



AIRPORT COMMISSION MEETING
Monday, March 21, 2022, 4:30 pm
Murfreesboro Municipal Airport
Business Center
1930 Memorial Blvd. Murfreesboro, TN 37129

Attendees:

Steve Waldron, Airport Commission Chair
George Huddleston, Vice Chair
Cannon Loughry
Shelby Hunton
Lynn Lien
Bill Shacklett, City Council Representative
Dr. Chaminda Prelis, MTSU Aerospace Department Chair

Absent:

Butch Jones
Craig Tindall, City Manager

Also in attendance:

David Ives, Deputy City Attorney
Katie Drive, City Staff Attorney
Scott Elliot, Project Development Director
Chad Gehrke, Airport Director
Ryan Hulseley, Airport Manager
Kim Fann, Airport Account Clerk
Benson Hadley, Barge Design Solutions
Brian Fields, MTSU Airport Operations Manager

Mr. Steve Waldron welcomed Cannon Loughry and Shelby Hunton as newly appointed members of the Airport Commission. He asked them to each introduce themselves to the other Members of the Airport Commission and the public present.

Prayer and Pledge of Allegiance: Cannon Loughry

1. Call to order – Attendance
2. **Approval of January 2022 Airport Commission meeting minutes**
Mr. Bill Shacklett moved to approve the January 2022 minutes as presented. Cannon Loughry seconded the motion, and all voted in favor. The motion passed.
3. **Consider approval of the proposed annual rental rate adjustments (Chad Gehrke)**
Mr. Chad Gehrke presented a recommended adjustment to the annual rental rates for various facilities including T-hangars and tie-downs. Mr. Gehrke stated that recently the Airport Commission had approved an annual adjustment of 4% for a Commercial Operator's Lease Agreement. Mr. Gehrke reminded the Airport Commission that for over two decades the Airport Commission has adjusted the annual rental rates by 3% each year except for just one or two years when there was major construction on the airfield and such events as a worldwide pandemic.

Mr. Gehrke provided copies of the what the 4% increase would be for each of the various types and sizes of T-hangars, tie-downs, and end room storage units. Mr. Gehrke also provided what adjusting the rental rates by 5% would be. Mr. Gehrke stated that he provided that information based on the fact that inflation had grown by 7% recently and increasing costs of various supplies and services. Mr. Gehrke stated that another reason for this adjustment is the concern that the Airport Commission has stated at previous meetings is when new hangars will be built there would be today quite the dichotomy in costs and therefore rental rates. Mr. Gehrke stated that new rates if approved would begin July 1, 2022.

The Airport Commission discussed various sizes of the hangars and differences in the units such as which ones have insulation, bi-fold doors, etc.

Mr. Gehrke stated another concern that he has is that the City Council had recently made a cost of living (COL) adjustment to all full-time, employee pay of 7% due to inflation. The proposed FY23 City budget will have another smaller adjustment for full-time and part-time employees. The Airport will have to make adjustments to cover these changes.

The Airport Commission discussed the information. Canon Loughry asked how the Murfreesboro Airport compared to other surrounding airports. Mr. Gehrke stated that the Airport Commission tries to position the Murfreesboro rates between the higher Nashville area airports and the airports in the more rural areas. Mr. Gehrke stated that many airports were just now discussion and making substantial increases in their rental rates due to the reduction of state funding and urging of the state to set their airport hangar rates to market rates. Mr. Gehrke stated that adjustments are never a popular decision but incremental increases over several years is always better than having to increase the rent a large amount one or two years out of the blue.

George Huddleston moved that the various rental rates as presented be increased 5%. Bill Shacklett seconded the motion. All voted in favor and the motion passed.

Mr. Waldron stated that he would like to see the development of a plan to make further adjustments to the T-hangar rent to bridge the gap between new and older hangar rents. Mr. Waldron stated that in the apartment rental business, when a tenant that had resided in one of their units for many years moves out the rent for that unit might not reflect the current market rates. He suggested that the Airport set new hangar rents when new customers rent a hangar unit. He stated that we would have to contact those on the Hangar Waiting List. He stated that we may not want to adjust the oldest hangars such as the A, B, C hangars but the existing similar bi-fold electric doors that will be similar to those built new on the north end of the airport. George Huddleston and Steve Waldron talked about some of the finer points on how to perhaps determine what that new price difference might be. Benson Hadley stated that the new hangars at John C. Tune Airport were renting for \$600 per month.

