

**MINUTES
AVIATION ADVISORY COMMISSION
GLENDALE MUNICIPAL AIRPORT
6801 N. GLEN HARBOR BLVD.
GLENDALE AVIATION CONFERENCE ROOM
GLENDALE, AZ 85307
MAY 8, 2010
9:00 AM**

I. CALL TO ORDER

II. ROLL CALL

Present:	Commissioner Chairman	Carl Dietzman
	Commissioner Vice Chairman	Bill Scott
	Commissioner	Carl Duggins
	Commissioner	Bill Kelly
	Commissioner	Robert Irons

Absent:	Commissioner	Ron Cohoe
---------	--------------	-----------

Attendees:	Airport Administrator	Judy Skeen
	Environmental Program Manager	Michelle Wilson
	Senior Inspector	Susan Baldwin
	Field Intelligence Officer	Mark Hollingsworth
	Executive Director/CEO	Steve Yamamori
	Senior Biologist	Steve Fairaizl

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Commissioner Kelly motioned to approve the March 10, 2010 and April 14, 2010 minutes as written. Commissioner Duggins made the second. The motion passed 5 - 0.

IV. BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR

None.

V. AIRPORT BUSINESS

1. Ms. Skeen updated the Commissioners on the status of the revised Bylaws and Rules and Regulations.

Ms. Skeen stated that the Bylaws were very close to going before Mayor and Council however; the city's Legal Department wanted to make some additional changes. Once those changes are made, the Bylaws will come back before the Commission, then onto the Government Services Committee and then to Mayor and Council for final approval. This process will move forward in the fall due to summer schedules.

Ms. Skeen stated that the Rules and Regulations were still in review by various parties.

2. Ms. Skeen also discussed the installation of security cameras on the airport terminal building. Ms. Skeen stated that airport staff is being trained on the proper use of the cameras. Ms. Skeen commented that the cameras were a good means of security for the airport.
3. Ms. Skeen announced that Mr. Richard Klink, the airport crew leader, gave his retirement notice and his last day will be on June 4th. Ms. Skeen stated that Mr. Klink has worked for the city since the airport opened and he will be greatly missed.

VI. PRESENTATIONS:

1. ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES PRESENTATION

Ms. Michelle Wilson, Environmental Program Manager for the City of Glendale gave an overview of the role and responsibility of the Environmental Resources Department regarding, air quality, storm water the National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA) and other issues.

Ms. Wilson displayed an organizational chart for the Environmental Resources Department.

- What do we do?
 - Serve as internal environmental consultants to all city departments
 - Assist with environmental compliance goals and concerns
 - Water quality sampling and compliance
 - Water conservation assistance for citizens and departments
 - Fulfill roles and responsibilities listed in City Manager's Directive (CMD) #5

Ms. Wilson discussed air pollutants and federal standards. Highlights include the following:

- Particulate matter and ozone are the two criteria pollutants of which Maricopa County is most prone to exceed federal standards.
 - Particulate matter has higher concentrations and likelihood to exceed in winter months due to inversion layer.

- Ozone has higher concentrations and likelihood to exceed in summer months due to high temperatures and sunlight.
- Health conditions created or exacerbated by particulate matter include asthma, cardiopulmonary disease, bronchitis and valley fever. Children and the elderly are sensitive groups at higher risk of being affected.
- Because Maricopa County has failed to meet federal particulate matter (PM) standards on a consistent basis, in 2007 a plan was developed to reduce particulate emissions by 5% each year until the standard is met. Fifty-three PM-10 control measures were implemented. The plan required 3 years of clean data (2008, 2009, and 2010).
- The costs of non-attainment of federal standards include further tightening of the State Implementation Plan and the Federal Implementation Plan. Furthermore, there can be a negative economic impact to Arizona in the form of loss of tourism, decreased construction, higher fees and fines and loss of federal transportation dollars.

Ms. Wilson discussed Rules 310 and 310.01 which can impact the airport operations.

