CITY COUNCIL SUBCOMMITTEE ON REGIONAL AVIATION ISSUES & SCOTTSDALE AIRPORT ADVISORY COMMISSION
Public Meeting
Wednesday, June 8, 2005 at 6:00 p.m.
Airport Terminal Building Lobby
15000 N. Airport Drive, Scottsdale, AZ

City Council Subcommittee on Regional Aviation Issues

Bob Littlefield, Chairman

Jim Lane

Kevin Osterman

Airport Advisory Commission

Leonard Tinnan, Chairman

Bill Mack, Vice Chairman
Philip Vickers
Fred Madanick

Don Maxwell
Tom Guilfoy
Mike Osborne

Notice is hereby given to the members of the City Council Subcommittee on Regional Aviation Issues, the Scottsdale Airport Advisory Commission, and to the general public that the City Council Subcommittee on Regional Aviation Issues and Scottsdale Airport Advisory Commission will hold a joint meeting open to the public at 6:00 p.m. on Wednesday, June 8, 2005. The meeting will be held in the Airport Terminal Building at 15000 N. Airport Drive. The City Council Subcommittee and/or Airport Advisory Commission may vote to go into Executive Session, which will not be open to the public for purposes of obtaining legal advice from the City's Attorney on any of the agenda items listed below pursuant to A.R.S. Sec. 38-431.03(A)(3)*.

Persons with a disability may request a reasonable accommodation, such as a sign language interpreter, by contacting the City Clerk's Office at (480) 312-2421. Requests should be made as early as possible to allow time to arrange accommodation.

How the Agenda Works: The Council Subcommittee/Airport Advisory Commission takes a separate action on each item on the Agenda. If you wish to address the Council Subcommittee/Commission regarding any or all of the items on the Agenda, please complete a Comment Card for each topic you wish to address and submit it to the Aviation Staff. You will be given at least three minutes to speak per item. Comment cards must be submitted before public testimony has begun on any agenda item.

AMENDED AGENDA

(Items concerning Briefing of Naples Airport Authority Stage 2 ban court decision and Briefing of Santa Monica Airport discriminatory landing fees have been added)

CALL TO ORDER – Chairman Littlefield

ROLL CALL

PUBLIC COMMENT

The Public Comment time is reserved for citizen comments regarding **non-agenda** items, therefore, no official City Council Subcommittee or Airport Advisory Commission action or discussion can be taken.

MINUTES

1. Action – City Council Subcommittee
Approval of the Minutes of the City Council Subcommittee on Regional Aviation Issues and the Airport Advisory Commission Joint Meeting of March 16, 2005 *(minutes previously approved by the Airport Advisory Commission on April 13, 2005)*

2. Action – Airport Advisory Commission
Approval of the Minutes of the Airport Advisory Commission Meeting of May 11, 2005

GENERAL BUSINESS

3. Information – City Council Subcommittee
Report from the Chairman of the Airport Advisory Commission Subcommittee on Signage – Commissioner Vickers

4. Action – City Council Subcommittee
Discussion and possible recommendation to the City Council to approve the installation of aircraft noise warning signage, as recommended by the Airport Advisory Commission

5. Action – City Council Subcommittee
Discussion and possible recommendation to the City Council to approve funding to participate in Sound Initiatives legislative efforts

6. Action – Airport Advisory Commission
Recommend to City Council approval of four leases resulting from the Aviation Business Center office space invitation for bid process

7. Information – Airport Advisory Commission
Review proposed Airport Rule and Regulation changes related to driver/vehicle requirements

8. Information – Airport Advisory Commission
Briefing of Naples Airport Authority Stage 2 ban court decision

9. Information – Airport Advisory Commission
Briefing of Santa Monica Airport discriminatory landing fees

AERONAUTICAL BUSINESS PERMIT(S)

10. Action – Airport Advisory Commission
Ratification of Airport Aeronautical Business Permit for Scottsdale Flight Academy for aircraft leasing and rental services and flight training services

11. Action – Airport Advisory Commission
Ratification of Airport Aeronautical Business Permit for Just Great Foods for off-airport catering services

12. Information – Airport Advisory Commission
Aeronautical Business Permit additions, cancellations, or revocations

OPERATIONS/ENFORCEMENT UPDATE

13. Information – Airport Advisory Commission
Airport Operations/Enforcement Update for May 2005

MEETING SCHEDULE

14. Action – Airport Advisory Commission
Review/modify 2005 meeting schedule

PUBLIC COMMENT

The Public Comment time is reserved for citizen comments regarding **non-agenda** items, therefore, no official City Council Subcommittee or Airport Advisory Commission action or discussion can be taken.

DIRECTOR'S REPORT

ITEMS FROM THE COMMISSION

ITEMS FROM THE CITY COUNCIL SUBCOMMITTEE

ADJOURNMENT

*The Open Meeting Law, at A.R.S. Sec. 38-431.03(B), requires that a public body advise all persons attending an Executive Session or obtaining access to Executive Session Minutes or information that such Minutes and information must be kept confidential except from members of the public body which met in Executive Session, from officers, appointees or employees who are the subject of discussion or consideration pursuant to subsection A, paragraph 1 of Sec. 38-431.03(B), and from the auditor general made in connection with an audit authorized as provided by law.

CITY COUNCIL SUBCOMMITTEE ON REGIONAL AVIATION ISSUES ACTION REPORT
TO: City Council Subcommittee
FROM: Airport Staff
SUBJECT/PROJECT NAME: Approval of Minutes

Agenda Item No.: 1

Meeting Date: 06/08/05

Staff Contact: Scott Gray

Phone: (480) 312-7735

ACTION
Approval of the Minutes of the City Council Subcommittee on Regional Aviation Issues and the Airport Advisory Commission Joint Meeting of March 16, 2005 (*previously approved by the airport Advisory Commission on April 13, 2005*).

for

Scott T. Gray, C.M.,C.A.E
Aviation Director

Attachment: Minutes of the March 16, 2005 Joint Meeting

Action
Taken

APPROVED

SCOTTSDALE CITY COUNCIL
SUBCOMMITTEE ON REGIONAL AVIATION ISSUES
AND SCOTTSDALE AIRPORT ADVISORY COMMISSION
Public Meeting
Wednesday, March 16, 2005 at 6:00 p.m.
Scottsdale Airport Terminal Building
15000 N. Airport Drive

Subcommittee Members
Councilman Bob Littlefield
Councilman W. J. "Jim" Lane
Councilman Kevin Osterman

Commission Members
Leonard Tinnan, Chairman

Bill Mack, Vice Chairman
Philip Vickers
Fred Madanick
Don Maxwell
Tom Guilfoy
Mike Osborne

Staff Present
Scott Gray, Aviation Director
Gary Mascaro, Asst Aviation Director, Operations
Chris Read, Assistant Aviation Director, Administration
Jennifer Lewis, Aviation Planner
Matt Johnson, Airport Specialist

MINUTES

CALL TO ORDER
Chairman Tinnan called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL
Roll call confirmed members present as stated above; with the exception of Commissioner Guilfoy who arrived later in the meeting.

