

MINUTES of
AIRPORT BOARD MEETING
May 12, 2010
Aurora Room, 7:00 p.m.

I. **CALL TO ORDER:** Chair Jerry Godkin called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

II. **ROLL CALL:**

Members Present:

Laurie Berg	Jerry Godkin	Scott Watts
Tamara Cook	Butch Laughlin	Steve Zimmerman
David Epstein		

Staff/CBJ Present:

Jeannie Johnson, Airport Manager	Catherine Fritz, Airport Architect
Patricia deLaBruere, Deputy Airport Mgr.	Tom Carson, Carson Dorn
Jerry Mahle, Airport M&O Super't	Rich Etheridge, Fire Department
John Coleman, Airport Business Mgr.	Keith Walker, CCF/R

Public Present:

Mike Wilson, Coastal Helicopters	Renda Heimbigner, R&D Leasing
Pete Carlson, AOPA/AK Airmen's	David Heimbigner, R&D Leasing
Jim Vuille, Public	Aran Felix, Grateful Dogs (GDOJ)
Nick Borchert, USDA/Wildlife Services	

III. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** *Steve Zimmerman moved, David Epstein seconded, the adoption of the April 14, 2010, Regular Monthly Meeting minutes. The motion passed by unanimous consent.*

IV. **APPROVAL OF AGENDA:** *The agenda passed by unanimous consent.*

V. **PUBLIC COMMENTS:** None

VI. **INTRODUCTION:** Airport Manager Jeannie Johnson introduced Nick Borchert as the new USDA Wildlife Biologist. Mr. Borchert said that the Wildlife Biologist is trained in identifying wildlife hazards and mitigating or being able to put forth recommendations on how to remove or reduce the hazards and reduce the damage.

VIII. **UNFINISHED BUSINESS:**

A. **Fire Department Update on Retroactive Requirement for Sprinklers in Some Hangars:** Fire Chief Rich Etheridge said that most people are aware that there was a sprinkler ordinance adopted by the City that understandably created a lot of concern for a lot of hangar owners at the airport. He was a Fire Marshal and in charge of reading and interpreting the codes. There is a new Fire Marshal now, who was also confused with the way the ordinance is written. The building officials and plan reviewers were confused

with it, too. If the ordinance is confusing to the officials tasked with enforcing it, how would the City expect the public and design professionals to be able to read and understand what was intended. Chief Etheridge wrote a memo to the City Manager that this is a confusing ordinance, it has had a negative impact on several buildings in town, people haven't started the corrective renovations, so it was requested that the ordinance be repealed. The City Manager supported this and asked to have the repeal request sent to the Building Code Advisory Committee. They will meet on May 19 and then they will send the City Manager a recommendation. Chief Etheridge is asking people not to move forward with corrective actions at this time, which will give time to get recommendations from the Building Code Advisory and forward to the Assembly.

B. Report from Airport Board Operations Committee Joint Meeting with Wildlife Hazards Working Group (WHWG): WHWG Chair Steve Zimmerman said the two groups met on Monday night. The meeting was held because a motion was passed by the Board, "That the Manager be directed to apply for a permit to allow the removal of eagle nests that propose a hazard to aircraft and in the event that a permit is obtained, that no action be taken under the permit until the specific proposed action is brought before the Board and approved with or without modification." In the meantime, an emergency permit was received to remove a nest or sticks and no Board action was taken. The meeting on Monday night was to begin the discussion of what the actions the Board should consider approving if, in fact, the permit is authorized. All six members of the Wildlife Hazards Working Group and the three members from the Operations Committee were in attendance, as well as Laurie Berg, Jerry Godkin, Jeannie Johnson, Nick Borchert and Jim Vuille. The Fish and Wildlife Services was represented by Steve Brockman and Richard Enriquez.

The question that generated the most discussion was, "When dealing with territorial eagles, is it better for airport safety to remove an eagle nest or to let the resident birds stay there and maintain their territory." No consensus was reached on this question. Because issuance of the permit could be ground-breaking and have implications for other airports across the country, it was felt that if a permit is issued and nests are removed, a research program should be in place to try to determine if removal of a nest increases or decreases wildlife hazards to the airport.