- These are stringent rules in place to reduce particulate matter pollution and were revised in 2008 and 2010.
- The rules regulate activities that generate dust.
- Rule 301 addressed earthmoving, weed abatement, excavation and grading.
- Rule 301.01 addresses the use of vehicles on unpaved lots/open spaces, unpaved roads, vacant lots and unpaved parking lots.
- A dust permit is required for any dust-generating operations that disturb greater than or equal to .01 acre.
- A citywide permit from the Maricopa County Air Control Department is required for routine maintenance activities. This is an annual permit and also covers weed control and soil erosion prevention programs at the airport.

Ms. Wilson discussed wastewater and stormwater conveyance. Ms. Wilson displayed a map of the various canals, creeks and rivers that stormwater travels through in Maricopa County and also displayed a map overlay of the Glendale Airport storm sewer system. Wastewater travels through sewer systems into water treatment plants. Stormwater drains into underground piping and is discharged into waterways throughout the valley such as New River, Aqua Fria River and Skunk Creek.

Ms. Wilson discussed the 1972 Clean Water Act and the 1987 Water Quality Act and storm water regulations. The National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NDPES) regulates municipal, construction and industrial (includes airports) stormwater systems. Permits are required by the NDPES for all point sources discharging pollutants into the waters of the United States. A stormwater pollutant is anything that is not pure rain. Permits reduce stormwater pollution by emphasizing pollution prevention, minimizing exposure and encouraging

implementation of Best Practice Management. Ms. Wilson explained the various types of stormwater permits.

Ms. Wilson explained the National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA)

- Passed in 1970
- Must be completed prior to all “federal actions”
- Requires environmental factors be considered at an early stage in the planning process and alternatives reviewed for actions with significant impact

Airports are impacted by NEPA because of the following types of federal actions at airports:

- Federal funding for projects
- Airport Layout Plan approval
- Approval for new public use airport
- Authorizing Passenger Facility Charges
- Federally-owned land transfers and releases
- Approval of noise compatibility programs
- Issuing a Part 139 Certification
- Funding an FAA-approved Wildlife Hazard Management Plan

Ms. Wilson discussed the three types of NEPA Evaluations which were required for any project with a possible environmental impact. The type of evaluation required is determined by the scope of the project

- Categorical Exclusion Determination (examples in this category could include a new runway in a major airport, a new commercial service airport, timeframe 1 – 6 years.)
- Environmental Assessment – Finding of No Significant Impact (EA/FONSI) (examples in this category could include a controversial land acquisition, a new runway, waters or wetland, helicopter facilities, timeframe of 1 - 3 years.)
- Environmental Impact Statement (examples in this category could include administrative functions, repair/maintenance issues, timeframe of 1 - 4 months.)

Ms. Wilson discussed other environmental issues that the airport needs to consider:

- Hazardous/solid waster
- Hazardous materials
- Ozone, air pollutants and greenhouse gases
- Fuel use and spill containment
- Water quality
- Wildlife
- Noise
- Light emissions

Ms. Wilson stated that it is very important for the airport to consider environmental factors and regulations and follow the permitting process when changing processes or procedures, when implementing new programs, performing construction and conducting demolition.

Ms. Skeen thanked Ms. Wilson for her presentation.

2. TRANSPORTATION SAFETY AUTHORITY PRESENTATION

Ms. Susan Baldwin and Mr. Mark Hollingsworth of the Transportation Safety Authority were in attendance to discuss airport security. Ms. Baldwin is assigned to the Glendale and Buckeye Airports.

Ms. Baldwin stated that the security of general aviation airports is critical to the security of the nation even though they are not typically targeted by terrorists. Ms. Baldwin stressed the importance of being aware of and reporting suspicious activity.

Ms. Baldwin was asked about security for chartered planes and private planes flying in from Mexico. Ms. Baldwin explained that the names of passengers flying on a chartered plane are provided to the TSA by the charter company. The TSA then conducts security review on the names. Ms. Baldwin stated that a private plane from Mexico must pass customs and border protection. Ms. Skeen stated that these planes typically land in Yuma to clear customs or are directed to another site to clear customs.

Mr. Hollingsworth discussed recent terrorist plots in the United States and stated that the TSA is continuously working to improve its methods of terrorist detection and thwarting attacks. Mr. Hollingsworth commented on new imaging machines that were being used in pilot programs at a few large airports in the U.S. Mr. Hollingsworth displayed pictures of specific terrorists in captivity and also those on the run.