MINUTES
1. **Action - Subcommittee**
   Approval of the Minutes of the November 24, 2004 City Council Subcommittee Meeting

Airport Commissioner Don Maxwell approved the Minutes of the November 24, 2004 City Council Subcommittee Meeting. Airport Commission Vice Chairman Bill Mack seconded the motion and the minutes were approved by a vote of 10-0 [seven Airport Commissioners and three City Council Subcommittee members].

2. **Action – Airport Advisory Commission**
   Approval of the Minutes of the January 12, 2005 Airport Advisory Commission Meeting

Commissioner Maxwell made a motion to approve Minutes of the January 12, 2005 Airport Advisory Commission Meeting. Commissioner Osborne seconded the motion and the Minutes were approved by a vote of 10-0 [seven Airport Commissioners and three City Council Subcommittee members]

PUBLIC COMMENTS
Chairman Tinnan stated he had a public comment card from Mr. Arthur Rosen.

Mr. Rosen, representing AOPA (Airport Owners and Pilots Association), stated he wished to discuss safety versus noise at Scottsdale Airport. He noted the mountainous terrain surrounding the airport and they type of aircraft that use the airport, explaining the different classes of aircraft and how they approach their takeoffs and landings. Mr. Rosen reiterated the importance of safety as primary concern.

Mr. Dave O'Neil stated he received a letter from airport staff, along with photos, advising he was in violation concerning wastewater from washing his aircraft in the Airpark. Mr. O'Neil stated they do not use anything toxic, just the same as would be used to wash a car at home. He stated the water from the washing that is shown in the photos taken would have been gone if the photo was taken two hours earlier. He noted there was no residue left from their washing, however, the area near the City hangars shows much residue and the City should take care of that problem before they go after those who do not leave residue near their hangars Mr O'Neil said something needs to be put in the Airpark regulations to allow them to wash an aircraft once in awhile; they are not a commercial washing operation leaving residue in the area. Mr. O'Neil stated he would like this issue added to a Commission agenda for further discussion.

AERONAUTICAL BUSINESS PERMIT(S)

3. Action

Ratification of Airport Aeronautical Business Permit for Alliance Aircraft Services, L.L.C. to provide aircraft leasing and rental services at Scottsdale Airport.

Mr. Matt Johnson advised that Alliance Aircraft Services, L.L.C. has provided the appropriate documentation as required in the Airport Minimum Operating Standards and the City's insurance requirements have been met. Mr. Johnson added that Alliance Aircraft Services, L L C. is currently using one tiedown and has a one-year Revocable License Agreement, dated December 27, 2004, for office space in the Aviation Business Center. Mr Johnson stated the associated fees are anticipated to generate an additional $2,532 in annual revenue to the Aviation Enterprise Fund. Mr. Guy Milanovitz, managing partner, was present at the meeting to respond to any questions.

Vice Chairman Mack made a motion to approve the Airport Aeronautical Business Permit for Alliance Aircraft Services, L.L.C. to provide aircraft leasing and rental services at Scottsdale Airport. Commissioner seconded the motion and it was approved by a Commission vote of 7-0.

4. Information

Aeronautical Business Permit Additions, Cancellations, or Revocations

Mr. Johnson advised the Commission there was one permit revocation The revocation was for All Nations Air, L.L.C. as they failed to meet the minimum requirements to operate at Scottsdale Airport by not remitting their fees or having the required office space as they forfeited their lease at Scottsdale FBO. Mr. Johnson noted All Nations Air, L L.C. was a medical flight company that operated medical flights out of Scottsdale Airport.

GENERAL BUSINESS

5. Information

Aviation Enterprise Fund Five-Year Financial Forecast

Mr. Gary Mascaro stated this item is provided annually to the Commission for their information and review. He added the purpose of the Aviation Fund Five-Year Financial Forecast it to review the Airport's overall forecasted revenues and expenditures, including all capital improvements to identify any necessary adjustments and to maintain the Airport as a self-sufficient enterprise. Mr. Mascaro advised that Mr. John Ralston, Enterprise Finance Director would provide a presentation.

Mr. Ralston stated the Aviation Fund Five-Year Financial Plan is a financial planning tool that is used to assess the adequacy of existing rates and fees to support the Airport operation and planned capital improvements. He added that the City uses a conservative estimate to make sure the actual costs do not exceed the legal appropriation as sufficient cash is corrected to pay for the budget and expenditures. Therefore, the expenditure forecasts tend to be high, and the revenue forecast tend to be low. Mr. Ralston then gave a detailed explanation of the plan and responded to questions from the Commission, providing additional information concerning the plan items, and issues relative to the City's budget in general

Mr. Mascaro advised this item would be on next month's agenda as an action item before going to the City Council for final approval.

6. Action
Consider recommendation to City Council to accept adoption of the 14 CFR Part 150 Scottsdale Airport Noise Compatibility Study as prepared and presented by Coffman Associates

Mr. Mascaro stated this item is to recommend to City Council the adoption of the 14 CFR Part 150 Noise Compatibility Program. He noted this item has been brought before the Commission and the City Council Subcommittee several times, including the workshops and public meetings that have taken place. Mr. Mascaro advised that Mr. Jim Harris of Coffman Associates was present to provide a presentation and answer any questions.

Mr. Harris stated this evening he would like to provide an overview including highlights of the program. Mr. Harris then gave an overview of the Part 150 Study process, noting it is a voluntary study and airports are not required to do it. Mr. Harris advised that this study is an update of the one conducted in 1997 He noted there was heavy emphasis on public involvement in the process, which started with the formation of the Technical Advisory Team who reviewed the document as it was being prepared and had opportunity to make comments and provide input. He added they also expanded the Public Information Workshop activity, conducting a number of workshops throughout the course of the study process to ensure the public also an opportunity to be involved in the process. Mr. Harris also noted the opportunity provided via the Internet for public review and file comments via the website.

Mr. Harris noted the first phase of the study process consists of submitting the Noise Exposure Map (NEM) document to the FAA for their review and acceptance. In October 2004, the FAA issued their finding and accepted the NEM document for Scottsdale Airport. The second phase, the Noise Compatibility Program, is what they are currently involved in, and it not only included the Technical Advisory Team, but also aviation and land-use experts from Phoenix and Scottsdale who got together to discuss measures they could look at or expand to enhance the Noise Compatibility Program He added that out of this they came up with the noise abatement alternatives, and various land-use alternatives that were submitted to the Technical Advisory Team and the public workshops, and out of that came the draft Noise Compatibility Program. He added they took a look at the current program and then, where appropriate, added new measures. The Draft Final Noise Compatibility Program was then taken through the Public Hearing process, giving the public 30-day legal notice of the hearing, which took place on January 27, and which included a pubic information workshop to explain what the program was about and what changes were being considered.

Mr. Harris stated at this point in time, they are in the approval stage, and it is before the Commission tonight prior to bringing it to the City Council for consideration. Subsequent to City Council adoption, the document then will go the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) for their formal review process. The FAA process takes approximately 180 days. Mr Harris added the FAA does not approve the document as a whole, but what they do is take every single measure and review and approve or disapprove each specific measure.

Mr. Harris introduced Mr. David Fitz of Coffman Associates to review the new measures proposed in the Noise Compatibility Program.

Mr. Fitz said he would walk them through three elements and review the recommendations that are new to this study. For noise abatement they had 16 total measures and 10 of those were carry-overs and 6 are new measures. Mr Fitz summarized the new measures listed below.

