



CITY CLERK'S OFFICE
Agenda DATE 11/25/15 TIME 10:10a
SERVED BY Lois Amador
RECEIVED BY [Signature]

**AIRPORT ADVISORY BOARD MEETING
THURSDAY, DECEMBER 3, 2015
4:00 PM – 6:00 PM
SANTA FE MUNICIPAL AIRPORT
MODULAR BUILDING (3002 B) NEXT TO TERMINAL**

CALL TO ORDER
ROLL CALL
APPROVAL OF AGENDA
APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES: NOVEMBER 5, 2015

PUBLIC COMMENT (PUBLIC COMMENT LIMITED TO 5-MINUTES PER PERSON)

INTRODUCTION:
INCOMING AIRPORT MANAGER - CAMERON HUMPHRES

PRESENTATION:
AIRPORT MASTER PLAN PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDATIONS - COFFMAN AND ASSOCIATES

DISCUSSION ITEM

1. RULES AND REGULATIONS - GROUND TRANSPORTATION @ SAF
2. PASSENGER FACILITY CHARGE APPLICATION - STATUS UPDATE
3. AIRLINE LEASE NEGOTIATIONS AND RATES AND FEES STUDY
4. AIRPORT TERMINAL RENOVATION BID AWARD AND CONSTRUCTION SCHEDULE
5. FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION'S PART 139 INSPECTION - DECEMBER 8-10, 2015

MATTERS FROM MEMBERS OF THE AIRPORT ADVISORY BOARD

PUBLIC COMMENT (PUBLIC COMMENT LIMITED TO 5-MINUTES PER PERSON)

ADJOURN

Persons with disabilities in need of accommodations, contact the City Clerk's office at 955-6520, five (5) working days prior to meeting date.

**SUMMARY OF ACTION
AIRPORT ADVISORY BOARD MEETING
Thursday, November 5, 2015**

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>ACTION</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
CALL TO ORDER		1
ROLL CALL	QUORUM	1
APPROVAL OF AGENDA	APPROVED	2
APPROVAL OF MINUTES July 9, 2015 and October 1, 2015	APPROVED	2
PUBLIC COMMENTS	INFORMATION/DISCUSSION	2-4
<u>ACTION ITEMS</u>		
ADOPTION OF AIRFIELD CONTROL PLAN	TABLED	4
CONSIDERATION AND ADVISORY RECOMMENDATION REGARDING HISTORIC REVIEW BOARD'S RECOMMENDATION FOR LANDMARK DESIGNATION OF AIRPORT TERMINAL	NOT RECOMMENDED	4-12
CONSIDERATION AND ADVISORY RECOMMENDATION REGARDING DRAFT RESOLUTION	RECOMMENDED	4-12
<u>DISCUSSION ITEMS</u>		
AOPA REGIONAL FLY - IN	INFORMATION/DISCUSSION	12-14
AIR SERVICE STUDY	INFORMATION/DISCUSSION	14-15
AIRPORT MASTER PLAN	INFORMATION/DISCUSSION	15
2014 FINAL CALENDAR YEAR ENPLANEMENT DATA	INFORMATION/DISCUSSION	15

AIRPORT FINANCIAL REPORT FY 15/16 1ST QUARTER	INFORMATION/DISCUSSION	15
AIRPORT MANAGER RECRUITMENT PROCESS	INFORMATION/DISCUSSION	16
MATTERS FROM MEMBERS OF THE AIRPORT ADVISORY BOARD	INFORMATION/DISCUSSION	16-17
PUBLIC COMMENT	INFORMATION/DISCUSSION	17-18
ADJOURNMENT	ADJOURNED	18

**SANTA FE AIRPORT ADVISORY BOARD MEETING
SANTA FE MUNICIPAL AIRPORT
THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 5, 2015
4:00 PM**

A. CALL TO ORDER

A regular meeting of the Santa Fe Airport Advisory Board was called to order by Chairman Stephen Ross on Thursday, November 5, 2015 at approximately 4:00 pm.

