

MINUTES of
AIRPORT BOARD MEETING
April 12, 2006
Aurora Room, 7:00 p.m.

I. CALL TO ORDER: Chair Ron Swanson called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

II. ROLL CALL:

Members Present:

Pete Carlson	Fred Gaffney	Ron Swanson
Gordon Evans	Joe Heueisen	Tom Williams
Eric Forrer		

Staff/CBJ Present:

Allan Heese, Airport Manager	John Coleman, Airport Admin. Asst.
Jerry Mahle, Airport M&O Superintendent	Merrill Sanford, CBJ Assembly Liaison
Patricia deLaBruere, Arpt Business Mgr.	Greg Chaney, Community Development
Ben Mello, Airport Planner	

Public Present:

Ella Rogers, Glacier Restaurant	Ken Wallace, EIS Consultant
Larry DePute, Hangar Owner	Roger Baker, EIS Consultant
Craig Loken, Alaska Seaplanes	Jeanne Josephson, Resident
Jim Vuille, FAA	Patti Sullivan, FAA
Susan Andrews, Local Resident	Sheri Ellis, SWCA
Patty Judson, Resident	Nathan Leigh, USKH
Karin Epperson, Resident	Janet Thrower, Resident
Helen Unruh, Thunderbird Terrace	Dick Rountree, Citizen
Bill Gissel, Neighbor	Jim Wilson, Coastal Helicopters
John Cooper, Cooper Consulting Engineers	Ed Kiesel, Ward Air

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

A. Gordon Evans moved, Fred Gaffney seconded, the adoption of the March 8, 2006, minutes as presented. The motion passed by unanimous consent.

B. Pete Carlson moved, Gordon Evans seconded, the adoption of the March 22, 2006, minutes as presented. The motion passed by unanimous consent.

IV. APPROVAL OF AGENDA: Airport Manager Allan Heese said that Item VII, Special Presentation is scheduled to occur at 8:00. He introduced Patti Sullivan with the FAA who is working with the Airport on the EIS issues. He then introduced Ken Wallace and Sherry Ellis from SWCA. He also introduced Ben Mello as the new/returning Airport Planner. Gordon Evans moved, Pete Carlson seconded, to approve the agenda. The agenda was approved by unanimous consent.

V. PUBLIC COMMENTS: None.

AIRPORT BOARD MEETING

April 12, 2006

Page 2

VI. UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

A. Petro Marine Tank Farm Lease Request: Chair Swanson noted there had been a lot of input from the public at the last meeting. The following motion was made, passed and reconsidered at the April 5, 2006, Special Airport Board meeting: “that the plan presented to the Board by Petro Marine be adopted and sent to the Planning Commission contingent upon a provision that the green belt, fence location and berm height be the subject of further design in response to neighborhood concerns. Design should take the form of a 10-foot minimum berm above the grade of Berners Avenue, the fence location to be on top of the berm or removed from the roadside and the 50-foot green belt maintained as a landscaped area.” Tom Williams had asked for reconsideration of the motion. Tom Williams brought up his notice of reconsideration, seconded by Gordon Evans. The motion passed by unanimous consent. Mr. Williams introduced a substitute motion and said it does not negate anything in the original motion, but places some additional restrictions on the motion. Tom Williams moved, Gordon Evans seconded, and asked unanimous consent to substitute the following motion, that the CBJ Airport Board approve Petro Marine’s request to lease Airport Subdivision Block J, Lots 5 and 6 for the development of an airport fuel storage site, subject to the following conditions:

1. Petro Marine may install tanks whose capacity in the aggregate do not exceed 120,000 gallons, of which not more than 90,000 gallons are for aviation fuel and 30,000 gallons are for heating oil;
2. Petro Marine shall place its tanks at the four storage tank locations closest to the existing road as reflected on its March 21, 2006 document entitled Petro Marine Airport Fuel Storage Site Plan, and is not authorized to use the three locations closest to Berners Avenue as also reflected on that document;
3. The 50 foot green belt adjacent to Berners Avenue shall be maintained as a landscaped area;
4. Petro Marine will pay all elements of developing the site, including but not limited to
 - a. Filling the site to grade, using existing material on site or materials to be pad for by Petro Marine;
 - b. The construction of
 - (1) a berm rising to a height of at least 10 feet above the grade of Berners Avenue paralleling Berners Avenue within the 50 foot green belt; and
 - (2) a comparable berm at least 50 foot in length beginning at the northeasterly end of the berm that parallels Berners Avenue and extending southerly along the edge of the development;
 - c. Installation of a new airport boundary fence to encompass their leased area, to be placed just off the top of the berm; and
 - d. Landscaping the 50 foot green belt adjacent to Berners Avenue.

AIRPORT BOARD MEETING

April 12, 2006

Page 3

5. Petro Marine will receive an annual credit of \$.21 per square foot leased to offset those site development costs described in paragraph 4 above, exclusive of the cost of the tank farm or its installation.

6. Petro Marine agrees to not distribute off-airport any fuel stored or put through the airport fuel storage facility unless the CBJ Planning Commission through the Comprehensive plan has specifically approved or approves the Airport fuel storage facility as an off-airport fuel storage site.

