ▶ **Establishing Citizen Advisory Committee**
  - ▶ **Creating a new Standing County Board Jurisdictional Committee**
  - ▶ **Spinning off Airport into its own department**

## Citizen Advisory Committee

- ▶ Created by Resolution of the County Board, size and scope defined by the County Board, but no formal County Board representation.
- ▶ A group of citizen subject matter experts, drawn from the community.
- ▶ No formal governance authority, but are able to influence and inform policy making by bringing community input and expertise to the policy making and oversight process.
- ▶ Not part of the budget or administrative oversight, Airport would still fall under public works department/committee.



## Standing Airport Jurisdiction

- ▶ Would need to Amend County Board Rules to create a new Standing Committee. Requires 2/3rds vote of the County Board.
- ▶ Committee of County Board supervisors. Could include community members with subject matter expertise but not necessarily.
- ▶ Could have policy oversight, and budgetary authority over the airport.
- ▶ Simultaneously would need spin off the Airport as its own department.

## Airport as its own Department

- ▶ Usually accomplished as a part of the Budget approval process
- ▶ Airport would be separated off the Department of Public Works.
- ▶ Airport Manager would be a Department head, appointed by County Administrator, subject to approval by the County Board, and would serve at the pleasure of the County Administrator.
- ▶ Would need to be a bunch of administrative disentanglement that would have to happen.

Questions???