Mr. Huddleston asked about the status of the private public project to build some box hangars. Mr. Gehrke stated that the City requested an estimate of what the site work alone would cost to prepare the site to pad ready status. He stated that they also prepared cost estimates on other improvements such as utility installation and construction of Taxiway E and other connectors. Mr. Gehrke stated that Barge provided that information and it was shared with Mr. Waldron and that is where that project is right now. Mr. Waldron stated that he and Mr. Baker are still determining various cost increases that have since occurred. They are looking at various ways to work together to see what can be done.

Mr. Waldron discussed the proposed plans for the layout of T-hangars, Box hangars, and large corporate hangars.

4. **Airport Safety and Capacity Study**

Mr. Gehrke shared with the Airport Commission the data comparing this spring's flight operations to last years. He showed them that MTSU has had an increase in flight lab hours flown but a decrease in airport operations by over 20%. He stated that with the decrease in operations there has been a decrease in complaints from both pilots and neighbors.

Mr. Gehrke stated that this proves that with MTSU and Murfreesboro Aviation actively dispatching their aircraft to other airports and decreasing the number of touch and goes here it has had a significantly positive impact on the Murfreesboro Airport pattern and operations.

Mr. Huddleston thanked MTSU and stated that this data does not support Dr. McPhee's decision to move the program.

Mr. Gehrke stated that those are discussions that he was sure that Dr. Prelis and members of his staff and MTSU administration have had regarding where the program is today and their desire to grow the program and where they believe will give them the greatest opportunities to grow the program to the level they envision.

Mr. Huddleston thanked Dr. Prelis for working with us to address the issues in the pattern.

5. **Discuss the proposed conceptual fuel price schedule** (Chad Gehrke)

Mr. Gehrke presented to the Airport Commission a conceptual fuel pricing schedule. He stated that Airport Staff has been working on this issue for over a year. Mr. Gehrke shared with the Members of the Airport Commission the current fuel price sheet for Avgas and Jet A fuel pointing out how complex the pricing schedule is. He stated that the complexity in the pricing schedule creates confusion with our employees and then errors are made. A great deal of staff time and effort is then spent correcting those errors getting money back to customers etc.

Mr. Gehrke stated that the purpose of the new proposed fuel price schedule was 1. address the complexity issue, 2. prepare for Jet A self-serve fuel, 3. provide opportunities for a corporate customer other than a Commercial Operator the ability to get a corporate level fuel prices to attract them and keep them here at Murfreesboro as a customer. Mr. Gehrke stated that LifeFlight, MTSU and other based customers would use the self-serve Jet A fuel service. Mr. Gehrke stated that the only companies that get the best discount at the airport on fuel are Commercial Operators. He stated that in the future we may want to attract a company that does not provide services but flies a great deal and would purchase a great deal of fuel. We may need that fuel pricing as another incentive for them to move their operations to Murfreesboro.

Mr. Gehrke described a problem with the current fuel rebate system that is in place. He stated that the problem occurs with fuel sales with Murfreesboro Aviation and with the taxes that are paid to the state. He stated that the taxes are not figured on the price of the fuel after the rebate which would mean fewer taxes would be paid to the State. Instead, he reported, that taxes are being figured on the price of the fuel at the time of the transaction and then later the rebate is figured there is a bit of a penalty or loss of revenue that we are creating with the rebate system. Mr. Gehrke described in the proposed system there would be a fixed based corporate level discount provided to all corporate level customers that would apply at the time of the fuel sale transaction.

Mr. Gehrke stated that one goal with the proposed fuel price schedule that he was proposing was to distribute the cost savings across the various types of fuel customers. He stated that the current system gives all of the discount to the Commercial Operators which the rebate comes directly from the set profit margin.

Mr. Gehrke described a proposed fuel price system that would offer a price discount to individual based customers as well as our Commercial Operators. The discount would decrease a bit for the Commercial Operators and increase for the individual based customers. The discount would be higher for self-serve fuel use compared to fuel truck service since there is more labor and equipment involved.