B. ROLL CALL

MEMBERS PRESENT

Stephen Ross, Chair
Chris Ortega, Vice Chair
Simon Brackley
Ron Krohn
Troy Padilla
(Vacancy)
(Vacancy)

MEMBERS ABSENT

OTHERS PRESENT

Jon Bulthuis, Transpiration Director
Bill Aneshensel, Aviation Association of Santa Fe
Michael Szczepanski, NMSA
John Spain, AASF
Kent Freier, Molzen Corbin
Jeff Miller, Landmark Aviation
Billie Little, Uber
Kristy Stephens, Enterprise/National
Justin Lisonbee, Enterprise/National
John Ferguson, Avis
David Rasch, Historic Preservation
Marilyn Bane, OSFA
Barbara Harrelson, OSFA
Bob Wood, Tower Manager
Ken DeLapp, Landmark Aviation
Paul Thompson, Santa Fe Valet
Elizabeth Martin, Stenographer

C. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. Bulthuis said he recommend tabling Item 1 under action items. The full plan was not completed in time for action.

MOTION A motion was made by Mr. Padilla, seconded by Mr. Brackley, to approve the agenda as amended.

VOTE The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

**D. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES
July 9, 2015 and October 1, 2015**

MOTION A motion was made by Mr. Brackley, seconded by Mr. Ortega, to approve the minutes of July 9, 2015 as presented.

VOTE The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

MOTION A motion was made by Mr. Brackley, seconded by Mr. Krohn, to approve the minutes of October 1, 2015 as presented.

VOTE The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

E. PUBLIC COMMENT

Chair Ross said we have a couple of action items. Traditionally the process is to have public comment at the beginning and at the end. If there are any comments to action items two and three, this is a good time to speak. Comments are limited to five minutes per person

Ms. Billie Little came forward and asked to speak to another issue. She said that recently she had started driving for Uber. About ten days so she is new to it all. She came to the airport as a good place to start. The first day she watched another driver go inside and she stayed in the car. She watched him come out with a customer. The next day she went inside and there were people disembarking and two shuttle guys saying they had transportation so she did too. The shuttle guy came up to her and got in her face and yelled at her and told her she had no right to be in the terminal and they had exclusive rights and she had to go outside. Another of his colleagues came on her other side and was bullying and intimidating. She left. She called Jon and he said to come today. He said she can be there but not soliciting. That is fine. The next day she came she got yelled at again by another Uber driver. He yelled at her today and told

her she had no right to be in the terminal. There is no signage or guidelines. She feels tensions are raising. It is a good time for this Board to have a meeting and bring together stakeholders and have a period of setting up guidelines and put them on the airport website and a sign that says guidelines here. Thank you.

Chair Ross said we are going to try to put together a discussion about this issue at our December 3rd meeting.

Marilyn Bane said her issue is action item two and three. It might be more productive for you to discuss it first and then she will comment.

Chair Ross said let's proceed now.

Ms. Marilyn Bane said as you can see, you will be looking at the issue of the possibility of giving the Airport a Landmark designation and the standards that come with that. Clearly from my standpoint it is a very deep concern that she has over maintaining the standards of the airport going forward. The character of the airport is very important. She feels so very strongly and the preservation community joins her in making sure, what may seem not as important, it has a character all its own. She thinks it is very important that we pay as much attention to the airport and get as much funding as we can for the airport. She will help in any way she can to get money. She is concerned that the standards be upheld and that there is creativity in maintaining the best of what we have and add on what is needed so that it can maintain Landmark status or the historic registry. The airport does need to be expanded, however, we need to maintain the character of Santa Fe. If you have any questions please ask David.

Mr. David Rasch said he is here for questions. You are reviewing the recommendation of the H Board. He can explain to the Board what that means and he can speak to the Resolution.

Mr. Aneshensel asked can we listen to him and his offer now. We would like to know what actions have been taken already, who is involved and where it is going. We could not find anything on the City website.

Mr. Bulthuis said we have the minutes from the H Board meeting where the recommendation was made to request Landmark status to the City Council. The Finance Committee has reviewed the design Resolution at a meeting on Monday. We have a copy of that if you would like. He deferred to Mr. Rasch for more detail.

Mr. Aneshensel said it would be useful to know who has what authorities and when meetings are, so interested people can attend. We want to have a voice in that.

Chair Ross said we can distribute that.

Mr. Bulthuis said everything is on the City website with minutes and packets. The

Finance Committee has reviewed the Resolution. Everything is available. He can help guide everyone to where those things are.