Mr. Williams said that Petro Marine indicated that they would not need more than 120,000 gallons of fuel storage. When the diagram was shown at a subsequent meeting, it had the availability of 210,000 gallons. He believed it is important to provide Petro Marine access to the fuel tank farm. It is required to give them equal access. Given the competitors capacity on the tank farm, 120,000 gallons would give equal access without providing excess access.

In the document handed out at the last meeting, it showed the tank locations. It was Mr. Williams intent to restrict them from the proximity to the neighborhood and increase the effectiveness of the visual barrier. He noted that Petro Marine stated at the last meeting that this was to be used strictly for airport fueling.

The 50 foot green belt will be maintained. Staff had noted the Airport does not have budget for this project; therefore, he thought it was appropriate for the developer for the land to up-front the cost of development. Typically, the Airport charges the \$.34 rate for developed land and gives a credit down to the undeveloped land (which is the \$.21 margin in the motion).

Mr. Williams said staff had a meeting with a few representatives from the neighborhood and the fence location was not going to be directly on top, but just off the top. If Petro Marine were not moving into this area, there would be no cost to move the fence as the fence would not need to be moved. He felt the landscaping costs of that portion immediately in front of Berners Avenue and Petro Marine's site should be paid for by Petro Marine.

Mr. Williams said the last point was put in there as Mr. Baker had noted that Petro Marine had no intention of using this fuel off-site. He felt the Airport would be well advised to stipulate that this site could not be used for off-site valley locations. If that restriction is not set in there, the risk is run that it is used on an emergency basis and then it becomes a tank farm for all the valley.

A five-minute recess was held.

John Cooper, Cooper Consulting Engineers, said that they have a few problems with the motion. Landscaping needs to be defined by the Board. It is something Airport staff will have to maintain. It is possible that landscaping can be done so that the Airport never gets any revenue off of the site, which he did not believe was the intent. Petro Marine has no control over cost and needs to satisfy the Board; therefore, he asked the Board to specify the landscaping. The proposal provides three additional tank spaces for if and when they are ever

AIRPORT BOARD MEETING

April 12, 2006

Page 4

needed. Petro Marine does not see a need for more than four tanks. At the same time, it is unknown when a different type of aircraft requiring different fuels may fly into Juneau. The plan as designed will allow this to be dealt with reasonably expeditiously and without going through the same kind of process again that Petro Marine has been going through for the last few weeks. Approving the 120,000 with some nominal review of additional tankage requirements is reasonable. Just cutting out the additional three tanks asks for more headaches for all involved at some point down the road.

Mr. Cooper said that regarding a comparable berm at least 50 feet in length beginning at the northeasterly end of the berm that parallels Berners Avenue, the last discussion with Airport staff was that it would be at least 10 feet high and take up the entire 50-foot width of the green belt. Fifty feet from the northeast corner means Petro Marine is taking up space with the 50 foot width that is not available without sacrificing tank capacity and that they are not happily going to sacrifice that capacity. If a 10-foot berm height is the critical issue, that can be dealt with inside of the 40 foot setback area. This needs to be clarified as to what comparable means.

Equality of access does not mean equal fuel volume; it just means fair access. Item 6 is acceptable only if it is amended to deal with everyone else that is on the airport today and is effective tomorrow. Fuel is going off airport now. It is not equal to make Petro Marine the only one to be restricted.

Airport Manager Heese said that discussions had been for diesel, not heating fuel as noted in Item 1. He asked if this was a problem for Petro Marine. Mr. Cooper said diesel is effectively heating oil, but Petro Marine is planning to put diesel in one tank as the Airport's facilities are using diesel for heating oil. Tom Williams moved, Gordon Evans seconded, and asked unanimous consent that the proposed motion be thus amended, to substitute diesel for heating oil. The motion to amend passed by unanimous consent.

Chair Swanson asked Jerry Mahle if he had been successful in meeting with the neighborhood regarding coordination regarding this project. Mr. Mahle said he had met with a couple of the neighbors. It was a very cordial meeting. The majority of them felt that if they had any input regarding what the green belt would look like, it means they would be accepting the situation, and therefore were not willing to meet. The meeting lasted for three hours. The main point of contention is they do not want to have the fence visible. They do not like one mound and then a flat area. They would like the mound to go up 10 feet (if not higher) and slope to the road and they want trees. They want to keep as much natural plant life that can be saved on there as well. Everyone knows that it is unknown where this will go, but the main person realized if this project goes forward, it would be nice to have input as to what they will see. The main issue was the height of the berm, not being able to see the tanks, that the fence go back as far as it can, that the berm slope out to the road and trees (they don't want grass). They liked the idea of putting willows on top of the berm.

Fred Gaffney asked a point of order, would the Board entertain public comment on this issue. Chair Swanson asked the audience if anyone was interested in testifying and no one so

AIRPORT BOARD MEETING

April 12, 2006

Page 5

signified. He said the Board understands the public's feelings about the project and they are trying to accommodate that.