Mr. Gehrke also stated that part of his proposal would be Mr. Huddleston's suggestion to adjust the current fuel flowage fee of \$0.25 per gallon to \$0.50 per gallon.

The Airport Commission members discussed the proposed fuel price schedule. Mr. Huddleston asked about the way the way the fuel price discounts and rebates are being reported. He stated that his concern is that if we are offering a \$0.90 per gallon discount on fuel we will never pay for our new fuel farm. Mr. Gehrke stated that what he was trying to show is that with the current price schedule we offer a discount of so many cents per gallon if the customer pays with cash. Then after that, if they are a commercial operator, the customer is given a rebate of so many cents. If you add those together it equals \$0.90. He stated in the proposed fuel price schedule there would be no discounts for payments with cash versus credit. Mr. Gehrke also explained that working with AirBP and Shell and their credit card systems passing the savings on to the customers. Those programs eventually went away or were difficult to participate in making it frustrating for our based customers who could no longer participate in those programs. Ryan Hulsey confirmed that very few based customers use Titan credit cards.

Steve Waldron stated that several tenants have discussed with him perhaps providing a better discount for based customers. Mr. Waldron asked if the current proposed fuel discount was sufficient or not enough? Mr. Gehrke stated that he reviews the fuel prices at various airports in the area but he does not have access to what fuel discounts the airports or FBOs are offering their based customers. That information is not available to the public.

Mr. Waldron stated that within in the area you can find prices that are really low but that is at an airport that most likely has not sold much fuel and has not had to purchase fuel recently with the new increased rates. Those airport's fuel prices do not reflect the current price of fuel. Mr. Gehrke stated that Ryan Hulsey reported that avgas had gone up \$1.00 over the last week or two.

Mr. Huddleston stated some various avgas fuel prices that he saw the other day on his way through Georgia which were considerably lower than Murfreesboro. He was questioning if there was an issue with Titan Aviation Fuels and the prices they are offering Murfreesboro. Mr. Huddleston stated that some of these airports that he referenced were very active airports so should have purchased fuel at the same rate that we are purchasing fuel.

Mr. Waldron asked if based customers were around 15% of our total sales. Mr. Hulsey stated that he believed that they constituted about 10% of our total sales. He stated that providing a discount to our based customers would not register much a loss of income on our total revenue.

Mr. Huddleston asked what our credit card fees and the ability through better technology to be able to have a customer prepay for fuel? He stated that would help the City not having to pay the credit card fees and be able to offer the customer the lower priced fuel.

Mr. Huddleston asked if we have the technology to allow to accept prepayment for fuel from our based customers, what percentage of our based customers use the fuel truck service, and what percentage of our transients use the fuel truck service?

Mr. Gehrke stated that this was just conceptual at this time. Mr. Gehrke stated that Ryan and Kim were working with Titan so that we can offer the Contract Fuel program for Jet A sales to corporate accounts. Mr. Gehrke stated that Ryan Hulsey and Kim Fann are working with Titan and Atlas to incorporate a breakdown of the taxes into the receipt that our customers receive.

Mr. Waldron stated that he liked what is being proposed with the corporate level discounts and asked that he keep sharing this information with the Airport Commissioners.

6. **Airport Director's report regarding**

a) **Future federal funding** Benson Hadley shared some most recent information.

b) **Hangar One Project** (Scott Elliot)

Chad Gehrke introduced Scott Elliot, the Project Development Director. Mr. Elliot gave a review of the costs of the project. He reported that 60% of the project is complete. Mr. Elliot reviewed some of the delays that had occurred during the project. Mr. Elliot stated that there were still quite a few materials that had not been delivered yet. He stated substantial completion was scheduled for the end of December. Mr. Elliot reported that the City approved an extension of 172 days with a new substantial completion date of June 20, 2022.