Ms. Skeen stated that the Glendale Airport has increased its security with the recent installation of cameras at the terminal building.

Ms. Baldwin explained the process of screening flight training students:

- If a U.S. citizen, proof of citizenship must be provided to the flight school or the instructor. Background checks are conducted.
- If not a U.S. citizen, a VISA must be obtained, all personal information must be submitted to the flight school and the TSA will conduct a background screen. The flight school must also provide pictures of the student to the TSA and the student is also fingerprinted. TSA must clear the fingerprints prior to flight training.

Chair Dietzman inquired as to how and/or why a person is placed on the No Fly List. Mr. Hollingsworth replied that there were specific criteria, but it was classified information. Basically, the concern is if the person is a threat to national security.

Ms. Skeen mentioned that at the Glendale Airport, some pilots have reported issues with lasers pointed at the planes. Mr. Hollingsworth commented that there are at least ten laser incidents reported each month. Mr. Hollingsworth added that arrests are made and usually the culprits are children.

Ms. Baldwin again stressed the importance of being aware of suspicious activity and those situations that do not look normal.

Ms. Skeen thanked Ms. Baldwin and Mr. Hollingsworth for their presentation.

3. FIGHTER COUNTRY PARTNERSHIP PRESENTATION

Mr. Steve Yamamouri, Executive Director and CEO of Fighter Country Partnership, stated that that mission of the group was basically to support the men, women, families and mission of the Luke Air Force Base (LAFB).

Mr. Yamamouri explained that the Fighter Country Partnership has partnered with the City of Glendale and thirteen other valley cities to set up Luke Forward. Luke Forward is a campaign to get the F35 Program established at LAFB. Mr. Yamamouri explained that LAFB must be sustained for various reasons; one important factor is the \$2.17 billion annual impact on the valley's economy.

Mr. Yamamouri noted that there are three top contenders in the running for the F35 program:

1. Luke Air Force Base
2. Holliman AFB in New Mexico
3. Edwards AFB in Florida

Mr. Yamamouri stated that currently, an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is being done on LAFB regarding the F35 Program. The EIS draft is expected at the earliest by the end of the summer and at the latest by the end of 2010. Hearings will then be held once the EIS is complete. If LAFB is chosen, Mr. Yamamouri stated that F35's could be on the ramp at LAFB by 2014. Anywhere from 100-150 F35's could be on the ramp at LAFB. Mr. Yamamouri hoped a decision on location of the F35 Program would be reached in the next 18 months.

Mr. Yamamouri discussed the reasons that LAFB is the best choice for the F35 Program:

- Great weather
- 365 days of training use
- The superiority and size of the Barry M. Goldwater Flying Range

- Infrastructure is in place for immediate use

Mr. Yamamouri explained that the F35 would have a conventional take-off and landing at LAFB, but vertical take-off and landing in Yuma. The F35 has a reinforced tail hook to land on naval carriers.

Mr. Yamamouri expected that the F35 would gradually replace the F15, the F16, the A10 and the Harrier.

Mr. Yamamouri encouraged the Commissioners to visit www.LukeForward.com for more information and to register support of the F35 Program.

Vice Chair Scott asked that an update of the F35 Program be put on the agenda for the next Commission meeting. Ms. Skeen agreed to do so.

Commissioner Kelly wondered what would happen to LAFB if the F35 Program is not awarded to the base. Mr. Yamamouri stated that the Marine Reserves are currently at LAFB and the goal is to have the Navy Reserves stationed at the base. Mr. Yamamouri commented that the future of LAFB would be very cloudy without the F35 Program.

Mr. Yamamouri stated that besides regular operations, there are 120,000 veterans who access LAFB for the pharmacy and other needs.

Ms. Skeen inquired about any pollution issues expected from the F35 Program. Mr. Yamamouri replied that the ADEQ has released findings that there was no pollution issue with the program.

Ms. Skeen thanked Mr. Yamamouri for his presentation.

4. AIRPORT WILDLIFE PRESENTATION

Mr. Steve Fairaizl of Airport Wildlife Consultants gave a presentation on wildlife hazards at the airport.