Gordon Evans got clarification on the rent credit in that it would only occur until the cost of development was satisfied. Mr. Evans then asked if the Airport would allow Trajen and Delta Western to increase their tanks to 120,000. Mr. Heese replied that if a different tenant wanted to lease additional land, it would be dealt with just as Petro Marine is being dealt with. If additional tanks could be fit on the existing lots, it would be their call. He did not see any Board or staff involvement in trying to equalize quantities of storage capacity. Chair Swanson thought that any additional tanks would go through the Planning and Zoning Commission to address the addition prior to them being installed. Mr. Cooper said Petro Marine is asking the Planning and Zoning for approval up to the 210,000. Planning and Zoning would probably put some kind of notification or nominal approval criteria on the three spare tanks. Petro Marine would have to go before the Commission and request the addition, but it may be a staff-level approval. The existing facility has not been through the process, so any additional tanks would trigger a full conditional use for the entire facility.

Tom Williams moved, Gordon Evans seconded, to amend the motion in Item 5, the second line, which says "annual credit \$.21 per square foot leased until" add "of" before "\$.21" and substitute the word "until" for the two words "to offset" "those site development costs described in paragraph 4 above" and insert "are recovered by Petro Marine, exclusive of the tank farm or its installation." The amendment passed by unanimous consent.

Gordon Evans moved, Tom Williams seconded, an amendment under item 4.d., "Landscaping," to satisfy Mr. Cooper's concerns that after the word "Avenue" change the period to a comma and added "as directed by the Airport Board and/or staff." Chair Swanson said it is unknown what the landscaping is. He said this is the City's responsibility. He thought that item 4.d. should be deleted. Gordon Evans agreed with Chair Swanson that Item 4.d. should be deleted and withdrew his motion; Tom Williams withdrew his second. Gordon Evans moved, Tom Williams seconded, to eliminate 4.d. The amendment passed by unanimous consent.

Tom Williams moved, Gordon Evans seconded, to amend the motion for clarification under item 2. "closest to the existing road" adding "fuel farm" in front of the word "road." The amendment passed by unanimous consent.

Tom Williams moved, Pete Carlson seconded, to amend the motion under item 4.b.i. to add "along northern boundary of Lots 5 and 6" after "paralleling Berners Avenue" and before "within the 50 foot green belt; and." The amendment passed with one objection by Gordon Evans.

Tom Williams moved, Eric Forrer seconded, to amend item 4.c., immediately after "fence" to delete the words "to encompass" and insert the language "along the northern and eastern boundary of. . ." The amendment passed by unanimous consent.

AIRPORT BOARD MEETING

April 12, 2006

Page 6

Eric Forrer questioned the language about restricting the gallons allowed on the leased space. He felt it was unduly treading on the business plan of the company in question. Eric Forrer moved to tag onto the very end of item 1. "pending reconsideration by the Board." This motion died for lack of second. Eric Forrer moved to add the same language to the end of item 2., "subject to reconsideration by the Airport Board." The motion died for lack of second. Mr. Forrer did not understand the notion of not being able to use these fuel farm facilities for off-airport usage. He thought the restrictions encourage an inefficient use of local facilities. He thought fuel will become a huge issue in the upcoming years. He also thought the Board should achieve an income level from the fuel that flows on the airport, regardless of whether it is airport use or not. There is also an issue for equal rules for all residents of the fuel farm. If rule 6. happens in this motion, it should somehow be made to cover the entire fuel farm and not just a single resident.

Chair Swanson said he also had a great deal of difficulty with item 6. He said he buys his home heating oil from an airport distributor. He does that because he likes to support businesses that are on the airport. He did not see a problem with buying fuel from an airport distributor for other purposes. Gordon Evans asked if the Airport makes money from these sales. Chair Swanson replied that it keeps them in business. Mr. Williams said this point was raised by Petro Marine at the previous meeting. If Petro Marine's intention is to make this a valley distribution center, they should be up-front about it, apply for it and then it falls in the realm of the Planning Commission. This is the best location for the airport. It is airport property and it was put there for airport uses. He agreed that the Board probably ought not to try to over-restrict things conceptually, but the problem lies to where the facility is. If, when the EIS is completed and it is found that there is a better place altogether to have a fuel tank farm and the fuel tank farm folks would like to establish a fuel tank farm at a better location and create a whole valley distribution center that the Airport could profit from, the Airport should try to generate the business. He is trying to find a balance of providing for the needs of the airport and providing sufficient access for a competitor on the airport without opening it wide up. Greg Chaney said he researched the permit for the existing fuel farm and it was issued with the restriction that it would be for airport use only and not for distribution off-site. He said this was not to say that this couldn't be approved. Chair Swanson asked if the Planning Commission would have a problem with selling fuel off-site. Mr. Chaney replied that whatever the proposal is they will consider that. Once you get off site, you are talking about traffic through the rest of the community.