The Airport Commission members discussed the project. Mr. Elliot confirmed that the City was not paying any additional material costs.

c) **Approach Management Project**

d) **Taxiway A and Ramp Pavement Rehab Project**

e) **Airport Safety and Capacity Study**

f) **Airport Layout Plan**

Benson Hadley, Chief Planner for Barge Design Solutions stated that the state had received bids for the statewide crack repair, seal coat, and paint project. Mr. Hadley described the various areas of the airport that will be receiving this pavement rehab work.

Mr. Gehrke described the process and reason that all the Commercial Operators received notice that the areas around their hangars need to be cleaned of all objects by June 15th to clear the area for the pavement crews.

Mr. Hadley stated that the same contractor that have received all of the other state pavement repair projects across the state have been awarded this year's contract as well.

Mr. Hadley stated that the Approach Management Project and Taxiway A and Ramp Pavement Rehab Project were not included in this statewide project so that the Airport had more control of when the runway and taxiway work will be completed. With the statewide project the Airport does not have any control over the contractor. Mr. Hadley and Mr. Gehrke described the current plan and scheduling for the Approach Management and Taxiway A and Ramp projects.

Mr. Hadley shared with the Airport Commission 30% plans for the Taxiway A and Ramp project. He described that this project will be a mill and overlay as requested by the State. Mr. Hadley reported that the state has said that as of right now the state will put the apron portion of the project off another year due to lack of funds. Mr. Hadley described various details regarding the project. He reported that final design will begin in May.

Mr. Haley stated that the next step for the Approach Management project will be to conduct and aerial survey once leaves are in tree. That will help with identifying the point for the displaced threshold which will really begin the coordination efforts with the FAA and assist in maintaining the approaches for Runway 36.

The Airport Commission members discussed the importance to move forward with more ramp areas and runup areas.

Mr. Gehrke stated that the State agreed not to modify all the turn radiuses that were not updated during the Runway Extension project.

Mr. Hadley stated that the BIL provides Murfreesboro \$295,000 for the next 4 to 5 years. The FAA and the State are still determining how to manage this new funding project. Murfreesboro ranked high to get one of the highest funding levels.

Mr. Gehrke stated that there is over \$2 million being budgeted for hangar development area on the north area of the airport. Mr. Gehrke stated that he will be working with Barge to get under contract to start to get to work on the installation of utilities and getting this area prepared and pad ready for hangar construction.

Mr. Gehrke stated that he was budgeting around \$550,000 for construction of the fuel farm pad and another \$600,000 for the fuel farm. He stated that the City has agreed to purchase the new fuel farm and not lease the equipment. Mr. Gehrke reviewed some of the details for the capacity of the fuel tanks and other items.

g) **FAA Safety Info Share** – Traffic Pattern Operations was a great success.

h) **Tennessee Airports Conference** – March 28-30,2022 Embassy Suites

7. **Any other business to come before the Airport Commission**

Mr. Gehrke reviewed the Airport Dashboard. He highlighted that the Business Center received \$3,500 in revenue last month. He stated that there were 41 people on the T- hangar Waiting List and 10 on the Tie-down Waiting List.

8. **Consider date and time for next Airport Commission meeting**

April 18, 2022

9. **Adjournment**

1. **Call to order – Attendance**

Airport Commission Chair Steve Waldron welcomed everyone and called the meeting to order.

2. **Consider approval of January 2022 Airport Commission meeting minutes**

Bill Shacklett moved to approve the January 2022 Airport Commission meeting minutes. John Polk seconded the motion and all voted in favor.