F. ACTION ITEMS

1. ADOPTION OF AIRFIELD ACCESS CONTROL PLAN - PROPOSED IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE

This item was tabled.

2. CONSIDERATION AND ADVISORY RECOMMENDATION REGARDING HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

Chair will do number 2 and 3 together.

Mr. Bulthuis said he will defer to David Rasch for a brief explanation of the process.

Mr. Rasch said the State of New Mexico Historic Division determined that the airport is eligible for State and Federal listing. That prompted the Mayor to ask us to get involved. We published the agenda and put a poster out there for the H Board meeting/hearing. They unanimously recommended Landmark status for the terminal building only. The H Board has jurisdiction over the exterior and some interior renovations of historic buildings. This means that if the Governing Body adopts the Landmark status, which they are required to hear, all elevations of the terminal building will be under the jurisdiction of the H Board. When the City heard this recommendation some members felt that would be very restrictive. A Resolution was drafted. The Landmark status has been put on hold. The Resolution is just a Resolution not law. An Ordinance is law. The Resolution takes the jurisdiction away from the H Board and gives that jurisdiction to my office with the H Board Chairman in consultation. The Resolution went through Finance through the consent calendar. It goes to Public Works next Monday and the Governing Body on Tuesday. He will not be at the Council meeting, but someone else will take it through. Once approved or not, we have to hear the Ordinance for the Landmark designation no matter what. That is the law. If we approve the Resolution we still have to do the Landmark Ordinance. The Resolution will disappear if the Landmark designation is approved.

Chair Ross said you said some people think the Landmark designation is too restrictive. Can you explain. There is an urgent need.

Mr. Rasch said the Landmark designation outside of the Historic District makes all facades primary facades requiring preservation. To remove a window requires a hardship exception.

Chair Ross said we are not proposing to change the exterior of the building. Energy efficient windows, what about that.

Mr. Rasch said the Board would have to listen to that and give an exception. The Board has granted exceptions for metal windows before.

Chair Ross said most airport have automatic sliding glass doors.

Mr. Rasch said lately my Board has been willing to work with people. We understand it needs to be a functional 21st century building.

Mr. Ortega said part of the terminal building is the control tower. It is more modern. How does the Landmark status effect that.

Mr. Rasch said we would apply to the tower. FAA standards would have to be aired at the H Board. We can't go against federal standards. We say in the Resolution that for example chain link fences are not allowed unless under certain other standards.

Mr. Ortega said right now the only thing moving is the Resolution.

Mr. Rasch said yes.

Mr. Ortega asked is it fair to say that it will sail through consent. If at a later time the Landmark gets approved does that render the Resolution moot.

Mr. Rasch said the City Attorney said we will have to work on that. A Landmark Ordinance is law so it may apply.

Mr. Ortega asked what is the time frame for that.

Mr. Rasch said we are thinking of bringing it back in January. First we have to get a sponsor, they do have that. Then we have to publish the Ordinance. Thirty days later the Governing Body hears it. It is not published yet. We plan to publish it on December 9th and hear it in January.

Mr. Padilla said as we are going through the planning of the need to expand the interior and down the road expand the terminal further how would the H Board look at that. It is a need. We need the minimum stuff.

Mr. Rasch said he has heard the Master Plan. He understands the needs. My Board will look at it differently. He does make a recommendation to the H Board. To do an addition on this building, if it is a Landmark, the H Board has jurisdiction over the addition. By law, it only can expand by 50% of the buildings footprint. If it doubles the size it has to be given an exception by the Board.

Chair Ross said tell me about the architecture standards that apply to an addition.

Mr. Rasch said it is based upon the Historic Review District.

Chair Ross asked if the Airport is under a strict Landmark designation what would it look like.

Mr. Rasch said either way it has to harmonize with the existing building.

Mr. Krohn asked does an addition imply that it is an attached structure.

Mr. Rasch said yes, if it is not attached we don't have jurisdiction and neither does the Board. If we are not involved the, the State standards will be based on the Federal money used. In terms of efficiency in design, an addition is usually just attached on to a building. We would want the original historic building to remain visible. There could be minor adjustments.

Chair Ross asked does the eligibility carry with it any standards itself.

Mr. Rasch said right now Federal standards will apply if any federal money is involved in your project. The building has to be listed on the State register to be under State standards.