Tam Cook noted a clarification of the meeting. She said there were some questions that were answered: The Airport obtained an emergency eagle nest removal permit. Apparently the staff at the Airport obtained it correctly and it was, in fact, an eagle nest removal permit. The nest was appropriately removed under the direction of the appropriate federal agency's supervision. The Airport is either number one or two in the United States to obtain an emergency eagle nest removal permit, with Florida perhaps beating us. The other clarification is that the permit that the Board requested to apply for in December has,

AIRPORT BOARD MEETING

May 12, 2010

Page 3

in fact, not been filed because it turns out that coming up with the permit is a fairly complex issue. It has not been filed because of any problem with the Airport staff, but with the difficulty of coming up with a permit that will be acceptable to U.S. Fish and Wildlife staff. Staff has been working with Steve Brockman, who is assigned to deal with permits in this area.

Ms. Cook reported that so far there is no permit that will address the potential problem with mitigation. The other item of interest is it appears that the requirement of mitigation may not be something that can be waived. The mitigation has to do with an obligation that an activity may have, if an activity takes place that involves the removal of an eagle territory from the eco system. It is not directed at particular birds or particular nests, but if the total activity results in a territory that had supported a pair of eagles no longer being able to do that, then there is an obligation to find a different territory to compensate the wild population in some fashion.

There was a fair amount of discussion of how the Airport might mitigate if that is the parameter set by U.S. Fish and Wildlife. The biologists in the room who were the most familiar with the eagles in this area appeared to agree that there is no available eagle territory that is not occupied that the Airport may offer up as mitigation, although some creative solutions were proposed. All of those proposals were rejected. Work on the application will continue. At the meeting, Mr. Brockman was hopeful that it could include some aspect dealing with a study. While a study would not constitute mitigation, it might possibly be accepted by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service in lieu of mitigation. Ms. Cook thought that the scientists in the room were in unanimous agreement that they did not know whether removing the resident eagles would be more hazardous or less hazardous for the airport. That is when everyone turned to the conclusion of making a study and making it part of the permit.

Board Member David Epstein asked why the permit application had not been filed. Ms. Johnson replied that she thought the application had been filed. Tom Carson took photos, made maps, filled out the application and sent it in. It has recently been noted that she had not signed the application even though it had been sent in. In the course of the conversations with U.S. Fish and Wildlife, paperwork has been submitted. Mr. Carson reported that he prepared the permit application and asked Steve Brockman to look at it together so that it could be submitted one time and that would be it. He and Mr. Brockman had a discussion about mitigation, which might be worth \$100,000. When this was shared with Ms. Johnson, she said wait and let's see what options are available to try to control the mitigation slant. He admitted that the signature of the application kind of got away from him. In discussions with U.S. Fish and Wildlife, it was decided that the application would be put on hold until the end of nesting season. At this point, dialog has begun, the information has been provided, but the lingering question of mitigation still remains. It's

been an overall extremely useful period of time. He thought the process will be fair and reasonable for all concerned.

Board Member Laurie Berg said that when the Board makes a motion, it expects staff to follow through of that motion. Mr. Carson replied that the application had been submitted. Ms. Johnson said Tom Carson was probably the wrong person to request the application; it should have been done through the Wildlife Biologist. She noted that Mr. Carson has handled this in a very professional manner. The files have now been transferred to the Wildlife Biologist, who will follow up with the permit application.

IX. **NEW BUSINESS:**

A. **PFC Amendments:** Staff has two PFC amendments in a public comment period ending May 14. They are increases to the matching share of two completed projects, in order to close out the accounting. These amounts are \$978 for the closeout of the EIS account, and \$8,556.29 for the closeout of the Delta-1 Ramp Expansion account. The funds will come from existing PFC collections and interest, no additional collection is required. After FAA approval of these amendments, both amounts need to be appropriated through two Assembly meetings. Staff expects to have FAA approval in time for introduction at the June 7 Assembly meeting.