No. 11 discourages long straight-in and left downwind approaches to Runway 21. He added this has been a long-standing issue for the Airport and they felt it was important to include.

No. 12 with the new radar coming online, there is going to be an effort to try to establish new procedures and they wanted to include it in this study that any efforts towards that end are fully coordinated with the City, both on approach and departure for any type of routing procedure.

No. 13 concerns VFR procedures and trying to prevent low over-flights whenever possible and encourage pilots to maintain safe minimum flying altitudes.

No. 14 constructing a run-up enclosure to minimize noise impacts and they coordinated with the FAA on this particular issue. Mr Fitz stated engine run-ups have a tendency to be more startling, last longer and affect businesses adjacent to the Airport in the Airpark. They wish to make an option like this eligible.

Commissioner Guilfoy asked why Mr Fitz jumped right into recommendations rather than giving a summary of how things have changed over the years. He said it would appear that the noise contours have centralized around the Airport and single-noise events have centralized the Airport, and the Airport is less noisy in 2004 or 2005 than it was in previous years. Mr. Fitz agreed it is less noisy, but as far as complaints and the attention they get, basically perceptions are changing, regardless of the improvements they make.

A lengthy discussion then ensued concerning noise complaints, the large volume due to accessibility of taking calls online, and by phone, and from various areas often outside the Scottsdale Airport area, and how many calls report any visible aircraft that can be seen from their residence

Commissioner Maxwell spoke about measure 11 and how if you are going to say "discourage" that may mean something different as the pilots know that the Tower is going to control, but from a public point of view and they are still going to see it happen as the Tower to avoid traffic problem would allow pilots to do it Mr. Harris agreed they had numerous discussions on this item but he reiterated what Mr. Rosen of AOPA said earlier that safety is most important. So they are primarily discouraging the procedure when safety is not an issue.

Chairman Tinnan asked who is responsible for doing the "discouraging" in No. 11. Mr. Harris responded it comes down to TRACON.

Mr. Gray stated he wished to discuss this item and that it has multiple meanings. He explained that when the Scottsdale Tower is open, their main goal is flight safety Mr. Gray stated an airspace consultant did an independent analysis of the use of left downwind and straight in. He found that 7 out of 10 times it was safer to utilize left traffic to Runway 21, but there were 3 occasions where it wasn't necessary and they could have followed the right traffic procedures that were in place. Therefore, the idea was a message to Air Traffic Control to not just follow the same procedure for convenience, follow it when it is required for safety. However, since our Tower closes from 9:00 p.m. to 6:00 a.m. and people come in between those hours, the discouragement is to them since they are not going to get the Air Traffic Control direction. Mr Gray stated the information would be provided in the pilot guide, which will advise them of the discouragement. Additional lengthy discussion ensued as to what do they do to discourage when the Tower is closed.

Councilman Littlefield stated he does not have a problem with this because it is a matter of doing what you can and if you look at the FAA Airport Facility Directory, it says we have a right hand pattern for Runway 21, and they also can look at the windsock, and the pilot guide. Instead of the word discourage, they could use "chart procedures," but have to be realistic as to what they can do. If they put it in all the relevant publications, then you have done as much as you can to make it clear to transient population. Councilman Littlefield stated the people in the Tower direct aircraft and base their instruction according to other traffic in the pattern, it is not TRACON.

Commissioner Osborne asked about the ground run-up enclosure and if it referred to an L-shaped blast fence, a single blast fence, or a 360-degree enclosure. Mr. Fitz responded they are referring to a three-sided enclosure that would be designed for large aircraft. Commissioner Osborne said based on his experience, he would advise not to do it. He doesn't think anyone would use it, and you get a lot of recirculation jet exhaust in there and the data you get from it is useless.

Councilman Littlefield wanted everyone to understand that No. 13 is dependent on No. 12 and they are not going to get charted VFR procedures until they get the ASR11 radar.

Returning to the list of new measures, Mr. Fitz advised that No. 15 has already been implemented and there is a very nice pilot guide that staff produced to inform transient helicopter pilots of the noise abatement flight path.

Mr. Fitz stated that No. 16 looks at the sectional chart where urban areas are identified in a yellow color on charts and that is to notify pilots transiting the area that they need to fly at an altitude of 1,000 feet above the highest obstacle.

Councilman Littlefield inquired if any consideration was given to some of the complaints about training flights from the schools at Deer Valley and Scottsdale and to recommend that the FAA actually start charting training areas on the terminal chart, as they do for aerobatic boxes. Mr. Harris responded that it probably would not have been appropriate under the Part 150 Program but something that could certainly be pursued by the Airport.

Mr. Gray added that to have an area designated they'd have to have a sponsor and typically that would be one of the flight schools that would go to the FAA and request a sponsor of a location usually further outside the metropolitan. He added that right now the closest one in this area is near Lake Pleasant and it is very busy, so they are looking for another location.

Councilman Littlefield said he had a procedural question and asked when this gets to the City Council they are going to have to vote on the individual items since the FAA will also look at the individual items. He added in theory, they could approve Items 1 through 16, minus a couple. He asked if items can be added or if it was too late. Mr. Harris responded it is never too late, however, if you drop an item it is not a problem, if you add an item because it hasn't gone through the committee and the public hearing process you would basically have to go back to the beginning point and bring it through the process.

Commissioner Mack asked if the Commission made a motion to accept this report as printed, but added that it does not mean they will accept or enact everything recommended in the report.

Councilman Littlefield suggested the Commission send a report to the City Council of which items they approve of and which they don't as that is what the Council will be looking for from the Commission.
Mr. Harris added that the FAA is going to want to see a program that the City endorses, however, it is still up to the City as to the implementation of any items, and item may be part of the program, but the City may choose not to implement it in the first few years, but later on choose to do so. By keeping the item in the program is a matter of eligibility and inclusion in the overall program.

Commission Maxwell asked if they changed the language in No. 11 to say, encourage the use of charted patterns would that be okay. Mr. Harris responded it would be okay as long as the intent doesn't change but they have to have the FAA review the language to assure the intent doesn't change.

Chairman Tinnan asked why the FAA has to review the language change if it hasn't been sent to them yet for approval. Mr. Harris responded that the primary reason is because they have been through the public hearing process and the FAA would need to ensure that something hasn't been substituted or is not consistent with what was intended in the public hearing.

Mr. Gray brought up the issue of the run-up enclosure as an example. He said if it stays in the program, but the City chooses to move it's existing run-up blast fence from where it is on the north end of the Airport to the location that was determined in the study, and if that resulted in the noise reductions they attempted to accomplish the City would then just elect not to move forward with that item. If, however, they found out that there were still some issues, they could do additional noise analysis and determine if the three-sided enclosure would be needed. He reiterated that just because an item is listed, it does not mean the City is going to go out and build a million-dollar building, if there are other options available before they go through that expense.

Councilman Littlefield reiterated that the City Council would look to the Airport Advisory Commission's recommendation based on their expertise, especially with their non-flying colleagues who will look to the Commission for their expertise, so he would like to ensure the recommendation that comes out is really the consensus of the group.

Chairman Tinnan stated that with the concurrence of his colleagues, he would like to go through all of the recommendations and then come back and take a vote on each one of the recommendations.

