

MINUTES OF A WORKSHOP
CITY COUNCIL, VENICE, FLORIDA

JANUARY 28, 2010

A Workshop of the City Council to consider the Airport Master Plan Update was held this date in Council Chambers at City Hall. Mayor Martin called the workshop to order at 1:33 p.m.

ELECTED OFFICIALS AND OTHERS PRESENT

Roll was called with the following elected officials present: Mayor Ed Martin, Vice Mayor Ernie Zavodnyik, and Council Members Jim Bennett, Sue Lang (1:37), Kit McKeon, and John K. Moore. Emilio Carlesimo was absent.

Also present: City Clerk Lori Stelzer, City Attorney Bob Anderson, City Manager Isaac Turner, and for certain items on the agenda: Assistant City Manager Nancy Woodley and Airport Director Fred Watts.

I. MASTER PLAN UPDATE

Ms. Lang noted her objection to the recommended motion included in the agenda which was handed out at the meeting, but not included in the agenda posted on the city website.

Ms. Stelzer advised the suggested motions were presented in a format similar to council instructions prepared for regular meetings.

Discussion followed regarding suggested verbiage for motions and facilitating the meeting process.

Ms. Stelzer briefed council on the meeting posting process and different types of meetings, noting this was called as a special meeting in order to allow council the option of taking action.

Ms. Lang objected that nothing was listed under Council Actions and the public was not made aware that action would be taken.

Mayor Martin indicated he felt the logical outcome of this meeting was to provide staff with additional direction following the FAA's rejection to downgrade the Venice Municipal Airport's Reference Code (ARC) to B-II.

Lisa Mastropieri, DY Consultants, Project Manager, summarized the December 11, 2009 meeting with the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) to present the alternative B-II standards and the FAA's subsequent rejection of the request, and presented new options that met both city council and FAA requirements.

Bill DeGraaff, DY Consultants, Senior Planner/Engineer, outlined a modified airport alternative based on FAA input including shifting Runway 13-31 to the south to minimize Runway Protection Zone (RPZ) impacts and maintain Runway 13-31 as a “C” runway, maintain Runway 4-22 as a full “C” and noise abatement runway, and applying Runway Object Free Area (ROFA) standards.

(2:04) Discussion followed regarding declared distances without adding runway length, cost of adding 515 feet to Runway 13-31, relocating the driving range, Runway Object Free Area (ROFA), moving fencing without impacting the golf course, grant funding for rehabilitation of Runway 4-22, changing Runway Safety Area (RSA) standards, grandfathering airports at current standards, imposing the ROFA in similar fashion as the RSA, existing flight patterns, pilots not following policies, maintaining Runway 4-22 as the noise abatement runway, and bridge displacement.

Mr. DeGraaff provided council with a detailed explanation of the difference between relocating the threshold and declared distance.

(2:28) Discussion ensued regarding relocating versus displacing the threshold, reducing airport utility, existing displacement of Runway 4-22, and pilots following displaced threshold markings.

Ms. Mastropieri reviewed the draft data count from March through December 2009 noting total operations of 49,900, adding that the count would continue for a full twelve months through December 31, 2009. Ms. Mastropieri explained that the majority of operations were small aircraft or A1 operations.

Mr. DeGraaff presented an overview of the weight bearing capacity evaluation of Runway 4-22 based on data obtained by Roy D. McQueen and Associates, Ltd. in April 2006, which concluded the runway was in poor condition and in need of rehabilitation.

Council members discussed survey results.

Ms. Mastropieri reviewed next steps including obtaining twelve months of complete data, discussing other alternatives with the FAA, public workshops, and sending the final Master Plan Update and Airport Layout Plan to the FAA.

Discussion followed regarding citizen requests, displacing the threshold of Runway 13-31, declared distances, and conducting an environmental assessment.

(3:02) Responding to Mr. Anderson, Ms. Mastropieri indicated that driving range relocation costs were approximately \$400,000, depending on amenities and not factoring in condemnation costs. Mr. DeGraaff suggested petitioning the FAA for costs, including condemnation costs.

Mr. Anderson stated the property was subject to a long term lease and dealing with a tenant would trigger the possibility of condemnation expenses.

Mr. DeGraaff reiterated his suggestion to petition the FAA for funding because the city is attempting to meet FAA standards.

Ms. Mastropieri added she would clarify those costs with the FAA.

Mr. Anderson requested confirmation of grandfathering if the FAA revised standards and brought the airport out of compliance.

Mr. DeGraaff responded that the FAA didn't expect all airports to make changes when it revised rules, however, if the FAA provided runway reconstruction funding, compliance was required unless a modification to standards is furnished. Mr. DeGraaff added the FAA did request the return of grant funding when runway improvements were not completed because of a change in elected officials.

Discussion followed regarding the original strength of Runway 13-31, runway usage, grant assurances for Runway 13-31, FAA looking favorably on improvements to Runway 4-22, and making 4-22 a noise abatement runway.