Alternatively, should the FAA approval not be received in time for the June 7 Assembly meeting, staff requests a transfer of these amounts from the Airport Revolving Capital Reserve account so that these accounts can be closed by the end of June, at the request of the Controller's office. *David Epstein moved, Steve Zimmerman seconded, that upon approval by FAA of the PFC amendments, the Airport Board approves the appropriation of \$978 to close the EIS project account, and \$8,556.29 to close the Delta-1 Ramp project account. Alternatively, if FAA approval is not received, the Airport Board approves the transfer of these funds from the Airport Revolving Capital Reserve account. The motion passed by unanimous consent.*

B. **Draft "A Resolution Clarifying the Membership, Function and Responsibilities of the JNU Wildlife Hazard Working Group ("WHWG") and Distinguishing it from the JNU Wildlife Hazard Advisory Group" (Attachment #1):** Ms. Johnson presented the draft resolution. Because the item was presented to the Board so late, she recommended it be referred to the Airport Board Committee of the Whole. The reason for this resolution is that there is a Wildlife Hazards Working Group that was created and appointed by the Board. The resolution is the finishing piece for CBJ to acknowledge the group. The resolution states what has happened in the past and formalizes the Wildlife Hazards Working Group. She asked the Board to consider renaming the group as the Airport also has a Wildlife Hazard Advisory Group through the

AIRPORT BOARD MEETING

May 12, 2010

Page 5

Wildlife Hazard Management Plan. When you get these two groups noted in minutes or in a meeting, it is very confusing.

Board Member Steve Zimmerman said he is probably the person who has worked on the issue the most. He started working on the creation of the Wildlife Hazard Working Group in 2001. The resolution pretty much reiterates what was done in the past by the Board. He suggested a few minor changes need to be made. *Steve Zimmerman moved, Tam Cook seconded, to give preliminary consideration to the resolution in front of the Board with the possibility of completing work on it tonight.* Airport M&O Superintendent Jerry Mahle said that the FAA states this working group should be a diverse community group. Mr. Zimmerman said that this issue was discussed when the group was formed. Ms. Cook noted that the resolution addresses the group makeup by establishing terms for the members. *Tam Cook moved, Steve Zimmerman seconded, to amend the resolution under Section 3, that at the regular meetings, the Wildlife Control Officer shall submit a report and summary of wildlife monitoring and hazing activities along with the officer's recommendations for changes to those activities. The amendment was approved by unanimous consent.*

Steve Zimmerman moved, David Epstein seconded, to amend the resolution under Section 3, by reading "The Wildlife Hazard Working Group shall meet at least semiannually or upon request of the Airport Board or the Airport Manager." The motion failed.

Steve Zimmerman moved, Tam Cook seconded, to amend the resolution under Section 2 second sentence by striking "the RSA project is completed and". The motion passed by unanimous consent.

Steve Zimmerman noted a point of grammar – it is actually the “Wildlife Hazards Working Group.” There is an “s” on the end of Hazard.

Ms. Johnson said that it would only take another whereas clause to change the name of the group. The Board noted that the resolution was accepted with the two amendments.

C. **Airport Manager's Report:**

1. Wide Area Multilateration (WAM) at Juneau International Airport (Attachment #2): The attachment was written by Marian Blakey, the former Administrator of the FAA. She was very helpful in getting the order through that said that FAA could not take runway length in order to gain runway safety area. This is a feather in JNU's cap to have this program in Juneau. A lot of people can see a plane with an operating transponder. It is very much like radar but more technologically advanced.

AIRPORT BOARD MEETING

May 12, 2010

Page 6

2. Snow Removal Equipment Facility (SREF) Funding Update: Ms. Johnson had a meeting with the FAA Airports Division recently about the funding for the SREF. The SREF is on the CIP list and the plan was to obtain the additional funding above the available AIP dollars from the Congressional delegation. The Airports Division said that if more AIP dollars are obtained, it will only be applied to the existing AIP dollars not increase them. Ms. Johnson thought the gap will be filled in other ways. This will mean a change to the Assembly in how they would lobby for funding. The unfortunate piece is this shortfall was noted two days after the State adopted a \$3 billion capital budget. Docks and Harbors did very well federally and on a statewide basis. She felt the Airport could do well next year. Design for the SREF is going ahead.