Mr. Fitz stated he wished to mention that they did take an additional step in looking at noise access restrictions and hired HMMH, the consultant that prepared the Part 161 Study for Naples Airport. Mr. Fitz advised that the consultant looked at the situation in Scottsdale to see if it would be feasible and prudent to pursue a Part 161. Mr. Fitz stated, in summary, the consultant determined it would not be feasible for Scottsdale to pursue that course of action.

Mr. Fitz then discussed the recommended land-use management. He stated there were nine total measures in this area. The first is another level of disclosure to make people aware of the potential for noise impact for structures developed near the Airport. The other measure is that the City of Phoenix should consider rezoning some open area located north of the CAP Canal that are currently zoned for residential land use, but have a plan for commercial and industrial use These areas are north and west of the Airport. He added they recognize the land is under City of Phoenix jurisdiction, but this establishes the position the City of Scottsdale would take regarding the Airport.

Chairman Tinnan stated it is easy to continue to agree with something recommended eight years ago, however, No. 7 states that the City of Scottsdale should consider amending its current building codes to incorporate prescriptive noise standards. He wanted to know why we should continue to ask the City to do this as we are approaching build-out. Mr. Fitz responded that in many cases it would be in-fills or major remodels and it really ties into what the City is going to be doing with recommendation No. 6. He said one of the things they look at in developing an overlay zoning, which provides another level of protection. Mr Fitz stated that what they are trying to do is give the City Planning staff the tools to protect the Airport by asking them to include some installation standards if they choose to build inside a particular noise contour

Commissioner Guilfoy asked if a report card has been done on existing measures and how would that be brought to the attention of the City Council. Mr. Fitz responded that the report card is included in both the

NEM and the NCP document He added that is part of the requirement of doing an update is to evaluate the existing program

Mr. Gray interjected that quite some time ago, Airport staff went to the Planning Department and requested that they implement some of the recommendations listed. At the time, the City's Planning Department was just embarking on the General Plan rewrite, which they determined to complete first. In the meantime, Airport staff instituted another look at the Part 150 Study and assessed the existing procedures and added some new ones. Once this goes through the Council and FAA process, Airport staff will be working directly with the Planning Department to implement all of the items that are recommended by this body and the Council, and ultimately approved by the FAA. Therefore, even though it appears that No. 7 is irrelevant today because it was never implemented, it is still one of those items that when they go through the process that the code overlay zoning, whatever it may be, will be changed to reflect their desire. Mr. Gray added, however, that in construction practices today, they already meet most of the recommendations, but it gives them an extra piece to ensure that some new development doesn't come along and put in windows or doors that do not meet their noise reduction requirements.

Commissioner Vickers stated in regards to Item No 9, that it is embarrassing that the consultant would put forth or record a recommendation of this nature to the City Council to go to the City of Phoenix and ask the City of Phoenix to consider rezoning the most valuable property in the entire City. He added that Scottsdale is in critical negotiations in terms of revenue sharing, which is far more important than dictating to the City of Phoenix to rezone the most valuable property they have north of the CAP Canal. Mr Fitz stated it is important to note that the zoning is inconsistent with what the City of Phoenix has in the General Plan, and all they are saying is what is in the General Plan, what they have planned for, is good planning relative to the Airport, and feel the zoning should be reflective of what is in the General Plan, because they will look for inconsistencies when rezoning cases come up. Commissioner Maxwell noted that the City of Phoenix was represented on the Technical Advisory Team and there have always been cooperative efforts between the two cities.

Mr. Fitz noted the recommended Program Management Measures, stating they have 6 total measures; 3 new and 3 carry-overs, one is an automatic carry-over, which is a requirement of doing a Part 150 Study and is to monitor and update as necessary

Mr. Fitz stated the first new measure, No. 4 is to acquire and implement a flight track noise monitoring system. No. 5 is to continue the Airport location signage program, and No. 6 is the Pilot and Community Outreach Program.

Commissioner Guilfoy inquired why No. 4 keeps coming back, the flight track monitoring system, as the joint body said no. Chairman Tinnan stated the Council Subcommittee and Airport Commission rejected the acquisition of a flight tracking monitoring system based upon lack of information as to whether it would be of value. Commissioner Maxwell recited sections of the presentation comparing the volume of noise complaints from 1987 through 2003. He asked what they do with a flight track monitoring system is not going to help on the noise contours and they cannot do anything about it. He added he would never recommend it to the City Council and it has already been voted down once.

Mr. Gray acknowledged that Commissioner Maxwell provided a historical snapshot of where we were on this issue. He stated at that time they were looking at a system that the Airport staff was recommending be purchased. There were two options; one was just flight tracking to give them a tool to identify the altitudes of aircraft. The second option would include a permanent noise monitoring system, similar to what Sky Harbor would have in place, it would cost an additional $350,000, bringing the total project cost to approximately $600,000-$700,000. Staff believes that a flight tracking system would provide valuable data that we cannot get today. It doesn't mean that the noise program will cease to exist without it, but the data that would be acquired from a flight tracking system would be valuable data to assist in validating or invalidating some of the complaints. They could also learn what they are going to see when the radar is in

place, and a number of other things Mr Gray stated, again, the point is – just because it is listed, doesn't mean they are going to go do it. There are other reasons it is listed; one being that it is possible. So if they consider acquiring a $700,000 system, it is now 95% funded by the FAA and only 5% by the City of Scottsdale, which is a huge difference in cost However, whether we have that data or not, we cannot penalize anyone for violating a voluntary program. Mr Gray added that staff is at a major disadvantage when talking to any citizen in being certain exactly where an aircraft was, what it's altitude was, where it went, how it got here. In approving this particular line item, does not commit the City of Scottsdale to spend $1.3 million dollars. It is still up to the City of Scottsdale to determine whether or not it would apply for the funds to implement the system.

Chairman Tinnan stated the language in the item subjects the City to unbridled criticism for failure to acquire and implement. He said the wording can be changed such that the City should reevaluate the technology and benefits of acquiring and implementing a flight track and noise monitoring system He stated they have taken a negative vote in the past, and now they are putting in print that the City shall acquire and implement.

Councilman Littlefield said they should just say what they mean. He stated the City Council has always put great weight in what the Airport Advisory Commission said. He admonished that when they take a vote tonight they should say what they mean. If they believe that such a system is useful, they should leave it in. If they don't believe it's useful, they should send it to Council with a recommendation that the Council not approve that particular item. The Council will make the final decision, but the Commission should approve if they think it's a good idea, and if they don't, then they don't. Councilman Littlefield stated his personal feeling is that when they get the ASR11 in North Phoenix they will have the information they need so he would oppose it for budgetary grounds.

Commissioner Vickers stated he doesn't understand that a long time ago, Commissioner Guilfoy stated that the information is already available in the Tower. Councilman Littlefield said it was his understanding that radar is unreliable below 1,000 feet because of the mountains between her and Williams-Gateway where the equipment exists. However, when the ASR11 is here and there is reliable radar to the ground, that information would be available.

Commissioner Mack asked about No. 5, continue Airport location signage. He commented on the signage which cautions about aircraft noise area, and low flying aircraft that they have in Chandler and warns prospective homebuyers when they come within a mile of the Chandler Airport. Mr. Fitz said he contacted airports using signage such as those and found that the signs were not used for those noise abatement, they were specifically used for height above roadways and were warning signs where there is concern about height of aircraft over roadways.