Joe Heueisen said he could live with the motion if it did not contain items 1. and 6. Gordon Evans thought that item 6. should be kept to avoid a valley distribution center. Tom Williams moved, Gordon Evans seconded, to amend the motion to eliminate the phrase "through the Comprehensive Plan" in item 6. The motion passed by unanimous consent. Mr. Cooper said that the permit Mr. Chaney had addressed only applies to the three Delta Western tanks. It does not address the Trajen tanks or anything else on the fuel farm today. It does not address anything that would be covered under the conditional use permit that Petro Marine has, except as precedent. It would not be a binding precedent. He said that the Board has heard that Delta Western has violated their permit. Whether Trajen has the same conditions are unknown.

AIRPORT BOARD MEETING

April 12, 2006

Page 7

Fred Gaffney opposed the motion. He supported Petro Marine's request to have a fuel tank at the airport. He thought competition is good. The public has commented on the issue saying they do not want the tank farm there. They do not like the one that is there now. They do not care for the impound lot, etc. He appreciated staff's working with the public to try to resolve this in the best way possible. He understood their position. He discussed the fact that there is a propane storage tank facility located next to Floyd Dryden, which he does not like. He does not view all of this fuel in one area and located near a neighborhood as being the best location for the tanks. He was loath to double the amount of fuel or more next to a neighborhood. He knows it is in the Airport Master Plan. If Petro Marine goes to the expense of doing the project, the tank farm will be there for a long time. If a third distributor wants to come in because it is part of the Master Plan, etc., more tanks would be put in the area. He felt there must be better locations on the airport for a fuel tank farm. He thought it may be appropriate to have a valley distribution center located at the airport and then the airport can actually make some revenue. He could not support expanding a tank farm facility near a neighborhood presently. He wanted to respect the wishes of the neighborhood.

Gordon Evans clarified the motion status – if the motion on the table passes, then it will take the place of the motion passed last week. If the Board rejects the motion, the original motion stands. If the Board wants to take the original motion back up, then there needs to be a motion to reconsider the Board's action in passing the motion. If the motion to reconsider passes, the original motion would be before the Board again for an up or down vote.

The motion as amended was as follows: move and ask unanimous consent that the CBJ Airport Board approve Petro Marine's request to lease Airport Subdivision Block J, Lots 5 and 6 for the development of an airport fuel storage site, subject to the following conditions:

1. Petro Marine may install tanks whose capacity in the aggregate do not exceed 120,000 gallons, of which not more than 90,000 gallons are for aviation fuel and 30,000 gallons are for diesel;
2. Petro Marine shall place its tanks at the four storage tank locations closest to the existing fuel farm road as reflected on its March 21, 2006 document entitled Petro Marine Airport Fuel Storage Site Plan, and is not authorized to use the three locations closest to Berners Avenue as also reflected on that document;
3. The 50 foot green belt adjacent to Berners Avenue shall be maintained as a landscaped area;
4. Petro Marine will pay all elements of developing the site, including but not limited to
 - a. Filling the site to grade, using existing material on site or materials to be pad for by Petro Marine;
 - b. The construction of
 - (1) a berm rising to a height of at least 10 feet above the grade of Berners Avenue paralleling Berners Avenue along the northern boundary of Lots 6 and 6 within the 50 foot green belt; and

AIRPORT BOARD MEETING

April 12, 2006

Page 8

- (2) a comparable berm at least 50 foot in length beginning at the northeasterly end of the berm that parallels Berners Avenue and extending southerly along the edge of the development; and
- c. Installation of a new airport boundary fence along the northern and eastern boundary of their leased area, to be placed just off the top of the berm.

5. Petro Marine will receive an annual credit of \$.21 per square foot leased until those site development costs described in paragraph 4 above are recovered by Petro Marine, exclusive of the cost of the tank farm or its installation.

6. Petro Marine agrees to not distribute off-airport any fuel stored or put through the airport fuel storage facility unless the CBJ Planning Commission has specifically approved or approves the Airport fuel storage facility as an off-airport fuel storage site.

The motion failed on a vote of three to four, with Pete Carlson, Eric Forrer, and Tom Williams voting for the motion.

Gordon Evans moved, Tom Williams seconded, to reconsider the Board's action in passing the motion last week. The vote passed on a vote of five to two, with Eric Forrer and Ron Swanson voting against the motion.

A recess was held.

Chair Swanson noted that the reconsideration motion was made by an ineligible reconsideration motion maker. In order to make a motion for reconsideration, the motion maker must have voted in the affirmative. Mr. Evans voted negative on the original motion's vote and, therefore, is ineligible. Fred Gaffney moved, Gordon Evans seconded, to reconsider what was discussed and passed last week. The motion failed on a vote of four to three, with Gordon Evans, Fred Gaffney, and Tom Williams voting for the motion. The motion from last week's meeting stands.