3. Briefing on Washington, D.C. Meetings. This was a two-fold trip – lobbying and two classes. The primary purpose was to lobby for the 26 MALSRs. FAA is giving some push back on this project. Ms. Johnson met with all three delegations. Mark Begich has put in \$750,000 for planning money for the terminal parking facility. A brief discussion was held about the gap in the SREF. It was suggested there was a need for creative requests – perhaps energy grants, etc. All are very supportive of 26 MALSR. A meeting was held with the FAA Navigation Services. Eight people were present at the meeting, including two attorneys. Unfortunately there was no one in the room that recognized anything about politics – only engineers and attorneys. Lisa Murkowski has gotten a \$1 million earmark for the 26 MALSR, which was only one of a few earmarks she got. Hopefully this will send a signal to the FAA that this is an important project. They are still contemplating whether they should design it. She met with Alaska Airlines' legislative liaison in DC as Alaska Airlines is very interested in having this project go forward as it is a safety issue and will lower the minimums, which will allow more flights to get in. The Alaska Committee is also very interested in helping get this project moving forward. The Record of Decision expires in July 2010. The 26 MALSR project was included, mitigation (\$1.5 million) was paid in order to have the 26 MALSR project, and the Airport obtained a land transfer from the State of Alaska for the 26 MALSR. Unfortunately, people move on and the forward momentum of a project is lost. Staff is trying reestablish that momentum.

4. Economic Impacts of Airport Projects: A talk was given to the Southeast Alaska Board of Realtors, who wanted to know what was happening at the airport. In the course of gathering information for the talk, it was very impressive to note that the total of the two ongoing projects (RSA and Terminal Renovation) is approximately \$65 million, with approximately 60 people working between the projects. About 80% of those people are local.

AIRPORT BOARD MEETING

May 12, 2010

Page 7

5. Airport Architect's Report (Attachment #3): The equipment and tables are being moved back into the baggage screening area. TSA will be back on line with the regular system for checked baggage on May 13. The other big change was with the exit lane from the departure lounge. Other than a few bugs in the beginning, it has been going well. This type of disruption will continue over the next several months during construction. Everything is going well. The contractor is working collaboratively with the Airport. Major milestones include opening up the new escalator and stairway hopefully by the end of the month. The main contract will be finished in early October.

6. Airport Engineer's Report (Attachment #4): The rip rap of the extended RSA is complete on the west end, including the change order to extend the reinforcement past the southwest corner of the float pond. The pressure sewer from Bayview was lowered where it passes beneath the new Duck Creek. The Duck Creek corridor is completed. Waste material from this project and other areas has been placed outside the rip rap wall and is the perimeter of the new safety area and is approaching completion. The west end is ready to receive dredge spoils.

The new Maplesden Way road has a D-1 surface. When an approved asphalt mix design is ready, asphalt will be laid. Rock was hauled across the Northeast development area on a steady basis. They began building the perimeter wall, which will soon be linked around the footprint with the foundation. Work is also being done on the southeast side.

The dredge is here and assembled. A lot of pipe is being put together. They expect to begin dredging the first week of June.

X. COMMITTEE REPORTS:

- A. Finance Committee: None.
- B. Operations Committee: See above.

XI. ASSEMBLY LIAISON COMMENTS: None

XII. PUBLIC COMMENTS: None.

XIII. BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS:

- A. Chair Jerry Godkin noted Beth McEwen sent an e-mail regarding Airport Board vacancies. Mr. Epstein has reapplied. He reminded the other Board members and public to apply by June 16. The Assembly sitting as the Human Resources Committee will meet on June 28 to go over the applications.

AIRPORT BOARD MEETING

May 12, 2010

Page 8

B. Tam Cook said that the Wildlife Hazards Management Plan is updated every 12 months and she asked the Manager to explain the review process at a future meeting. Ms. Johnson said the last time it was reviewed was 2007 and it has not been reviewed since. She is aware that it needs to be reviewed and it will be.

XIV. **ANNOUNCEMENTS:** None.

XV. **TIME AND PLACE OF NEXT MEETING:** The next regular Airport Board meeting will be held on June 9, 2010, at 7:00 p.m. in the Aurora Room.

XVI. **ADJOURN:** *Steve Zimmerman moved, Laurie Berg seconded, to adjourn the meeting. The meeting adjourned by unanimous consent at 8:35 p.m.*