Chairman Tinnan asked if there was some law that prohibits the creation of unique signs warning of the presence of an airport. Mr Harris said there are some limitations of how they are used but it is a question that could be more appropriately answered by the City Attorneys office

Councilman Littlefield suggested once they are done with the Part 150 Study one of the things they should do as a joint group, agenda this item as to what type of signs they would actually want designed.

Mr. Fitz stated the overall impact is to decrease the potential for noise impact and that is the goal of the Study. Chairman Tinnan asked although we are having a decrease in noise, would numbers increase due to the growth of development. Mr. Fitz responded that was correct.

Mr. Fitz stated it was important to not allow any development to occur within the 65 noise contour and if you keep proactive in noise abatement programs the number of noise complaints can be somewhat kept down, despite the development and growth in the area

Councilman Lane asked what exactly does the Pilot/Community Outreach accomplish and does it just provide another venue for complaints and what it represents. Mr Fitz stated the outreach program is valuable in educating people.

Mr. Gray stated after Northwest 2000 it resulted in everyone suddenly noticing airplanes and air traffic and making complaints. The purpose of the Pilot/Community Outreach is to educate pilots, including the flight school students and instructors, to be sensitive of noise abatement procedures. In addition it is helpful to residents, realtors and Ms. Jennifer Lewis of the Airport staff will meet and educate them, providing information and materials concerning the airport. Another tool, not implemented yet, and similar to the Air Fair that used to take place, would be a type of Airport Open House event and would provide the opportunity for citizens, realtors, etc. to find out more about the Airport. Mr. Gray stressed that it is a very valuable educational tool and has been well received by pilots and the community.

Mr. Harris stated he thought everyone would like a summary of the comments they received through the Part 150 Study process. Mr. David Fitz advised that prior to the public hearing, through the website and the public information workshops they had approximately three comments from three or four different people. During the public hearing comment period they received 50 comments from 18 different people, and had 16 people attend the public hearing and 10 of them spoke for the record. Mr. Fitz added that the website was extremely successful as far as public outreach, as all the documents were posted on the website and could be downloaded and there were over 405 downloads of the various documents over the course of the 14-month study period. The website form to post comments had 24 posted with statements for or against the airport. He added that quite a few were supportive of the Airport.

Mr. Fitz stated a sampling of typical comments from people who have lived here for many years they indicated something has changed They were not specific, but mentioned general increase in noise, and increase in traffic and over-flights. Other comments mentioned aircraft flying too low over their house, and helicopters were an issue for a couple of individuals. Several people wanted restricted hours for the Airport and they wanted a restriction on Stage 2 business jets, and a few people asked for a flight tracking monitoring system either to enforce or help understand where the aircraft are coming from or how low they are.

Commissioner Guilfoy inquired what a study like this costs. The response was approximately $319,000, mainly due to the extensive regulatory process. Mr. Harris felt that there weren't as many people attending the public hearing as they were able to obtain the information from the website. Some people attended the workshops to get a particular question answered and then leave without posting further comment.

Chairman Tinnan noted they should begin to consider their motion on this agenda item. Prior to that he introduced Mr. Dan Ables, resident, who would like to speak on this agenda item.

Mr. Dan Ables stated his address in Scottsdale and that he wanted to speak about flight tracking. Mr. Ables said he thinks it is needed for helicopters, and that both Airport staff and the consultant also feel it is needed. He added it is not a duplicate expenditure and since he has been drastically impacted by helicopter over flights, he would like to provide a citizen's perspective.

Mr. Ables provided a history that included when he built his house in 1977 and what Scottsdale Airport was like at that time Since then he has been amazed at the growth and utilization of the Airport, including the many different types and sizes of jet aircraft, larger and noisier prop planes, along with the constant buzzing and intrusion of helicopters. Mr. Ables said his main focus concerns the helicopters that utilize Scottsdale Airport and Airpark and were not originally located here. He stated that a large percentage of these helicopters fly over his house when flying west into the Airport/Airpark from the east. He added they are extremely nosy, fly very low, and many seem to hover causing more noise. Mr. Ables stated that in 2003 he submitted approximately 350 complaints over a six-month period through the noise hotline

website concerning both aircraft and helicopters which were noisy and flying directly over his house. He stated he also witnessed a near collision of two prop planes over his house during that time, which was only prevented by last minute evasive action

Mr. Ables stated that from all these complaints, he received only one response from Airport personnel which was related to his report on the near miss collision, and the Airport response was they did not have a report filed by the pilots of such an incident, therefore, he was assured that everything was under control at the time He added that without any means for the Airport personnel to track those two aircraft, it was left up to the pilots' discretion and their honor code of ethics to report the incident, which they did not do.

Mr. Ables stated in 2004 he concentrated his efforts in working with Ms. Jennifer Lewis concerning the helicopter problem. Ms. Lewis went to his home and sat outside with him to observe the helicopters Mr. Ables stated Ms. Lewis advised him she was working with the Airport based helicopters to get their voluntary signature on documents that layout a suggested flight pattern for helicopters going into and out of Scottsdale Airport and Airpark, and that this suggested pattern would be included in the new helicopter pilot guide book, which has already been published and distributed. Mr. Ables stated the helicopter pilots can't seem to find Point Pima and subsequently, Raintree, which they are to follow in to the Airport, so instead they come in diagonally off the Point 101, instead of going up to Pima, and when they make that diagonal cut, they fly directly over his house.

Mr Ables stated he has had many conversations with Ms. Lewis concerning helicopters not following the suggested flight patterns in and out of the Airport and Airpark relating to the east side only. Mr. Ables gave specific information on the helicopters he noted over his house and Ms. Lewis has made some progress through her efforts. He now only reports an average of two or three helicopters a day over his house, whereas in 2004 it was five a day. Mr. Ables stated Ms. Lewis was not able to identify a large number of the helicopters he reported, especially those at night.

Mr. Ables stated he has come to the conclusion and fully supports the consultant's recommendation and the Airport's desire to have a flight tracking system recommended to the City Council included in the Part 150 Noise Compatibility Study. He added that cost should not be an issue, since the system would be 95% federally funded and 5% City-funded. Mr Ables added that if being a good neighbor is not what the intent is, and then this whole thing is a moot question. If they are trying to be a good neighbor to the citizens, then being able to identify these helicopters, so Ms. Lewis can talk to them and try to get them to sign the voluntary letter of agreement, they will know that someone is watching them and they just might adhere to the flight pattern, and then you would never hear from most citizens. Mr. Ables asked for their support to approve a flight tracking system.

Mr. Brian Ready, representing the Arizona Business Aviation Association (AzBAA), past president, and member of the Technical Advisory Team for the Part 150 Study stated he wanted to make himself available from a pilot's perspective if there are any questions he can answer that the consultant or Airport staff could not address. Mr. Ready stated he agrees that noise complaints have gone up because people see airplanes more than they hear airplanes and that seems to have started with Northwest 2000. Mr Ready stated the outreach program is a great step toward improving understanding between residents and pilot community.