Chair Ross asked what are the Federal standards.

Mr. Rasch said the Secretary of the Interior standards are similar to the municipal standards. It has to be the same architecture as the historic building.

Mr. Brackley said you are talking about the exterior look of the building. There have been changes over the years that do not comply.

Mr. Rasch said the City Attorney has advised me that we can go into the interior of buildings. The Resolution does have language about the interior, tin light fixtures and chairs, need to be preserved and duplicated. We have the total legal authority but we need to use it judiciously.

Mr. Ortega asked if the Resolution approved by the Council and the Ordinance is not until January, what happens in between. Is our project on hold.

Mr. Bulthuis said the renovations we have been discussing and that have been designed and are out for bid would continue forward either way. This would effect future projects only, not this Phase 1 project.

Chair Ross said we had the walk through with some Councilors and others and

there was a free form discussion about this project. Those concerns and discussions have been completed.

Mr. Rasch said the City Attorney advised us that it is not a Landmark until it is a Landmark.

Mr. Ortega asked has all this been looked at in context of what surrounds the terminal.

Mr. Rasch said no, that is not being looked at.

Mr. Rasch said the terminal building will be wagging the tail of this dog. We are hoping the entry will change so we don't have to go by the junk yard..

Chair Ross said thank you. Please stay around for questions.

Mr. Bulthuis said the State's acknowledged that the building is eligible for listing on the National Historic Registry. It may be useful to hear a bit about that.

Mr. Rasch said the State and the City do not have funding to carry out the necessary study to nominate the structure for either register so it is not our intent to go down that path. The State has recognized that another organizations like OSFA could fund that kind of a study and the State would use it to go through the process to list it on the registers.

Chair Ross asked how would that change projects at airport.

Mr. Rasch said if the Governing Body does not accept the Ordinance or the Resolution only the State would review projects. If it is placed on a the list the City will have no jurisdiction. It will be State and Federal.

Chair Ross asked if the City takes one of these techniques, does that mean the Feds won't do anything.

Mr. Rasch said as long as there is Federal involvement the State will review it under the Secretary of the Interior guidelines. If we get all the approvals the State will review under their standards and advise. The City will do concurrent reviews under different standards.

Mr. Padilla said there are other buildings on this airport that are as old or older. Are they being considered.

Mr. Rasch said no other buildings are being considered.

Mr. Rasch said the Mayor said we need to look at this.

Mr. Bulthuis said he is asking for your recommendations as a Board that I can carry back to the Governing Body related to each of these methods. David laid it out pretty clearly. The Resolution has a little less binding authority and is not a law but honors the intent to preserve the historic character of the airport while allowing for modern amenities. The Landmark Ordinance does have the force of the law. The Landmark Ordinance will also require public hearings before the H Board.

Mr. Krohn said in terms of either option, my question is when meeting TSA standards how do either of these impact that from a cost perspective. The Landmark status is a nice luxury to have but do we have the money to honor that.

Mr. Freier said he did not see a lot of cost involved. If we are looking at TSA and security improvements it is not a big deal. Issues of having to have similar structures like trying to find tin lights could be costly. Physical improvements will take extra time to go through the H Board.

Mr. Rasch said he agreed.

Chair Ross asked how does the Resolution compare to the standards of the Ordinance.

Mr. Rasch said the Resolution is based on Historic Review District standards which are relaxed standards. The Landmark Ordinance will require that all historic material on all facades must be retained. In the Resolution it says it must be harmonious.

Chair Ross asked how about the addition.

Mr. Rasch said the addition would be addressed in a similar way either way.

Chair Ross said Jon you might want to go through these standards briefly.

Mr. Rasch read the Resolution.

Mr. Padilla asked on your Board does anyone have any airport experience.

Mr. Rasch said he did not believe so. It is just a design board about how things look. We would follow your lead on function.

Chair Ross asked the Board, where are we.

Mr. Bulthuis said he is looking for a recommendation from the Board about the two recommendations. The Landmark designation and the Resolution.

Chair Ross said he liked the Resolution. It brings David and the Chair of the H

Board into a process with us to ensure that the building's important design attributes are maintained. He does not think anyone here wants to change that. He likes the flexibility of it and that you thought about how to accommodate our issues out here. He sees that the Landmark status will create a process and maybe some conflicts down the road between functionality and preservation. He is glad David helped with the Resolution.

