Aviation Advisory Committee (AAC)
April 17, 2013
Milton, Florida

The Aviation Advisory Committee met on the above date with the following members present: Mike Harris (District 2), Brian Watkins (District 3), Michael Wooley (District 4), and Jeff Fanto (Eglin Air Force Base). County staff present: County Administrator (Hunter Walker), County Engineer (Roger Blaylock), County Assistant Engineer (Michael Schmidt), and Administrative Services Manager (Tammy Simmons).

Watkins called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m. ***The minutes of the November 14, 2012, meeting was approved unanimously. Minutes from the March 20, 2013 meeting was presented for information only due to no quorum.***

Proposed Airport Minimum Standards – Hatch Mott McDonald

Peter Prince Field (2R4)
Minimum Standards for Airport Aeronautical
Commercial Activities
Presentation, April 17, 2013, presented by Jonathan Ignacio

1. Project Update – Minimum Standards Review
    a. Minimum Standards (MSAS) govern basic requirements to provide any commercial aeronautical services within the airport and deals with service providers and the kind of services the airport would provide to the general flying public. Critical elements include:
        i. Qualifications and experience of the service providers and its personnel.
        ii. Scope of Activity that the potential service provider will provide or engage in at the airport.
        iii. Standards required of land and facility improvements to accommodate the specific activity of service provided.
        iv. Certifications/Licenses required for the service provided.
        v. Certification/Licenses required for the personnel and the number of personnel that the entity would be able to provide.
        vi. Equipment that the service provider would have to provide in terms of their operations.
        vii. Insurance required from the entity.
        viii. Identify the hours of service provider.
    b. Airport Rules and Regulations (ARR) govern the on-going activities of the service providers, how the services will be provided dealing with the operations and the air side operation area, such as:
        i. What is expected in terms of operations at Aircraft Operations Area (AOA)?
        ii. Security Procedures.
        iii. Storage and transfer of fuels.
        iv. Environmental restrictions and protections that are imposed by states and federal regulations.
        v. Motor vehicle operation access to airport and restricted areas.
    c. Why do we need Minimum Standards
        i. Peter Prince, 2R4, is a Federal Grants Recipient, therefore; FAA requires it.
            1. Santa Rosa County signs Grant Assurances which includes:
                a. Non-discriminatory clauses insuring airport operates for the common good.
                b. Non-exclusive rights clause for operation of the airport.
            2. To ensure a safe, efficient and adequate level of operations and services are provided.
            3. Protects airport users from unlicensed and unauthorized products and services allowing for legitimate, licensed, and experienced with the services provided.
            4. Promotes the orderly development of airport lands.
            5. Provides a level playing field for companies/individuals wishing to provide aeronautical services.
            6. Minimum Standards do not have to be approved by FAA; however, FAA highly recommends that all airports establish and implement a minimum standard and airport rules and regulations.
            7. It's a means to minimize potential for violations as it relates to grants.
    d. FAA's Role:
        i. Sets Policy and guidelines Advisory Circular ((AC) 150/5190-7).
            1. Does not approve the Airport's Minimum Standards, however; encourages airports to have FAA review it to ensure it is in the context of the guidelines and policy.
        ii. FAA does not enforce it; it is the airport or Sponsor's responsibility to implement and ensure that compliance is met on the set minimum standards.
        iii. When it comes to dispute, especially pertaining to safety, FAA is the final authority. If there is a case where a proposed activity is rejected by the county on the bases of safety then FAA will step in and make the final determination

whether the proposed activity is safe or unsafe.

e. Minimum Standards require:

i. Airport specific to be best suited to the Airport's needs.

ii. Reasonable and relevant to the operations and services that are required within the airport.

iii. Consistent enforcement through out.

iv. Compliance as part of any lease contract to any service providers.

v. Development or update to include airport community involvement, making sure we reach out to the airport community and to the committee as we move forward to finalize the minimum standards.

vi. Updating policy should be clearly defined in a procedure.

2. Background/History

a. In the past, prior to minimum standards, most of the requirements and definitions of services or policy were dealt through the existing lease contracts with its tenants.

b. MSAS/ARR draft was formulated in October 2006.

c. AAC provided comments/inputs.

d. County Attorneys' review was obtained.

e. Finalization of draft held due to pending AMP Update.

f. In 2011, it was moved to be reviewed for finalization.

g. Hatch Mott MacDonald has conducted a review of the initial draft and is in the process of finalizing it and generating input from the committee, the county, and the airport community.

3. Gap Analysis conducted to date, the draft minimum standards upon review indicates there is conflict from the Draft Minimum Standards 2006:

a. T Hangar Use – the hangar lease contract has language with regards to the usage of T-hangars exclusively for aircraft; however, that language is not reinforced in the draft minimum standards. The hangar lease language needs to be consistent as FAA is very keen in ensuring that T-hangars and corporate hangars are primarily used for aeronautical purposes. FAA requires hangars be built in complete compliance with the requirements of the Fire Code, National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) 409, and the Florida Building Code. The 2011 Building Code was updated requiring sprinkler systems, a solid fire wall between hangars, or comply with the actual intent for a group S T-hangar larger than 12,000 s.f. Previous building code had two categories for group S hangars, S-2 (Low-hazard storage) and S-1 (Moderate-hazard storage); they eliminated the low-hazard hangar. The new hangars that are being built are guided by the new requirement under the Florida Building Code, the old hangars will not be required to meet the new standards unless major construction on them is untaken or maintenance and self-fueling of aircraft within the T-hangars be allowed. Harris would like to see some language that would require hangar doors to be closed when tenant is not present, as open doors allow for dirt and dust to collect in the hangar and blow throughout the entire hangar unit.

b. Review/Update identified as every 12 months – To establish if there is any change in services that have been introduced to the airport.

c. Update procedure/process not clearly defined

d. Vehicle entry to Airport Operational Area (AOA) appears not constrained. Runway incursions by vehicles need to be minimized or eliminated by putting into the rules and regulations that any vehicle that needs to cross to the other side would have to use the entry taxiway at both ends of the runway. The revised Airport Layout Plan (ALP) includes construction of a vehicle service road, which is under design, it will access from the south hangars on the west side all the way down to Aviation Drive. Eliminating the mid-taxiway on the west side will force traffic to go right or left, leaving the one on the east side to provide a rapid exit to Peter Prince Aviation Center and Aircraft Management Services would keep theirs to the south. Ignacio stated FAA considers air field as taxiways and runways and air side as that whole airport component.

e. Banner towing designated area not identified. If banner towing is allowed as part of the services available for Peter Prince then it is a requirement to reflect that on the airport layout plan identifying the banner towing area, it needs to be shown on the aeronautical map to insure FAA captures it and FAA will need to look at it to establish it meets their safety criteria. The County does not currently have a request or an operator that has asked to provide this service.

- Some of the concerns with the banner towing operations were:
  - It will open up other parties that are interested in providing banner towing service, allowing for many operator at one time.
  - With operations up significantly at the airport due to the flying school at Peter Prince, it is incompatible.
  - It will be very difficult to operate with T-hangars and all the other ancillaries at the airport
  - An area would have to be designated for safe banner towing operations.
  - It could possible interfere with the approach path at Whiting Field.

f. Aircraft storage for special aeronautical service provider operation (SASO) – hangar standard to be enhanced – there is some language in terms of this particular service being allowed within Peter Prince, however; there is no language of any specific hangar standard that would apply. Typical language would include construction standards for both cor