Mr. Ready advised there are very technical reasons for the left downwind during busy times and he would be willing to address that if they wished. He added they also need to address the two charted visual procedures, one being the IFR procedure, which can't happen until the ASR11 goes in, the second is the VFR procedure for VFR traffic coming in to the Scottsdale area, and the pilot guide is part of that step Mr Ready stated what the City Council can do for the Airport is to adopt some of the no restrictions for the community outreach. He noted the City of Surprise now requires every realtor to have a noise contour map when showing property within their city.

Mr. Norm Geisenheimer, resident of Ironwood Village, stated the biggest problem they have in Ironwood isn't with the local pilots or small airplanes, it is with the big planes. He stated last year he called about an aircraft coming in over Ironwood too low, and Ms. Lewis called him back to say the plane made it in okay, but she could not determine who it was or provide any other facts. Mr. Geisenheimer stated the jets come in so low over Ironwood at night that he can go out with a flashlight and actually light up the bottom of the plane. He asked why they are getting stuck with the aircraft coming over their area and the left-downwind, right-downwind issue.

Councilman Littlefield asked Mr Ready if it was true that there was some reason why business jets might be more inclined to fly over Ironwood Village than down the 101. Mr. Ready responded that typically business jets would want a 3 to 5 miles stabilized final. He noted that Scottsdale Airport is not conducive to a 5 mile stabilized final as many other airports, so in order to do that you have at least get 1 or 2 miles of stabilized final, which puts them just to the north east of Ironwood Village. Mr. Ready provided additional technical detail on the specifics of coming in on final approach to Scottsdale Airport

Chairman Tinnan stated he would like to ask a procedural question He asked if this Commission should act to strike any of the recommendations or to modify the language in any of the recommendations, that probably can be handled in some sort of white paper transaction between now and the time it goes to the City Council, where the City Council may make additional deletions and/or modifications His question is when this report is officially submitted to the FAA does it have to be rewritten to reflect the actions of this Commission and the City Council.

Mr. Harris responded that the report Chairman Tinnan has in front of him has been solely for review at this time. After Commission and Council actions, then the document will he reprinted reflecting any changes. Chairman Tinnan asked if any action the Commission takes tonight in transmitting it to the City Council can he handled simply by a modification of the paper outside the document. He asked if that was correct.

Mr. Harris stated he thought for the purposes of the Council, yes, it would be handled with an addendum that would be attached or paperwork that would illustrate what the recommended changes were.

Councilman Littlefield stated the actual legal step is when the Council adopts the Study. He stated what the Commission is doing tonight is advisory – not to make it seem less important, but he envisions the Commission coming out with a vote for example, that they like it the way it is, or we like it without such and such items, or we suggest wording change on such and such an item. Councilman Littlefield added then the legal step is the Council approval, which will be a little more restrained. He added the Commission's job tonight is to provide advice to Council and their colleagues.

Commissioner Maxwell stated he would like to make a motion to advise the City Council to approve the recommendation of the adoption of the 14 CFR Part 150 Noise Compatibility Program as presented with the following exceptions. That they recommend the City Council not to acquire and implement a noise and flight tracking monitoring system, and to change the language on discouraging long straight-in and left downward approaches to Runway 21 to read, to encourage the pilots to use the published pattern procedures for Runway 21. Commissioner Guilfoy seconded the motion.

Commissioner Vickers stated for the record. The $319,000 Study that is a total of 31 recommendations, 20 of which were in place in 1997. Ten are new, that's $30,000 per new recommendation. Commissioner Vickers added that as he sits here today, and if he would have sat here in 1997, he wouldn't have believed that 1997 study would have resulted in any significant change in the Airport's noise problem, and quoting Councilman Littlefield in one email received from him, the part 150 study isn't going to change anything we are doing at the airport anyway. Commissioner Vickers stated he firmly believe that he can't vote for any part of this particular study because he does not think it will improve the noise problem to the City of Scottsdale Airport and now or in the immediate or long-term future. Therefore, he is not going to

vote on Commissioner Maxwell's motion only because he does not believe this Study would contribute to the reduction of noise at this Airport at anytime in the future. And, finally for the record, he would like to say it is a total waste of the taxpayer dollars.

Chairman Tinnan stated he would like to remind everyone that when the Airport and the City undertook the Part 150 Study, it was with the understanding of the Commission, among others, that if we were ever going to get to the point of being able to plead for a mandatory nighttime curfew or to plead for the elimination of Stage 2 aircraft we would have to go through a Part 161 Study, but a necessary first-step was to do an updated Part 150 Study. It became mandatory then in the minds of every member of the Commission that we undertake the Part 150 Study knowing it was not an end unto itself. And that it was a basis, however, a stepping stone if we wanted to take a more drastic step, which has been recommended against by the consultants. Chairman Tinnan wanted the record to show that that is the basis in having undertaken a Part 150 Study.

Chairman Tinnan asked if there were any other comments on Commissioner Maxwell's motion. Councilman Littlefield stated he agrees with Commissioner Vickers, but stated the reason this study was undertaken, for those who understand the business and understand the very specific technical requirements and limitations of the Part 150 and Part 161 and the studies conducted under them, the result we have tonight was 100 percent predictable. He added they could have predicted the result of the study without having spent a dime, however, the reason we undertook the Study is because we had people in the community who said they would like to have more restrictions, and the only legal way that could happen would be to have a Part 150 Study that recommends a Part 161 Study. That's why this study was done, to answer those community interests that asked for it. Councilman Littlefield stated he didn't think anyone who understands aviation would believe that any stunning insight would come out of the study and most could have predicted the outcome, they did it to answer the community who asked them to take whatever steps you can to move toward that curfew, or that limitation or restriction. And that's why they undertook the study It is no surprise that the changes that are recommended are incremental

Mr Gray stated he would like to clarify the modification of Item No. 11 to make sure they understand it correctly. The way it was stated to encourage pilots to use published traffic patterns for Runway 21 it is the intent to focus if it's pilots as you stated, or is it to just generalize to encourage the use of published

Commissioner Osborne stated he would like to reword No. 14 to say, relocate the ground run-up facility to a less noise-sensitive area of the Airport, as the recommended enclosure is going to be counter-productive.

Commissioner Guilfoy asked if construct means from scratch, or can construct mean the building associated with relocation.

Mr. Gray stated the specific verbiage that's used here is to construct a noise enclosure, doesn't require them to move forward and do that, so he would suggest they move forward with relocating the existing facility and further analyze the necessity, based on that relocation, moving forward with a noise enclosure of some type, and if they find they have created a new noise situation with surrounding where they relocated, then they would obviously want to suppress that noise in some form whether it's a million dollars or $60,000 is to be determined later, once they get another noise specialist on board and do an analysis of what this facility would look like. Mr Gray said what it states is an option for them to move forward, but it certainly isn't what they are going to go out and do directly without doing some other step. Mr. Gray added they would ultimately have to go back to the Commission and the Council to get approval of the grant and the construction of such a facility.