Mr. Padilla said he is concerned. He has a feeling where the airport will go in the future with bigger airplanes and more people than we are at minimum now. How do we grow and preserve when we have an immediate need. To date with the engineering firm and different Mayors and Boards there has been a preservation of the tower so far. The terminal has changed in the interior from the day it was designed. We need to grow it more. Can we work together. Every time we need to put a piece of equipment or a different way to scan we have to run to a Board to get approval and that will slow things down. He doesn't know if there is anything we can do about it.

Chair Ross said the Resolution does not require Board approval just consultation. The Ordinance does. We have to accept one or the other.

Mr. Ortega said even though the Resolution may get approved, a few months down the road it may go away. It is a good compromise.

Mr. Bob Wood said he has been at the airport for eighteen years. He likes the terminal building and thinks it is beautiful. He said he is eighteen years older than it is. He shares Troy's concern that what you are doing is giving away power and that will eventually come back and haunt you. If you go down the road of preserving you have to talk about requesting approval. If you have to do one or the other the Resolution is the best option. Can we opt for neither one.

Mr. Aneshensel said he was thirteen years older than the building when it was under construction. He likes the terminal building. It looks swell. We labored long and hard on a short term plan. He does not want to see anything stop that. It is pure chaos on some days here to move people through because we don't have sufficient facilities. Larger aircraft is inevitable. We need to be a bit nimble on our feet going forward. We don't have that kind of money. It may be prudent to put this off so we can get the information out to interested parties. He volunteered Mr. Ortega to put this into a cohesive picture.

Mr. Paul Thompson said he owns a transportation company and moves thousands of people. He said we get a lot of complaints about the airport. They don't talk about it being historic and the charm but they complain about inefficiencies and say they will not come back here and will go to Albuquerque next year.

Mr. Krohn said the Resolution provides more flexibility and an easier process. The existing structure is inadequate on so many levels, maybe we need more flexibility than either of these documents provide.

Chair Ross said we need to vote yes on either or reject both.

Mr. Padilla said the City Council has to take this under consideration. What happens if they vote the Resolution down. The State does not have funding to move forward.

Ms. Bane said neither the State or the City do. But there are private entities that do.

Mr. Ortega said the Resolution is on its way to do something. It would be advisable to let people know what we think.

Mr. Padilla said he would like to revisit the Resolution. It is written by someone who does not have experience with airport operations and needs or what the demand is now and in the future. We have to grow the terminal or build a new one.

Chair Ross said he sees this as a planning document and not as impeding our ability to grow the airport. It could be a burden on Kent and his people but is not impeding development.

Mr. Padilla said we put the burden on Kent and in the 2nd Phase he has to do more work and we have less money. We have less money to spend.

Mr. Freier said your engineering and architectural costs on the project are 10%. What is expensive is the structure and the infrastructure. We went through a lot of this already. We were not expecting public hearings or the H Board. It may take a bit more effort to get approvals but that is a lot less than it would be in construction. It is more time consuming on the design part. Albuquerque went through the same things with the old terminal there. They finally made it TSA's headquarters.

Mr. Bulthuis said he thinks the intent of the Resolution is to avoid that onerous process. The other major intent is to have any future structure be compatible with the historic structure. The content of the Resolution does not address the operational issues. Those are things that we will put out to bid for competition. During that process he sees this as narrowing down immediately what we are looking for. If this passes we know what the expansion has to look like so it saves time up front in terms of getting the architect right to work. It also removes impediments like the 50% expansion rule. That is not workable for us. If the Landmark designation is approved it will lengthen the process. It is not as efficient as the Resolution.

Mr. Ortega said we still don't know even if Resolution passes if the Landmark designation will go through.

Mr. Bulthuis said that is correct but taking a strong active role in recommending

this will be important. Your voice would be clearly heard at that point.

Chair Ross said everybody seems to have gravitated to the Resolution. The Council will appreciate that.

Mr. Bulthuis said the Landmark Public Hearing is going to happen required by law. This is the first opportunity for the Board to express your opinion.