3. **Consider approval of the proposed Standard Operating Procedures**

Chad Gehrke described the Standard Operating Procedures stating that the process began approximately a year ago when the City contracted with Dr. Dave Byers of Quadrex Aviation to conduct the Airport Safety and Capacity Study. Mr. Gehrke stated that Dave Byers met with members of the Airport Commission and received input and information including some of the ideas the Commission Members had on how perhaps to solve some of the issues that occur in the pattern. Then Mr. Byers met with representatives of MTSU even getting the opportunity to fly a DA-40 and witness how the pattern operates here at MBT. Mr. Gehrke stated that Dr. Byers also spent time with Murfreesboro Aviation and received their input as well. Mr. Gehrke reported that he believed the real progress began when Dr. Greg Van Patton, Dr. Chaminda Prellis, Michael Gref, Brian Fields, and Larry Williams came on board representing MTSU and joined into this process. Mr. Gehrke stated that the Standard Operating Procedure document has taken on many forms over the last few months and it is at a point where the various parties involved in the creation of this document have gained trust with each other, have greatly improved communications, and have had weekly meetings to get to where the relationship is and the document is today. Mr. Gehrke stated that with these standard operating procedures in place the data is showing that what MTSU and Murfreesboro Aviation have adopted is helping reduce the number of aircraft operating in the pattern and therefore decreasing the number of complaints received from pilots and neighbors. Mr. Gehrke stated that he and the Airport Staff have observed improved communications among the student pilots and instructors and how they interact with the based and transient pilots improving the pattern and how it operates. Mr. Gehrke reported that both MTSU and Murfreesboro Aviation have contracted with Virtower so everyone is able to observe the operations and gather data. Mr. Gehrke stated that each flight school will receive data from Virtower specific to their own aircraft while the Airport receives data on all aircraft operations.

Mr. Gehrke then began to review the various sections of the documents. He started with the introduction. Mr. Gehrke described that he believed that the Standard Operating Procedures will be a living document changing from time to time. The introduction describes then the history and purpose for the adoption of standard operating procedures.

The next section is a standard operation procedure which has a title and date in which it is adopted. There is a description of what the objective is that the procedure is to address. Then there is the operating procedure followed by a list of action items. The action items describe perhaps how the procedure is going to be adopted or communicated. The action items may describe tasks that the Airport or the flight schools are responsible for. Then included in the document is the agreement which states that each party has received the Standard Operating Procedure. There are not penalties specifically assigned in this document except that now that these are Standard Operating Procedures, as described in our Airport Rules, Regulations, and Minimum Standards there are ramifications described for how any pilot, operator if they operate in an unsafe manner can be addressed. Mr. Gehrke stated as in anything the goal is to strive for compliance, safety, and efficiency.

Mr. Gehrke described next the Correction Action Report form. Mr. Gehrke stated that this was an item that Brian Fields from MTSU brought into the discussions. He stated that this is a form that pilots or the Commercial Operators can use to describe a problem, safety concern or issue that they have witnessed or were a part of. The document allows the various parties including the Airport to review the problem or issue and access what corrective action should be taken. Mr. Gehrke described that in some instances through this process in talking with the pilots involved there have been times that in the end it was determined that the pilot made the best decision they could have given the scenario and issues they were dealing with.

Mr. Gehrke stated that the exhibits include a map of the pattern, the Airport Rules, Regulations, and Minimum Standards, and the Advisory Circular describing operating at non-towered airports. Mr. Gehrke stated that the Airport Safety and Capacity Study will be included in document as well.

Mr. Gehrke stated that pilots do not have to read through this entire document to see what the Standard Operating Procedures are. Mr. Gehrke stated that a poster will be created that very clearly list with bullet points listing the various operating procedures. This poster will be located in the pilot weather briefing area and included on the Airport website as well. MTSU and MA will be provided posters as well if they would like to have them on display as well. Mr. Gehrke stated that not all of these procedures may be listed in the Airport Facility Directory or Supplemental Charts but some procedures will.

Mr. Gehrke then reviewed with the Airport Commission the first list of Standard Operating Procedures included in the first listing of procedures proposed for adoption which include:

1. Runway 36 is the preferred runway when the wind is calm, or the tailwind component is less than 5 knots.
2. 360 degree turns for spacing are not authorized. If spacing cannot be accomplished through extension of the upwind or downwind or throttle/airspeed adjustments, aircraft should depart the pattern and re-enter the pattern at the 45 to the downwind.
3. Aircraft should enter the traffic pattern on the 45 to downwind. To maintain proper separation and out of courtesy, aircraft in the pattern should adjust their upwind or crosswind turn to assist with the flow of aircraft entering the pattern from the 45 to downwind. For example, when a high -speed aircraft (120K+ approach speed) requests a straight in approach, pattern aircraft should announce their intentions and adjust their downwind or base turn to assist with this flow of traffic.