Councilman Osterman stated he would like the recommended changes worded so they can make them incrementally, so they don't have to immediately build a three-sided enclosure. Mr Gray stated if this is

approved, as stated tonight, and it goes to City Council and is approved the same way, and the FAA approves every one of the items, they still need to apply for a grant, put the construction out to bid, and get the approval of both Commission and Council before they can move forward to do anything

There was additional discussion regarding changing the wording on this item Mr. Harris stated the intent is to clarify the enclosure of the existing run-up area. Mr. Gray stated the issue is relocating the existing blast run-up area to the new location first. Find out what the results are. If they find they created a noise situation, then figure out what they need to do. Mr. Harris added he thought they could clarify how they would go about it. Mr. Harris suggests leaving it the way it is, with perhaps doing some more analysis prior to applying for it. Additional lengthy discussion ensued about this issue, engine run-ups, type of enclosure structure, etc.

Commissioner Osborne has proposed an amendment to Commissioner Maxwell's motion, do they accept the amendment to relocate the run-up area. Commissioner Mack seconded the motion

Commissioner Vickers stated he would vote against it. However, he asked if it wouldn't be easier rather than to make specific amendments, to forward it to City Council with the approval with the exception of the Commission has reservation on the following items

Councilman Osterman stated no matter what form they send it in, they would like it accompanied by a white paper explaining what modifications the Commission think necessary to make it work.

Councilman Littlefield stated when Council gets the action item, they will get the Part 150 Study, they will also get staff report and they will get in there, how you voted, and then a copy of the Minutes will also be attached.

Councilman Littlefield stated the fact that they are going through this level of minutia detail, he thinks it is appropriate that they give as detailed a recommendation as they can make for the benefit of the Council members who are not part of the subcommittee.

Chairman Tinnan stated since they do not have the reconstructed language before them, whatever they end up deciding tonight, is it possible if staff can provide the Commission by email within the next few days the new language so he can call for a vote for the new language.

Mr. Gray stated he has the new language. There were two items Chairman restated the recommendation, the motion before the Commission calls for revision of the wording in recommendation No. 11 (noise abatement measure), for a modification of the language of No. 14 (noise abatement measure), and for the deletion of No. 4 (program management measure). Chairman Tinnan asked if there were any further comments.

Chairman Tinnan stated he would like to comment on the deletion of No. 4, which recommends to acquire and implement a flight track and noise monitoring system. Chairman Tinnan would like to propose that they modify the language of that recommendation as opposed to deleting that recommendation, which would say that the City shall continue to evaluate emerging technology of flight track monitoring system hardware and to evaluate the benefits of future implementation of such.

Commissioner Maxwell stated he is opposed to it since the City Council, the Commission, and Airport staff can always do what Chairman Tinnan suggests and this is an action item that we are recommending them to acquire.

Commissioner Mack interjected that if Union Hills does exactly what they are talking about, they will have that benefit and they can get that without any cost, and that is coming in next year and it will be able to tell them if an aircraft is 1,000 feet over someone's house.

Mr. Gray stated he wanted to clarify Item No. 14 and his understanding of the amendment was to state, relocate existing run-up area to attenuate the noise. We are talking about complete removal of the enclosure concept, or is it to relocate and keep the possibility once we find out what we learn from the relocation If it's the latter then that will clarify.

Chairman Tinnan said they should read the language to make sure everyone is clear. Chairman Tinnan asked for the new language on No. 11 for noise abatement measures.

Mr. Gray stated the new language on No. 11 was..."encourage the use of published traffic patterns for Runway 21 "

Concerning No. 14, Mr. Gray stated if they are keeping the enclosure concept as part of the recommendation, the question would be do they just evaluate the run-up enclosure and do they need to state they are relocating. The relocation of the existing one may not be possible anyway, but he will ask Mr. Harris to state what he thinks the language should state so they still keep their options open.

Mr. Harris stated if he understands correctly they want to ensure that relocation and type of facility is designed that will appropriately address the concerns.

Chairman Tinnan suggested, "relocate the ground run-up area and construct attenuation barriers/enclosures as required to attenuate ..etc."

Mr. Gray then restated the wording for No. 14 to read, "Relocate existing ground run-up area and construct ground run-up enclosure as required to attenuate noise impacts within the 65dnl."

Chairman Tinnan stated on No. 5 in program management measures, he would like to move that the wording on that recommendation be, "to continue and expand the Airport location and warning signage program." Councilman Littlefield suggested he take out the words location and warning and just say Airport signage program. Chairman Tinnan agreed.

Chairman Tinnan stated No. 6 in program management should say, "continue Airport pilot and community outreach program," because it is something in progress.

Chairman Tinnan asked if they had a motion as amended and if anyone had any questions.

Councilman Littlefield asked if the way it is left now, No. 4 in program management would be disapprove. Commission agreed that was correct

Chairman Tinnan asked if all were in favor. The Commission voted to recommend to City Council to accept adoption of the 14 CFR Part 150 Airport Noise Compatibility Study for Scottsdale Airport, as amended, by a vote of 6-1 with Commissioner Vickers opposed.

OPERATIONS UPDATE

7. Information

Review of Airport Operations for January 2005

Mr. Chris Read asked if the Commission had any questions or comments concerning the Airport Operations update for January 2005.

Commissioner Osborne asked about the FBO employee on the golf cart incident. Mr. Read responded she was slightly injured when she drove the golf cart off the end of Charlie Taxiway.

8. Information
Review of Airport Operations for February 2005

There were no comments or questions on the February 2002 Airport Operations update.

MEETING SCHEDULE

9. Action
Review/Modify 2005 Meeting Schedule

Mr. Gray advised that the next regular meeting would be April 13, 2005. Commissioner Maxwell advised he would be out of state on that date.

Mr. Gray stated the City Council Subcommittee on Regional Aviation Issues will meet on an as-needed basis, or quarterly, whichever may come first.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no further public comments.

DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Mr. Gray stated that after five-years of effort, the NDB went away Before it went away they intended to have a standalone GPS approach but that did not happen. Mr. Gray added that the new GPS approach, which basically adheres to the old NDB approach, would be published. It is the same procedure with a new reporting point since the NDB is no longer there. Mr Gray said they did a 90-foot reduction in film so it should help in some cases.

Mr. Gray stated they recently held another Airport Clean-up Day, where they advertised to all the existing tenants that they would be collecting hazardous materials. There was a small turnout due to bad weather, but they collect some items, batteries, tires, etc. that they did not want disposed of in the regular trash facilities. Mr. Gray stated they would be doing this on a regular basis.

Mr. Gray said they also distributed the new helicopter pilot guide and nearly 300 of them were mailed out to the registered helicopter owners and operators in the State of Arizona.

Mr. Gray stated they also recently completed annual hangar inspections, in which Airport staff, City staff, Fire department, and building inspection participate. Some discrepancies were found which should be cleared up shortly.

Mr. Gray stated they recently had a radar public information workshop and was the public hearing on the new radar, which is still being proposed at the Union Hills site in Phoenix. Mr. Gray advised the Commission he was recently in Washington, DC primarily to meet with the TSA, but he also met with the FAA people who are in charge of that radar installation. The good new is they are still getting the radar, which will be called SDL; the bad news is it will not be installed in the timeframe they had anticipated. It takes 18 months to build the radar and the proposed time for completion is mid 2007.

The TRACON and Tower facility at Sky Harbor will be finished by end of 2006. The construction will be done simultaneously, however, without the new TRACON, the radar will not do anything because it has to be put into the new radar facility.