Mr. Brackley said he is encouraged by some of the language in the Resolution And by David's language that he recognized that the needs include for the terminal to be a functional 21st century building. We don't know if TSA will come out with new regulations and rules. The danger is we can't prescribe what is going to happen with future changes. The Resolution is acceptable to me.

Mr. Bulthuis said the Resolution does not have the force of law. It is a guiding document approved by the City Council and that we are expected to follow.

Mr. Krohn said the Resolution can be amended or eliminated but the Landmark designation can not.

Mr. Bulthuis said it would be more difficult with the Landmark. There is a different level of process to do that.

Chair Ross said we need action on both of items and a motion on each one.

MOTION A motion was made by Mr. Krohn, seconded by Mr. Ortega, to accept the Resolution as presented.

VOTE The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

MOTION A motion was made by Chair Ross, seconded by Mr. Padilla, that the Board not accept Item 2, based on advice that the City Council will accept the Resolution and that we feel the Landmark designation would be too much of an impediment to the operation and growth of the airport in the future.

VOTE The motion was approved unanimously by voice vote.

**3. CONSIDERATION AND ADVISORY RECOMMENDATION REGARDING
DRAFT RESOLUTION: AIRPORT DESIGN STANDARDS**

This item was voted upon above.

G. DISCUSSION ITEMS

1. AOPA REGIONAL FLY- IN - APPLICATION TO HOST FUTURE EVENT

Chair Ross said he went to Colorado Springs for a Fly-In and was blown away. 2,500 people and 400 airplanes were there. They also had a pretty intense set of meeting. They also had a camping area. He thought why don't we do this in Santa Fe. It would be positive for the airport, the FBOs, the hospitality industry and the community. He called the FAA and they told him that annually they open up a process to accept applications from different cities to host this. They have announced four locations for next year. They are now starting the process for the year after. There is time for us to think about this. The requirements are well tailored to us. You need the support of airport management and at least one FBO, the Governing Board needs to recommend that we take it on, the air traffic control tower must sign off on it and it is optional to have the local Convention and Business Bureau, Mayor and elected officials support. Host airports have to have the necessary capability of the airfield and the ability to park five hundred airplanes and one thousand cars. The local community has to be able to absorb people into restaurants and hotels. There needs to be no restricted airspace that would pose a problem to event. We only have Los Alamos. There needs to be a mechanic shop on the field and space for camping. If possible, local aviation groups need to agree to assist. The event is run by volunteers. They like to see things like tie down fees and landing fees be donated for the period of the event and hanger space as needed. Local law enforcement needs to sign up for traffic control. EMS and Fire need to be on site. It looks like it could be a benefit. The application is pretty burdensome. It would be fun but a lot of work.

Mr. Padilla asked would this be a 17/18 event.

Chair Ross said yes.

Mr. Padilla said so there is plenty of time to plan it. It bears further discussion. We would need to make sure of the timing. We would not want it to fall on dates during Indian Market or Spanish market. It is doable.

Mr. Ortega asked they do four a year.

Chair Ross said yes.

Mr. Ortega asked how many communities apply.

Chair Ross said he would find out.

Mr. Brackley said he think it sounds terrific. The business community would be enthusiastic. In the paperwork it says a cash contribution from the City's Economic Development Fund.

Chair Ross said lodges tax would be logically. They charge for it to pay for the event. He will have to see how much they are talking about.

Mr. Brackley asked were all the venues on airport property.

Chair Ross said yes except the activities like the museum and Pikes Peak.

Mr. Krohn said we have to have parking for one thousand cars.

Chair Ross said they parked them in a field in Colorado Springs.

Mr. Brackley asked did they use shuttles

Chair Ross said shuttles and golf carts.

Mr. Padilla said it is almost a City project.

Mr. Krohn said it would certainly bring community attention to the airport.

Mr. Wood said when we have had Fly-Ins before we have not had prior notification. My only real concern is parking areas for aircraft and that they all don't arrive at once.

Chair Ross said in Colorado Springs a ton of planes were in and out. It took a lot of thought.

Mr. Wood said we don't have enough staff to land a bunch at a time. Within our limits we could do that.

Mr. Padilla said he was sure the Colorado Springs Tower Chief would consult. Maybe your company could bring in extra help.

Mr. Wood said probably not. They have to be certified at the facility. It is totally different when just a few people are in the tower.