Note: The “45 to downwind” should intersect the midpoint of the runway as described in the Advisory Circular 90-66B. (See Exhibit A)

4. Traffic pattern aircraft always have landing priority and straight in approaches are best conducted with an empty pattern. Straight in approaches may only be conducted with the coordination and agreement of other aircraft in the pattern. Otherwise, straight in approaching aircraft should break off their approach two miles from the airport and enter the pattern as described above.
5. Pilots operating in the pattern should extend or adjust their downwind or base turn to assist the flow of traffic departing when a number of aircraft are holding short of the runway. Traffic holding short of the runway, when radio traffic allows, should make a call on CTAF announcing they are holding short and announce their intentions for departure of the pattern or staying closed traffic. Please note that closed traffic operations include touch and goes, stop and goes and land/taxi back operations.
6. When airport representatives observe more than four aircraft conducting closed traffic operations and/or three or more aircraft waiting at the end of Taxiway A for departure, or any number of aircraft have been waiting an extended period of time unable to access the active runway due to the number of aircraft repeatedly operating in the pattern:
 - a. the airport representatives will contact MTSU Dispatch

- b. MTSU Dispatch will communicate to all pilots monitoring Blue Raider Ops frequency instructing MTSU and MA aircraft operating in the pattern conducting closed traffic operations to depart the pattern to allow aircraft waiting for access to the runway time to depart.
7. Preferred departure procedure: Fly runway heading until at an altitude of 2,000' MSL. It is recommended to continue climb to at least 2,600' before leveling off.
8. Practice approaches on opposing runway is prohibited.

Mr. Gehrke described the supplemental procedures which are listed in the document. He stated that he felt that it was important that it be documented that MTSU and Murfreesboro Aviation have adopted supplemental procedures to address capacity issues. For example, MTSU is dispatching primary students to other airports to conduct pattern work and Murfreesboro Aviation is not allowing touch and go operations at Murfreesboro unless the pattern is open or has very few aircraft in the pattern. These supplemental procedures or measures help the airport a great deal.

Mr. Gehrke stated that one item that is listed in the document for MTSU to look into is that on the displays in the aircraft some MTSU aircraft are appearing not as their N number but as a number assigned to that aircraft by the FAA for example is MTU98. Pilots operating in the pattern are confused when MTSU pilots are announcing the aircraft N number but on the display seeing a different set of numbers. This is something that has been asked of MTSU to look into if pilots could announce the MTU number instead of the N number in those cases when appropriate avoiding that confusion in the pattern.

Mr. Gehrke stated that during the discussion with MTSU and Murfreesboro Aviation they could not agree on setting a limit to the number of aircraft operating in the pattern conducting touch and goes. The concern was who was going to be responsible or available to count, if that number is reached which aircraft has to leave the pattern, the first or last aircraft, etc. Representatives of MTSU and Murfreesboro Aviation asked that we first try the procedure listed where if aircraft waiting for departure start to line up a call is made to MTSU dispatch requesting all aircraft operating closed traffic to depart until aircraft on the ground are able to depart. Mr. Gehrke stated that he agrees to try that plan but if that does not work or that option is having to be conducted on a regular basis then assigning a number of aircraft operating closed traffic will be adopted.

Steve Waldron, Chair, stated that what Mr. Gehrke has described is a living document. It may not address all of the concerns that everyone wants addressed. It will be changed from time to time It is a starting point.

Clay Cook asked about the pattern training times and why it was not included in the document. Mr. Gehrke stated that since that was already existing and included in the Airport Facility Directory/Supplemental Charts the representatives of MTSU, Murfreesboro Aviation, and the Airport agreed to not list it.

Clay Cook pointed out in the FAA Directory the remarks do not list the number for which runway is the calm wind runway. Mr. Gehrke stated that he would make sure the FAA has the correct number and published as so.

Mr. Cook stated his concern about days when there is marginal IFR weather and there is a mix of IFR and VFR traffic and how to operate in those instances. He suggested that in future updates of the Standard Operating Procedures that be considered.