B. EIS Update: Chair Swanson said that he and Mr. Heese had attended a meeting with all the resource agencies earlier in the day. Patti Sullivan, Ken Wallace and Allan Heese all presented things to the group. Mr. Heese presented the Airport's new alternative, which will be called Alternative X (Attachment #2). The alternative business started when Mr. Huffman from the FAA came to Juneau a few weeks earlier and had a compromise position, which will be called the Huffman compromise (Attachment #1). The way Mr. Huffman explained it then, if Juneau accepts the Huffman compromise, it will go forward and EMAS drops in the trash can. If Juneau does not accept the Huffman compromise, the compromise falls in the trash can and EMAS goes forward. From the Huffman compromise, Mr. Heese and Tom Carson have polished it a bit and have a compromise of their own. This will be presented to Mr. Huffman in Anchorage by the Mayor, McKie Campbell (Commissioner of Fish and Game), Mr. Heese and him. Chair Swanson said he is of two minds, this meeting should be held with the Board's

AIRPORT BOARD MEETING

April 12, 2006

Page 9

unanimous approval for one plan or another. On the other hand, the Board approval may tie their hands when visiting with Mr. Huffman. He left it up to the Board.

Airport Manager Allan Heese said that the big advantage to the Huffman compromise is that it takes the airport way from the need to use EMAS. In order to do that, there is a 400 foot loss of runway length for landing in either direction. The east end project would be done strictly on airport property. When this was first proposed, it was proposed that it was exactly the footprint that has been presented in the Draft EIS as Alternative 6B, which has EMAS. The idea would be that the same footprint would be used and avoid EMAS, which would theoretically be possible by the shortening of the landing distance by 400 feet. The airport would retain the landing lengths by the use of the full-strength pavement at each end. This proposal actually exceeds the 6B footprint by about 188 feet. The question then becomes what happens if this was to be the accepted alternative by the Airport, but then the resource agencies reject this as a viable alternative because it exceeds the footprint of what has been presented as the smallest footprint and the least damaging environmentally. Either the runway must be shortened an additional 188 feet for landing or this gets thrown out and it goes back to EMAS as the only viable alternative. This is a question that needs to be addressed in the near future.

Chair Swanson said that Mr. Huffman said the Airport can adopt this as a temporary plan and then in five years, as the original compromise talked about, use EMAS if it proves itself in Cordova. Or, Mr. Huffman said if the Board would adopt this plan as a permanent solution, EMAS would fall off as a Record of Decision contender. He felt this was an important consideration to have. Mr. Heese said this got complicated in the presentation in that it has the extra 188 foot error. If this is accepted by the Board, but the resource agencies do not accept the addition 188 feet, the Airport would essentially be agreeing to shortening the runway even further. It would still be the same permanent/temporary solution.

Chair Swanson said they had discussed taxiways and he thought Mr. Huffman had said they would build taxiways concurrent with the fill and the full-strength pavement on either end. Either he misunderstood Mr. Huffman or he mis-spoke because taxiways are off the table. Fred Gaffney said he had discussed this with Mayor Botelho, who had the same recollection as Mr. Swanson. Mr. Heese said the issue of the extension of taxiways had been discussed. It makes no sense to extend the taxiways if EMAS is to be installed. That is why the taxiway extension falls away. The Airport never wanted EMAS and the FAA has said that they would re-evaluate taxiways in the future and taxiways could possibly constructed at that time. Extension of the taxiway on the east end would cause more wetlands impacts, which is a second consideration about not extending the taxiways.

Documents given to the Board included: A letter was sent by Alaska Airlines to the FAA (Attachment #3). Mr. Heese interpreted this letter as being pessimistic toward the FAA alternative. The FAA reads the letter as being favorable. Alaska Airlines states that back taxiing is not the desired thing to be done. In discussing the loss of runway length, they thought that slipping the runway should be considered but as long as the Airport will maintain the runway at fair or better braking action, then they didn't see the loss of 400 feet for landing as a big thing. Airport staff tries to keep the runway surface at bare and wet throughout the

AIRPORT BOARD MEETING

April 12, 2006

Page 10

winter, but there will be times that the runway condition may be poor. The runway condition cannot be guaranteed. The second item was questions the staff asked the FAA to address (Attachment #4). The third thing was a letter from the FAA Air Traffic Control Tower Manager (Attachment #5) specifically addressing the back taxiing question.

Staff and the consultant have been working on Alternative X for three weeks. The biggest drawback is that it exceeds the footprint of EMAS, which has been put forward as the least damaging practicable alternative. The west end would require about 350 feet of additional fill for the RSA. The east end would require approximately 170 feet of additional fill, which would be right up to the airport boundary. This would maintain the same departure point, runway end, and runway length on Runway 08. The threshold for landing on Runway 08 remains the same. This alternative meets the FAA runway safety area standards without shortening the runway length. This alternative also includes a taxiway extension on the east end, which would avoid back taxiing. This would be a permanent solution without EMAS.

The Huffman compromise will require 5.2 acres, Alternative X will require 11.75 acres, and JNU's original preferred alternative would have used 18 acres. All projects take advantage of some Refuge land on the west end, but these projects avoid, minimize and are the least damaging practicable alternative. The advantage the Airport staff sees is there are already impacts in that area; this would allow the airport to fill the area to remove wildlife hazards. This would meet the 4(f) issue because there is not a different least damaging practicable alternative. This also applies to reestablishing the trail, which has 4(f) issues, too.