Mr. Krohn said as a tourist destination we offer a lot. We could encourage people to come early and stay late.

Mr. Padilla said he would like to have more discussion on this.

2. AIR SERVICE STUDY - CONSULTANT SELECTION AND PROJECT SCHEDULE

Mr. Bulthuis said there is information in your packet on this issue, including an excerpt from the proposal of the firm selected and the scope of work. A group reviewed the proposals including myself, our Board Chairman, our incoming Airport Manager and Larry. It was a unanimous decision. This is a stand out company. Sixel is the company. The finalized contract has to go through the City Council approval process. The City Manager is capable of signing the contract. We are excited to get this work done and we are getting started with process.

Mr. Brackley said it takes nine weeks to do. When will they start.

Mr. Bulthuis said hopefully we will wrap it up in February. They are looking at data across our service spectrum.

Mr. Brackley said this is a slow time for Santa Fe.

Mr. Bulthuis said they will be looking at data across the board and across the calendar. We expect good things. This company received positive recommendations from other airports they worked with.

Mr. Krohn asked how do their recommendations dovetail to the infrastructure here to support the traffic they are suggesting.

Mr. Bulthuis said there is a lot of talk in negotiation about the Master Plan process and taking the work they prepare for us and feeding it back into the Master Plan. The work this group does will be enveloped into the bigger Master Plan Study. They are aware of where we are with the Master Plan. There will be a market assessment about what routes are financially viable and sellable to airlines.

Mr. Krohn asked what good is that if we don't have the infrastructure to support it.

Mr. Bulthuis said the Master Plan will hopefully provide that infrastructure by airline to make those commitments. We only have what we have in the short run.

Mr. Krohn said we recently saw an evaluation that our terminal needs to be 18,000 square feet. We don't have the resources.

Mr. Bulthuis said he met with the Mayor and he asked what we need to do to get Phase 2 going. He said we need the design money up front. He is very aware of this

and will work in the Legislative Session to try to obtain the funds.

Chair Ross said Sixtel can also help us to try to get the LA flight back.

Mr. Bulthuis said part of it is helping the City to tell its story and the investment we are making in the future terminal expansion and getting that out there.

3. AIRPORT MASTER PLAN - DECEMBER 3RD SITE VISIT, MPAC MEETING, PUBLIC MEETING

Mr. Bulthuis said our next Advisory meeting is December 3rd and will be the same format as we had three and a half months ago when the report was done. This meeting will have the plan advisory meeting in the early afternoon and then we will come to the Advisory meeting. A public meeting will happen immediately after.

Chair Ross said we will have to deal with the Advisory Committee quorum during the late meeting again.

Mr. Bulthuis said he would check with the clerk. It is really an open house. Hopefully the we will have full Board for that meeting. Now we are getting into the real meat of the Master Plan recommendations.

4. 2014 FINAL CALENDAR YEAR ENPLANEMENT DATA - FAA

Chair Ross said this information is in the packet. It looks flat.

Mr. Bulthuis said this is the data we get back from FAA after it is reported by the airlines and FBOs. It is pretty stable.

5. AIRPORT FINANCIAL REPORT FY 15/16 - 1st QUARTER (July - September)

Mr. Bulthuis said this report is in the packet. We are lagging a bit in receivables. We did a good job at the end of the fiscal year to come current. But it is clear that now we are lacking there again. It is due to a lack of staff and keeping on top of the receivables. He was not sure why this format is laid out like it is. He will get clean, clear, up to date data for the next meeting.

Mr. Ortega said you think it is not accurate.

Mr. Bulthuis said he is doubting that it is accurate on receivables. The expenses seems ok

6. AIRPORT MANAGER RECRUITMENT PROCESS - UPDATE

Mr. Bulthuis said he was happy to say that we have hired a person. He starts in March. His application is in the packet. The City Manager has accepted the selection committee's recommendation of Cameron Humphres for the position. His resume is here as well. He will join us by Skype for our meeting in December. He is living in New Zealand right now. His background is military early on and civilian more recently at the Rapid City Regional Airport. He took that airport through a similar path as we anticipate this airport going through. Terminal expansion, work with air service development and recruitment. He also has experience establishing clear standards and worked with rates and fees. He was a head above the other candidates. He accepted our offer. He will relocate and be at work on site on March 1, 2016. He is a good candidate worth waiting for. He is willing to participate in projects and processes even though he is not being paid for that yet. He will help me make the selection for the contracts manager position at the airport.