George Huddleston asked about a number of typos and corrections that he had highlighted. Mr. Gehrke stated that David Ives had done the same thing and he was able to go into the document and make those corrections and addressed his and David's corrections at the same time. He said that he would make sure that in the final document all of the corrections were made. Mr. Huddleston suggested that when describing how long aircraft waiting for access to the runway should wait no more than two minutes in item 6. Mr. Huddleston stated that he was hoping for a two-page documents that could be provided to the airport customers. He stated that his concern was that this document was too focused on flight training operations and not the operations of all the users. He stated for example five airport customers could be in the pattern conducting touch and goes and there is no way to address that. He stated his appreciation to MTSU and Murfreesboro Aviation for already addressing issues and changing their culture. He said that the data from Virtower is reflecting that.

Mr. Waldron asked George if he would like to make a motion describing a one-page document that lists these procedures to our customers and even have a meeting with our customers to describe and discuss these items with them.

Mr. Huddleston stated his concern that there are times that Airport Staff are not here and therefore some actions may not be able to be taken.

Mr. Huddleston moved to approve the Standard Operating Procedures and make a subset that can be presented to our based and transient customers and on the website. Clay Cook seconded the motion. All voted in favor.

Mr. Gehrke stated that his intention is to have that type of dialogue with the based customers as Mr. Huddleston described at the February 17th FAA safety seminar.

4. Consider approval of Property Maintenance Rules

Chad Gehrke reviewed the Property Maintenance Rules with the Airport Commission. He stated asked the Members of the Airport Commission to keep in mind that there are a couple of different scenarios to consider when reviewing the proposed Property Maintenance Rules. The two scenarios are that there are hangars and facilities that the City has built and leases to customers and there are scenarios where the City leases land to customers and they build hangars and facilities. In the future we may see more of the land lease situations. Mr. Gehrke stated that an important issue is how to address items stored outside of hangars; how to provide screening for such cases where that may be appropriate. Mr. Gehrke addressed customers who may fly out of the airport and park a car for several days and how that is handled.

George Huddleston stated that his concern was that he thought that the document was too broad siting some of the language regarding ensuring that all areas of grass are mowed, storage of cars, etc.

Mr. Gehrke addressed the question regarding cars being parked around the T-hangars. He explained various scenarios when the Airport Staff receives complaints from customers about parked cars around the T-hangar area. The Airport Commission members discussed certain auto parking situations around the T-hangars and the issues and how to possibly address it.

John Polk asked who monitors the rules and how often are hangars inspected. Mr. Gehrke stated that these rules apply to the exterior of the hangar and maintaining a good appearance around the airport. Mr. Waldron stated that this document is an effort to try to get the Airport up to date and compliant with other City regulations. He stated that the Airport is trying to enhance all areas around the airfield.

Mr. Huddleston pointed out 2.2 regarding the parking of automobiles inside the building. Craig Tindall, City Manager stated that may be an item that came from City Code that deals with ensuring the inside is free and clear of any fire hazards. Mr. Huddleston asked if the words regarding inside should be removed to keep it in line with the T-hangar Leases. Mr. Gehrke stated that 2.2 stated non-operational vehicles. In that case the Airport would not have an issue with an operable car parked in the T-hangar.

The Airport Commission discussed if there is adequate wing tip clearances throughout the T-hangars. Mr. Gehrke described the importance of the yellow lines on taxiways which tell a pilot they have adequate taxiway safety areas. He pointed out that there are no yellow lines in the middle of the T-hangars because the taxiway safety area is no longer able to be maintained. The Airport Commission agreed that either no parking should be posted or parking places painted in areas that there will not be problems or issues with aircraft wing tip clearances.

Benson Hadley stated that the standard design for the distance between hangars is 75 feet. Mr. Hadley stated that the distance would have to be 115 to 131 feet that would have to be kept clear in that area to maintain a Taxiway. The FAA refers to that ramp as a non-movement area.

Craig Tindall stated that 2.2 and 2.4 has to do with designated parking areas like what is in front of the Terminal. It is addressing how to keep the designated auto parking areas maintained. Around the T-hangars is not a designated parking area. Those areas are covered under other regulations.

The Airport Commission discussed people parking cars for periods of time when people fly out for periods of time. Mr. Huddleston was concerned that the amount of rules and how to communicate them. Mr. Waldron suggested installing some signs for people parking long term with a telephone as to who they should call to let them know that you are parking at the Airport for a period of time.