Patti Sullivan, FAA, said that Huffman compromise was done to address JNU's concerns on EMAS. It was also done considering the Airport Board's compromise, which did not meet standards. She felt it was good that everyone is at a point to discuss additional alternatives to help come to agreement. It is better to have more options on the table when it comes time to make the decision. Both of the alternatives are reasonable – they both meet standards, and they have less impact than the Airport's former proposal. She felt Alternative X is a reasonable alternative to be reviewed.

Gordon Evans moved, Tom Williams seconded, (as restated by Eric Forrer and seconded by Joe Heuelsen) that the Airport Board substitutes JNU proposal as a preferred alternative for the previous alternative. The motion was withdrawn by all parties.

Tom Williams moved, Eric Forrer seconded, to direct the Airport Manager and the Board Chair enter into discussions with the FAA as to the acceptability of the JNU proposal. The motion passed by unanimous consent. Ken Wallace, SWCA, said he thinks the question from the FAA will be if the FAA will accept the JNU proposal as a project for the EIS.

- VII. SPECIAL PRESENTATION: Dale Pernula, Community Development Department, said the Comprehensive Plan, which is a general plan for all of Juneau, was last updated in a major fashion in 1995, with adoption in 1996. Additional updates were done in 2003, but the major update was done in 1995. He handed out a copy of a portion of the work program (Attachment #6) that was put together on updating the plan.

AIRPORT BOARD MEETING

April 12, 2006

Page 11

There were 16 tasks identified for the Comprehensive Plan update. Task #11 deals specifically with the airport. Task #3 deals with the updating of policies by all boards, which would include the Airport Board. Task #11 says to add a new section in Chapter 4 on airport transportation. There is a lack of discussion on the airport in the current Comprehensive Plan. A person working on this update is contacting businesses at the airport and he requested any further contacts they may need. This is a major element in the update. Another major element is the GIS program and some of the LIDAR imagery, which may be useful to the airport. It will be useful to the City in evaluating the City-owned lands as to what it can be disposed for – particularly, the Mendenhall Peninsula, Peterson Hill, Lemon Creek, and maybe even West Juneau.

Pete Carlson noted that the Airport Master Plan is a guiding document for the Airport. It is approved by the Board, the FAA, and the Assembly. He appreciated the City including the Airport in this update.

Mr. Pernula said a comprehensive plan sometimes helps when securing federal grants. Although some states require comprehensive plans, it is not required by Alaska or the federal government. The CBJ Charter does authorize the City to have one.

VIII. NEW BUSINESS:

- A. AIP Grant Amendments: The FAA has amended three AIP grants at closeout.
 1. AIP 36 Terminal Security Enhancements: Staff requested approval to appropriate the AIP amendment in the amount \$11,442. Gordon Evans moved, Pete Carlson seconded, to approve staff request to appropriate the AIP amendment in the amount of \$11,442 for the Terminal Security Enhancements. The motion passed by unanimous consent.
 2. AIP 37 Parallel Taxiway Reconstruction: Staff requested approval to appropriate the AIP amendment in the amount \$36,857, and to de-appropriate PFC budget in the amount \$138,131.32 to the required level of match (PFC match was originally approved at twice the normal match amount in case the State did not participate—which it subsequently did—hence the large amount to de-appropriate.) Gordon Evans moved, Pete Carlson seconded, to approve staff request to appropriate the AIP amendment in the amount of \$36,857, and to de-appropriate PFC budget in the amount of \$138,131.32 to the required level of match for the AIP 37 Parallel Taxiway Reconstruction. The motion passed by unanimous consent.
 3. AIP 41 Acquire Airside Vehicles and Equipment: Staff requested approval to appropriate the AIP amendment in the amount \$4,090; to de-appropriate PFC budget in the amount \$116 to the required level of match; and to transfer \$70,000 of forward funding back to the Capital Reserve Account. Gordon Evans moved, Pete Carlson seconded, to approve staff request to appropriate the AIP amendment in the amount of \$4,090, to de-appropriate PFC budget in the amount of \$116 to the required level of match, and to transfer \$70,000 of forward funding back to the Capital Reserve Account

AIRPORT BOARD MEETING

April 12, 2006

Page 12

for AIP 41 Acquire Airside Vehicles and Equipment. The motion passed by unanimous consent.

B. Terminal Projects Funding Overview: Airport Administrative Assistant John Coleman said there are currently four projects underway, just completed, or about to begin, in the terminal: Terminal Enhancement Study Phase 2, Customs Office, Exit Lane Construction, and Roof and Canopy Renovation.

1. Terminal Enhancement Study—Over budget by \$13,000, but well within the amendable limit. Continued staff time is being charged to Project Design (revolving account) to avoid excessive red ink in the project account. A grant amendment will be requested at project closeout. Chair Swanson noted that money has been requested from the federal and state governments. This is an open grant that staff is charging to in order to cover the costs of working on the project. Mr. Heese said this can either be charged to a project or out of the operating budget. The guidance from the Board has been to charge as much time as possible to projects.