Mr. Brackley said the City Manager made an offer and he accepted. Has he been at this airport.

Mr. Bulthuis said no, we gave an exception due to his current living situation. He did have an early upbringing in New Mexico, being born in Los Alamos. He has family here. We are very happy. We talked about our experience with the previous manager so everything is on the table. He is excited about the opportunity.

H. MATTERS FROM MEMBERS OF THE AIRPORT ADVISORY BOARD

Mr. Krohn asked with the Police Department withdrawing have we hired a private security firm.

Mr. Bulthuis said that process has made it through the Finance Committee but has not been approved by City Council yet. We did go through an RFP process and we gave a recommendation. Currently we have Blackstone and they will continue until the new firm takes over.

Mr. Krohn asked is there any possibility that the police will come back at some point in the future.

Mr. Bulthuis said it is my hope that will be the case. There was nothing said to the contrary. It was a staffing issue. They have seventeen vacancies right now.

Mr. Krohn said on the front page of The New Mexican, in comparing the number of Public Safety and Police Department employees in comparable communities we may

be way ahead of other communities in the State. Seventeen vacancies doesn't mean a whole lot. Are they going to compensate the airport for the land they use for the shooting range. Since they have backed away from that now, maybe the Police Department should pay for Blackstone. Is the shooting range a compatible use of airport property. What would FAA say about that.

Mr. Bulthuis said it is not a compatible use. They recognize the historical fact that the facility has been here for decades. It is not something the future Master Plan wants to host. When the date comes that they can get another facility it will no longer be located on airport property. In the meantime they do have a facility at airport that they are not compensating the airport for. We have an agreement that they will pay market value for their installations. Both are being appraised now and we will have to enter into an agreement with the Police Department. We are very disappointed. We put a lot of effort into that. It is a loss. In long term having a law enforcement presence on the airport is a viable goal.

Mr. Ortega said a year and a half ago or so Francie explained to us that anyone using airport property should be leasing it at market value. What about the Wastewater Treatment Plant. We have a similar thing going on with them.

Mr. Bulthuis said we met with Wastewater. They intend to do more deep well injections and because of that plan to move we have not gotten into discussions at this point.

Mr. Ortega said the City recently hired a consultant to look at City leases.

Mr. Bulthuis said that is the City Asset Development Director, Matt O'Reilly. He is City staff. He was very involved in the review of the leases when the Jet center came forward. Going forward, once the Master Plan recommendations are made public and vetted, we will be instrumental in identifying parcels that are available and ready to lease. We are waiting a bit on the new entrance to be adopted.

Mr. Ortega said are we waiting for the Master Plan or is Matt doing some of this.

Mr. Bulthuis said real opportunities will come after all is evaluated. We have a couple of proposals that he is assisting with in terms of how we can make that property available to carry out their plan. You will see that coming back to this Board for approval.

Mr. Brackley said it fits in this conversation to say that the City is facing budgetary challenges. The Chamber is putting together an ad hoc committee to assist the City with potential solutions. We welcome input from this group or anyone else. We will forward the ideas to the City Council. There are opportunities at the airport we are not taking advantage of.

I. PUBLIC COMMENT

Ms. Kristy Stephens and Mr. Justin Lisonbee of Enterprise Rental Car introduced themselves. Ms. Stephens said we want to be a good business partner and help where there is an opportunity.

Chair Ross said you heard us struggling with competition among the rental car companies. We will discuss this issue at the next meeting.

Ms. Stephens said she will be there. We want to serve our customers who come in here.

Mr. Ferguson with Avis said what they are doing right now is what they are not supposed to do. We have the contract. They are not paying any fees and keeping their cars here a long time. They lie to customers that they are here.

Chair Ross said you are talking to the board John.

Mr. Ferguson said revenue is being lost because of what these people are doing. The previous manager allowed them five parking spots. They need to be honest. They are not at the airport. We had a conversation with National.

Chair Ross said we are going to vet this out next month and see if we can work something out. We have heard you and are sorry it is taking so long to get to you.

J. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 6:15 pm.

Stephen Ross, Chair



Elizabeth Martin, Stenographer