Mr. Huddleston stated that 48 hours should be struck and replace it with seven days. The Airport Commission discussed various times. Mr. Polk and Mr. Waldron suggested that 72 hours would cover a long weekend. The importance is that someone communicates that they are parking on City property for an extended period of time.

John Polk moved to strike the language regarding automobiles parked inside hangars in 2.2 and increase the time allowed to park and automobile on City property to 72 hours. Bill Shacklett seconded the motion. All approved.

5. **Airport Director's report regarding**

a) Future federal funding

Mr. Gehrke stated that the Airport has received word that it will be receiving \$295,000 in federal funding each year for the next five years. Benson Hadley stated that there has been no information as to how the funds will be dispersed or what projects will be eligible to use this funding toward. He stated that he will be attending a meeting with the FAA as they describe this funding program a bit more. Mr. Gehrke stated that his concern is that the State will require that this funding be used for only pavement and approach maintenance and ALPs and nothing else. He stated that he would report what he learn about this funding in the near future. Mr. Hadley stated that he hoped that as long as we are addressing pavement and approach issues we can use this funding toward site work for future hangars and perhaps use it along with NPE funds. Mr. Gehrke stated that he will be reviewing all state funding and where we stand to ensure those funds are spent within this fiscal year.

- b) **Airport Dashboard** Mr. Gehrke reviewed the number of meetings and events that have occurred and the revenues gained. Mr. Gehrke shared some pictures of some of the events and how many times the Business Center may have events in a few days. He reviewed the number of gallons of fuel sold and the increase compared to the previous year. Mr. Waldron asked questions regarding the new fuel farm tank sizes. Mr. Gehrke stated that the proposed Avgas will get a 20,000 tank and Jet A 12,000 gallons. He reviewed tie-down and T-hangar Waiting List.
- c) **Hangar One Project**
Mr. Gehrke reported that steel has been delivered but Morgan was searching now for a company to erect the hangar. He stated that the exterior metal was not ordered and there is a concern that there could be a delay in the manufacturing and delivery of that metal. Mr. Gehrke stated that the City was very clear that there is room on site for the storage of any materials for this project. Mr. Gehrke stated that he is working with the State to get the term of the Economic Development Grant extended to cover some additional time to get this project completed. The Airport Commission Members discussed some of the delays and issues with this project.
- d) **Approach Management Project**
- e) **Taxiway A and Ramp Pavement Rehab Project.** Mr. Gehrke reported that both planning projects are moving forward on schedule. Clay Cook asked about the timeline on that project. Mr. Gehrke stated that we are not quite there as to what the timing is. Mr. Gehrke stated that the concept is to close one approach and open the next approach as seamlessly as possible. He will be reporting
- f) **Airport Safety and Capacity Study**
Mr. Gehrke stated that he has requested that Dave Byers send the final report as soon as possible.
- g) **Airport Layout Plan**
City Council has requested some vision of the future of the Airport, how will it serve the community with some rather significant operational changes occurring. John Polk asked if the 5,000 foot runway would be included. Mr. Gehrke stated that that will be a subject we will talk about with City Council prior to our scoping discussions with the State.
- h) **FAA Safety Info Share – Traffic Pattern Operations 2-17-2, 7-9 pm**
- i) **Tennessee Airports Conference – March 28-30,2022 Embassy Suites**

6. **Consider any other business to come before the Airport Commission**

Steve Waldron asked that at the next Airport Commission meeting we discuss the fuel price schedule especially with the cost associated with the new fuel farm and other increased construction costs.

George Huddleston stated that he would like the Airport Commission approve the fuel flowage fee be raised from \$0.25 per gallon to \$0.50. The Airport Commission discussed whether that is appropriate now or at the next Airport Commission meeting when the fuel price schedule is discussed.

Cannon Loughry asked about the need for transient hangar space. Mr. Steve Waldron discussed with him the possibility of building a large hangar to rent out space to transients and based customers. This would include hangars that would be large enough for

7. **Consider date and time for next Airport Commission meeting(February 28, 2022)**

The Members of the Airport Commission agreed to meet February 28, 2022.

8. **Adjournment**