Mr. Fairaizl's discussed the Wildlife Hazard Assessment at Sky Harbor from 1998 to the Present:

FAA AC5200-33B Identifies Wildlife Attractants as:

- Landfills
- Water Management Facilities
- Wetlands
- Dredge Containment Areas
- Agriculture
- Golf Courses

Hazard Separation Distances recommended by FAA AC5200-33B:

- 5,000 feet for piston-powered aircrafts
- 10,000 feet for turbine-powered aircrafts
- 5 miles from approach and departure corridors

What Triggers a Wildlife Hazard Assessment?

- History of events
- Qualifying events
- Wildlife Strike (collision between an animal and an airplane)

Mr. Fairaizl stated that the Rio Salado project triggered a Wildlife Assessment at Sky Harbor. This project involved restoring the rivers that were dredged over time, basically resulting in restoring the Salt River bed adjacent to Sky Harbor.

How to Conduct a Wildlife Assessment:

- Identify a wildlife attractant (food, water, shelter)
- Survey the site
- Report general findings (when occur, distance from attractant, etc.)

Mr. Fairaizl displayed the formal FAA definition of a bird strike and the FAA reporting form used for a bird strike. Mr. Fairaizl stated that in 2009, there were approximately 10,000 bird strikes reported nationwide to the FAA (this includes both commercial and general aviation airports).

Future Projects at Sky Harbor regarding Wildlife Hazards:

- Review of planned developments
- Review of movement patterns of resident doves and other birds
- Education of adjacent landowners and airport staff
- Discover options for better drainage of the Salt River adjacent to Sky Harbor

Future Management Efforts Sky Harbor regarding Wildlife Hazards:

- Increase strike reporting and species identification
- Continue monitoring of hazards
- Management of observed hazards
- Keep airport staff involved in hazard control efforts

Actual Wildlife Management Techniques:

- Non-Lethal
 - Repellants
 - Exclusion
 - Laser
 - Trap and relocation
 - Scare devices
 - Pyrotechnics
 - Habitat modifications

- Lethal
 - Toxicants
 - Trapping and euthanasia
 - Shooting

General Wildlife Maintenance at Sky Harbor

- Discourage wildlife feeding
- Pick up trash and litter
- Cover garbage cans and dumpsters
- Remove dead animals

Most Effective Wildlife Hazard Management at Sky Harbor

- Habitat modification
- Trapping
- Exclusion
- Pyrotechnics
- Controlling food sources
- Technical assistance utilized
- Non-lethal methods used first

Mr. Fairaizl explained that there are plans for a SRP recharge facility adjacent to the Glendale Airport. The plans are to build large open water basins for SRP use. The total size would be 80-surface acres of water about four to five feet deep. This could significantly create wildlife hazards for the Glendale Airport. SRP does plan to work with the City of Glendale regarding wildlife hazard management at the recharge facility.

Ms. Skeen thanked Mr. Fairaizl for his presentation.

VII. LUNCH

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

Ms. Skeen updated the Commission on the progress of the new flight school at the airport. Details included the following:

- Plans are in the review stage.
- The building height and landscaping plans are under review.
- The projected opening date of the flight school is fall 2011.

Ms. Skeen stated that a pad at the airport south of the blue hangars has been confirmed for the Civil Air Patrol. Current lease negotiations dictate that the Civil Air Patrol must supply labor to offset lease payments. Ms. Skeen stated that once the lease is finalized, it will go to the Legal Department for review and approval and then brought before the Commission.

Ms. Skeen announced that this Friday, the 99'ers will paint the compass rows at the airport from 10:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. Paint will be supplied by the airport.

Ms. Skeen stated that approximately 200 people attended an open house at Arizona Flight Training last weekend. Other participants included Grassroots and Airwest.

Ms. Skeen reported that last weekend an aircraft took off but then returned to the airport because of smoke in the cockpit. Ms. Skeen stated that this was a minor incident.

IX. NEXT MEETING TIME

The Commission will vacate the June and July meetings. The next Commission meeting will be held at 7:00 p.m., Wednesday, August 11, 2010 on the second floor Conference Room of the airport terminal building located at the Glendale Municipal Airport, 6801 N. Glen Harbor Blvd Suite 201, Glendale, AZ.

X. ADJOURNMENT

Vice Chair Scott motioned to adjourn the meeting at 12:40 p.m. Commissioner Kelly made the second. The motion passed 5 - 0.