Recess was taken from 3:14 p.m. until 3:29 p.m.

Jim Marble, 832 Robert Street, commented on designation of noise abatement runways.

Paul Hollowell, speaking on behalf of Venice Aviation Society, Inc. (VASI), read a prepared statement concerning rehabilitating Runway 4-22.

Chuck Schmieler, 125 Castile Street, Venice Airport Business Association (VABA) president, discussed VABA's participation in the airport planning process.

Bill Newnam, 906 Golden Beach Boulevard, spoke in opposition to extending the runways.

Claudia Eaton, 416 Shore Road, expressed concerns for pollution caused by large aircraft.

Bob Dennis, 421 Mahon Drive, opposed C-II airport classification.

(3:59) Walter Hake, Venice resident, offered ideas concerning airport development.

Marshall Happer, 117 Martellago Drive, urged council members to obtain legal advice concerning the city's liability for homes in the RPZ.

Discussion ensued regarding waiving safety requirements for homes in the RPZ, designating clear zones, the airport being designated C-II in 2000, the RPZ being designated in the 1990s, RPZs being free of human habitation, the RPZ overlaying homes, rehabilitating Runway 13-31, and preserving safety.

Chris Davis, 340 Shore Road, reviewed B-II versus C-II designations and expressed concerns regarding the RPZ and environmental issues.

(4:22) Dan Boone, attorney for Venice Golf Association, discussed impacts to the golf course. Discussion followed regarding C-II RPZ overlays, new driving range location, and the golf course not funding mandatory changes.

Wayne Kozich, 324 Beach Road, stated that he lives at the north end of Runway 13-31 and planes consistently fly over his home, and spoke in support of a B-II designation.

John Moeckel, 185 Treviso Court, discussed funding and the timeline for submittal of the ALP and Master Plan to the FAA.

Discussion ensued regarding construction grants, the FAA supporting a C-II designation, what is best for the community, money spent on downgrading the airport, budget shortfalls, proposed rate increases, FAA correspondence, and the FAA granting concessions.

(4:59) Mr. Carlesimo **moved** to approve the C-II designation for the Venice Municipal Airport and to request the FAA to allow the Venice Golf Association fences to remain in their current location, and that the Venice City Council seek funding from the FAA for rehabilitation of Runway 4-22 in its present configuration of 5,000 feet long by 150 feet wide, and to adopt DY's recommended displacement plan for Runway 13, if possible.

MOTION FAILED FOR LACK OF A SECOND.

Discussion followed regarding B-II and C-II designations not changing airport functionality; moving forward no matter which designation was assigned; remaining consistent with safety and protection of the golf course; RPZ concerns; continuing this meeting on Monday morning after the Private Attorney-Client Session; Venice Municipal Airport being limited by physical constraints; relocating the driving range; boaters using the Intracoastal Waterway; submitting a plan without a designation; safety issues; airport utility; compatibility between airport operations and the surrounding area; money not being as important as compatibility; the golf course and airport co-existing; VABA and VASI wanting full runway capability; FAA's position being inconsistent with its regulations; resolving this matter in a timely manner; FAA needing legal authority for rejecting the B-II designation; approving a plan the FAA would support; requesting displaced threshold and extension of runways; requesting that fences not be moved; adding 500 feet to Runway 13-31; displaced threshold; longer runways allowing heavier aircraft to take off; and saving Gulf Shores and the golf course.

(5:41) Ms. Lang **moved** to direct DY to draft the actual B-II Airport Layout Plan for submission to the FAA. **Seconded** by Mr. Moore.

Ms. Mastropieri indicated she was prepared to present a completed plan to the FAA by the second week of March, and that the FAA would need a month for review, but stated the FAA was likely to turn the plan down.

Discussion followed regarding presenting a displaced threshold plan; putting up a barrier; utilizing the runway's full length; displacement having the least effect on airport utility; and requiring 1000 feet to land an aircraft.

Mr. Bennett suggested submitting a B-II plan with the statement "seriously considered a displaced threshold alternative, but rejected it because the city didn't want to diminish the utility of this airport". Mr. DeGraaff responded that the FAA would dismiss that proposal.

Discussion continued regarding alternatives if the FAA doesn't approve the B-II, being placed in a position that will ultimately condemn homes, requiring an environmental assessment, and the total cost of this process.

Mr. Carlesimo called the question.

ROLL CALL: MR. MCKEON, NO; MR. ZAVODNYIK, YES; MS. LANG, YES; MR. MOORE, YES; MR. CARLESIMO, NO; MR. BENNETT, YES; MAYOR MARTIN, NO. MOTION CARRIED.

Mr. Turner clarified that council approved the motion to draft the B-II, and stated he would schedule meetings with community members to familiarize himself with their arguments for a B-II designation.

II. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before council, the meeting was adjourned at 6:09 p.m.

ATTEST:

Mayor – City of Venice

City Clerk