Tom Williams recommended the Airport Manager come back with a budget, rather than just an open ended check. Chair Swanson said that the FAA grants money to the airport for a project and the Board has said charge to projects whenever possible. That is what staff has done. They have overspent the grant by \$13,000. Mr. Coleman said there is a cap of 15% above the grant that can be sought. Typically, when the project ends, the accounting is closed out and the Airport applies for the amendment. Mr. Heese said that staff would be happy to set a budget if the Board will let staff know what the scope of work is. Staff is continuing discussions on a vague project. These costs are being drawn from a project design account until such time as a scope of work is built, a budget is built and the grant covers it. If the project never comes to fruition and it is desired to re-establish the level of that capital reserve account, the operating budget or some other source would have to be appropriated.

2. Customs Office—Construction is complete and Customs has moved in. Some invoices remain to be paid, and some force account work remains to be charged. Budget is from existing Area Wide Sales Tax and Marine Passenger Fees. It is expected that the entire \$72,000 budget will be expended. Chair Swanson said that any requests for Marine Passenger Fees should be directed through City Manager Rod Swope.

3. Exit Lane Construction—Work continues. Temporarily being charged to Project Design (revolving account). Possible funding sources include FAA grant and existing Area Wide Sales Tax and Marine Passenger Fees. The Area Wide Sales Tax and Marine Passenger Fees being discussed were given to the Airport several years ago to deal with security upgrades, etc. This would possibly be a good place to lodge these costs. Staff will work on this to try to decide the best way to handle it.

4. Roof and Canopy Renovation—Waiting for roof inspection, to be followed by Engineering's recommendation. Temporarily being charged to Project Design (revolving account). Possible funding sources include FAA grant, and existing Area

AIRPORT BOARD MEETING

April 12, 2006

Page 13

Wide Sales Tax and Marine Passenger Fees, depending on the size of the project. Assembly Member Merrill Sanford said that because of the restrictions on the use of Marine Passenger Fees, it was set up for the City Manager to set up a committee who will designate the projects.

C. **Airport Manager's Report:** Airport Manager Heese reviewed the Airport Manager's Report (Attachment #7).

3. Discussions were held regarding the eagle nest. Fred Gaffney said he had made several phone calls to people who noted this is a breeding pair that have been in that area for a long time. Construction of the nest began last fall. He asked about the legality of removing an eagle nest. The bird watchers in the area felt these birds are quite savvy about aircraft and asked that the airport leave them alone. Chair Swanson said the new nest is on the approach end of the float pond and the runway and will cause a hazard.

Tom Williams called a point of order that in as much as he works for a 135 operator that operates from the float pond that he may have a conflict of interest on the issue. Chair Swanson ruled that he did not have a conflict of interest. Mr. Williams spoke with his employer, who had been distressed about the 2005 nest and would like to see both nests and trees removed.

Airport M&O Superintendent Jerry Mahle said he has permission from both U.S. Fish and Wildlife and State Fish and Wildlife to remove the nest. Both agencies' official stance is that until there is an egg in the nest, it is still just twigs put together, and not a nest at all. It is up to the Airport as to what is done. Hazing has not been working. To determine that there was no egg, pictures have been taken. As of 2:00 p.m. that day, there was no egg.

Patty deLaBruere said she has been on an aircraft that hit an eagle shortly after takeoff. She thought that safety-wise the two do not mix. Chair Swanson said when he was younger, he used to go on eagle counts. It took three people, one to fly, a person to look at the nest, and a person to keep track of the eagles diving on the helicopter from the back. They would go by to count the eggs, then the chicks, then the immature eagles and the eagles would continually dive at the helicopter and they would have to get out of the way. At the location of the nest, it would not surprise him to have an eagle dive at an aircraft to protect the nest. He felt the nest had to go and go quick.

In discussing what would happen if the nest were removed, Mr. Heese replied that there is a protected nest in the area. It is very likely that the eagles will go back to the original nest if the new nest was removed. Joe Heueisen moved, Fred Gaffney seconded, to direct staff to take all measures necessary to remove the eagle nest, up to and including tree removal. The motion passed by unanimous consent.

IX. **ASSEMBLY LIAISON COMMENTS:** Assembly Liaison Merrill Sanford thanked the Board for their discussions.

AIRPORT BOARD MEETING

April 12, 2006

Page 14

- X. PUBLIC COMMENTS: Ella Rogers, Glacier Restaurant Manager, thanked staff for their help with the water problem the previous week.
- XI. BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS:
- A. Gordon Evans asked if Air North would be back for the summer. Ms. deLaBruere said they are only coming into town on a charter basis only.
- B. Tom Williams asked:
1. At the next regular Board meeting, he would like to address the proposed purchase of the acreage across the road. Now that there is a Planner on board, he would like to know how much of the area is wetlands vs. non wetlands. He was not sure this was a good way to spend \$1 million.
 2. He requested a meeting prior to the next Board meeting to get the Airport Manager's evaluation done so that his evaluation might be given to him on time for the first time since he's been on the Board. Chair Swanson said that Mr. Evans is in charge of this. It was noted the following people would be out of town: Gordon Evans from April 25 through April 29. Ron Swanson from May 11 through May 25.
- XII. ANNOUNCEMENTS: None.
- XIII. TIME AND PLACE OF NEXT MEETING: The next regular Airport Board meeting will be held on May 10, 2006, at 7:00 p.m. in the Aurora Room.
- XIV. ADJOURN: Gordon Evans moved, Fred Gaffney seconded, to adjourn the meeting. The meeting adjourned by unanimous consent at 10:25 p.m.