ITEMS FROM THE COMMISSION

Councilman Littlefield asked if staff still gets requests from HOA's to speak. Ms. Lewis responded no

Vice Chairman Mack asked what happened with the insurance issue and in obtaining a refund for those that went ahead and purchased the insurance that was no longer required Mr Gray stated he sent an email to the Risk Management director indicating what the request was. Mr. Gray stated he received a response from Risk Management that they are rethinking his response a certificate of insurance under the auspice that they thought they were required if they so choose to they could request their insurance company to remove us as an additional insured. Commissioner Mack asked if Mr. Gray could send the Risk Management director that Commission is ready to ask that he appear before them. Mr. Gray stated he would be happy to do that.

Councilman Littlefield added that he would like Mr. Gray to forward the Risk Management director's emails to him so he could also follow up on it. Mr. Gray agreed to do that.

Chairman Tinnan thanked the members of the City Council Subcommittee on Regional Aviation Issues for participating in tonight's meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

D Maggiola
Administrative Secretary

COMMISSION ACTION REPORT
TO: Airport Advisory Commission
FROM: Airport Staff
SUBJECT/PROJECT NAME: Approval of Minutes

Agenda Item No.: 2

Meeting Date: 06/08/05

Staff Contact: Scott Gray

Phone: (480) 312-7735

ACTION

Review and approval of the Minutes of the Airport Advisory Commission meeting of May 11, 2005.

for

Scott T. Gray, C.M., C.A.E.
Aviation Director

Attachment(s): (1) Draft Minutes of the May 11, 2005 Meeting

Action
Taken

DRAFT

SCOTTSDALE AIRPORT ADVISORY COMMISSION
PUBLIC MEETING
AIRPORT TERMINAL BUILDING LOBBY
15000 N. AIRPORT DRIVE
SCOTTSDALE, AZ

MAY 11, 2005

MINUTES

PRESENT: Leonard Tinnan, Chairman
Bill Mack, Vice Chairman
Donald Maxwell
Philip Vickers
Fred Madanick
Tom Guilfoy
Mike Osborne

ABSENT: None

CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Tinnan called the meeting to order at 6:03 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Roll call confirmed members present as stated above.

MINUTES

Commissioner Maxwell moved to approve the minutes of the April 13, 2005 meeting. Commissioner Guilfoy seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously by a vote of seven (7) to zero (0).

Vice Chairman Mack moved to approve the minutes of the April 20, 2005 meeting of the Commission's subcommittee on signage. Commissioner Madanick seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously by a vote of three (3) to zero (0) by members of the subcommittee

PUBLIC COMMENT

None

AERONAUTICAL BUSINESS PERMIT(S)

Mr. Matt Johnson presented the agenda item for ratification of Airport Aeronautical Business Permit for Sunfare, L.L.C. to provide off-airport, in-flight catering services at the Scottsdale Airport Mr. John Stewart, the CEO of Sunfare, was present at the meeting to answer questions.

Commissioner Maxwell moved to ratify the business permit for Sunfare. Commissioner Osborne seconded the motion The motion passed unanimously by a vote of seven (7) to zero (0)

Mr. Matt Johnson presented the agenda item for aeronautical business permit additions, cancellations, and revocations. There was only one cancellation for last month.

GENERAL BUSINESS

Chairman Tinnan presented the next agenda item, which is to consider recommendation for the City's Transportation Department to install aircraft noise advisory signage as recommended by the Commission's subcommittee on signage.

A special committee, chaired by Commissioner Vickers and including Commissioner Madanick and Vice Chairman Mack, had been previously appointed. The Committee presented a report, including an exhibit that contained an annual noise complaint map for the years of 2003 and 2004, as well as an exhibit showing property that is either currently under development, or property that will soon be under development in and around the airport area.

The subcommittee came to the conclusion that aircraft signage programs should be adopted no later than within 180 days and that the staff and Transportation Department should work closely with the Airport Commission to determine more specifically where the signage should be placed.

Vice Chairman Mack added that a reporting system be utilized to notify the Commission immediately should any slowdown occur.

Commissioner Guilfoy stated he is strongly opposed to the recommendation.

Commissioner Maxwell moved to adopt the report of the subcommittee and forward it on to City Council, the City Council Subcommittee on Regional Aviation Issues, and the City's Transportation Department Vice Chairman Mack seconded the motion.

Further discussion ensued. Ms. Mary O'Connor, General Manager, Transportation, addressed the Commission and their questions.

Ms. Patricia Humphrey, 12401 N. 65th Place, Scottsdale, sent each of the Commissioners an e-mail Commissioner Maxwell reported that she quotes A.R.S. Section 28-8486 of the Transportation Code as saying: "It is the responsibility of the State Real Estate Department to file a map with the County Recorder's office showing property in the vicinity of a public airport."

Commissioner Maxwell clarified that the statute actually reads: "The State Real Estate Department shall have and make available to the public, upon request, a map showing the exterior boundaries of each territory in the vicinity of a public airport." He noted that the public airport would record the map; the State Real Estate Department does not have that responsibility.

Chairman Tinnan called for a vote on the motion; which carried by a vote of five (5) to (2), with Commissioner Guilfoy and Commissioner Osborne dissenting.

Mr. Gary Mascaro addressed the Commission regarding Agenda Item number 6: review of proposed airport rule and regulation changes, vehicle access onto the airfield, and answered their questions.

A comment card was received from Mr. John Meyer, representing the Air Commerce Center and the Greenway Hangars, who spoke to the Commission.

DRAFT

AIRPORT OPERATIONS

Mr. Gary Mascaro presented the April Operations Report and answered the Commission's questions regarding incidents at the airport.

MEETING SCHEDULE

The next meeting will be June 8th. The July meeting will be held on the 13th.

The City Council Subcommittee will meet on an as-needed basis.

DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Mr. Scott Gray had no items to report

ITEMS FROM THE COMMISSION

Commissioner Madanick requested that the bid process for the rental of the Aviation Business Center be placed on the next meeting agenda. The bid opening will take place in the Airport Conference Room on Monday, May, 23rd, at 2:00 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business to discuss, the regular meeting of the Scottsdale Airport Advisory Commission was adjourned at 7:13 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Dianna Campbell
A-V Tronics, Inc.

CITY COUNCIL SUBCOMMITTEE ON REGIONAL AVIATION ISSUES INFORMATION REPORT
TO: City Council Subcommittee
FROM: Airport Advisory Commission Subcommittee on Signage
SUBJECT/PROJECT NAME: Update from Airport Advisory Commission Subcommittee on Signage

Agenda Item No.: 3

Meeting Date: 06/08/05

Staff Contact: Scott Gray

Phone: (480) 312-7735

INFORMATION
Update by Commissioner Phil Vickers, Chairman of the Airport Advisory Commission Subcommittee on Signage.

PURPOSE
Discuss additional input from the Airport Advisory Commission Subcommittee on Signage on the Aircraft Noise Warning Signage Program as recommended by the Airport Advisory Commission

KEY CONSIDERATIONS

- Airport Advisory Commission Subcommittee on Signage held a second meeting June 7, 2005 to review input provided by various City departments.
- Airport Advisory Commission forwarded Subcommittee report with a recommendation to implement the signage program on May 11, 2005.

Scott T. Gray, C.M., C.A.E.
Aviation Director

Action
Taken