ATTACHMENT #7

JUNEAU INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT MANAGER'S REPORT April 12, 2006

1. Ben Mello will be back in the chair as the Airport Planner starting April 17. Everyone on staff is anxious to have him back to help share the heavy workload we have been under for a long time.
2. It was anticipated that banner operations will begin on April 13. Staff was working on the policy and operating agreement for this operation.
3. A new eagle nest is being built in the float pond area. Airport staff has been having conversations with the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Services, who has jurisdiction over it, who has said that until there is an egg on the nest for the first time, it is not considered a jurisdictional nest. The Airport can remove the tree and/or the nest. Hazing has not worked. From an aircraft aviation safety perspective, staff feels this ought to be removed, but also recognized this was a very sensitive issue.
4. Alaska Airlines enplanements continue to increase at a good rate. March 06 compared to March 05 shows an increase of 4.4%. Calendar 2006 year-to-date is 4.2% ahead of 2005. March 2006 is ahead of March 2001 by 4.8%; calendar 2006 year-to-date is ahead of 2001 by 3.7%.
5. Finance/Budget Update: Staff has submitted to the Finance Department the budget for FY 07/08 budgets, as approved by the Airport Board at the March 22, 2006, meeting. The supplemental spending authority request (Ordinance) for the FY 06 budget has been initiated and will come before the Assembly at the May 15, 2006, meeting.

Staff is working with the Controller's Office about certain line item discrepancies in the FY 07/08 budget, and how these will be detailed and explained to the Assembly. Some specific areas of concern are: elimination of negotiated wage increases for FY 08 in Airfield, the elimination of the \$20,000 in fleet reserve contributions for both years, cuts to Airfield contractual services for runway and taxiway paint (to meet FAA standards), cuts of cracker shells and other ammunition for Airfield wildlife management, cuts of water sampling for the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan, and deletion of Engineer costs for Airport projects. As these are all significant and necessary items, we anticipate major realignment of the budget will be needed during management of each fiscal year. Staff will continue to work with the budget and downtown and will keep the Board updated.

6. Deicing Effluent Regulation. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has decided to begin regulation of airport deicing effluents for both aircraft and airfield deicing activities and substances. To achieve this goal, EPA has prepared a questionnaire to be completed by some airports and airlines, describing the levels of deicing activities, fluids containment, and treatment. We have been tagged to complete a questionnaire. OMB anticipates it will take on average 175 hours to complete the questionnaire.
7. Construction Update:
 - A. Delta-1 Ramp Construction. No activity has occurred in this area since the last report as this project has been on hold for the winter. We now anticipate starting this project very soon. The main limitations remain ground temperatures to allow paving and asphalt plant startup.

- B. Taxiway Extension. The project to extend the two taxiways is nearing closeout status. This project began during the summer of 2004 and is finally complete. The Airport has submitted the closeout package to the FAA. Staff will require some Board and Assembly action in the next couple of months to appropriate the grant and PFC application amendments, although the project is within the previously reported amounts for the overruns on this project.
- C. Terminal Upgrades. At an earlier Board meeting, the Board directed staff to proceed with a project that will rehabilitate the roof on and the canopy in front of the 1984 wing of the terminal. Staff is investigating the best method to design and contract out for this work. Currently, staff is awaiting a roofing contractor (specialist for the Carlisle system) to return to Juneau to inspect the roof. Staff will be coming back to the Board in the near future for authority to take necessary action through the Assembly for appropriating the budget for this project.
- D. Main Ramp Improvements. Previously, staff met with the consulting firm of Dowl Engineering and their subcontractors to discuss the scope of work and design for the Main Ramp Improvement Project. Right now staff is considering three main thrusts for the project: expansion of the Gate 2 hardstand to accommodate the new cargo loader equipment, removal of the drainage swale between the Alaska cargo building and the main ramp, and repair of numerous failing rainwater catch basins on the ramp. A meeting is scheduled for next week to brief all ramp users and seek their input on the project.

After recent inspection of the drainage system, we received some good news and some not so good news. The good news is the drain pipes seem in better shape than we dared hope. The not so good news is that the pipes do not run in the directions or locations staff had previously thought. Also, the pipes were partially filled with a significant amount of sand. Therefore, staff has added flushing of the sand from the system and camera inspection of the pipes to the project. This will allow a more thorough inspection of the condition of the pipes and also allow staff to map where the pipes actually go.

- E. Impound Lot Improvements. A JPD contractor has installed razor wire around the impound lot. The razor wire is not quite up to the JPD's expectations, so they are looking at increasing or upgrading the current set up. JPD reported no further break-ins since the installation of the razor wire.