



AIRPORT COMMISSION MEETING
Monday, January 24, 2022 4:30 pm
Murfreesboro Municipal Airport
Business Center
1930 Memorial Blvd. Murfreesboro, TN 37129

Attendees:

Steve Waldron, Airport Commission Chair
George Huddleston, Vice Chair
John Polk
Clay Cook
Bill Shacklett, City Council Representative
Craig Tindall, City Manager, Ex-Officio
Dr. Chaminda Prelis, MTSU Aerospace Department Chair

Absent:

Lynn Lien
Butch Jones

Also in attendance:

Katie Drive, City Staff Attorney
Chad Gehrke, Airport Director
Ryan Hulseley, Airport Manager
Kim Fann, Airport Account Clerk
Benson Hadley, Barge Design Solutions
Brian Fields, MTSU Airport Operations Manager
Mason Marshman
Ans Wishing
Cannon Loughry

Prayer and Pledge of Allegiance: George Huddleston

AGENDA

1. Call to order – Attendance
2. Approval of January 2022 Airport Commission meeting minutes
3. Consider approval of the proposed Standard Operating Procedures (Chad Gehrke)
4. Consider approval of the Property Maintenance Rules (Chad Gehrke)
5. Airport Director's report regarding
 - a) Future federal funding
 - b) Airport Dashboard
 - c) Hangar One Project
 - d) Approach Management Project
 - e) Taxiway A and Ramp Pavement Rehab Project
 - f) Airport Safety and Capacity Study
 - g) Airport Layout Plan
 - h) FAA Safety Info Share – Traffic Pattern Operations 2-17-2, 7-9 pm
 - i) Tennessee Airports Conference – March 28-30, 2022 Embassy Suites
6. Any other business to come before the Airport Commission
7. Consider date and time for next Airport Commission meeting (January 17, 2022)
8. Adjournment

1. **Call to order – Attendance**

Airport Commission Chair Steve Waldron welcomed everyone and called the meeting to order.

2. **Consider approval of January 2022 Airport Commission meeting minutes**

Bill Shacklett moved to approve the January 2022 Airport Commission meeting minutes. John Polk seconded the motion and all voted in favor.

3. **Consider approval of the proposed Standard Operating Procedures**

Chad Gehrke described the Standard Operating Procedures stating that the process began approximately a year ago when the City contracted with Dr. Dave Byers of Quadrex Aviation to conduct the Airport Safety and Capacity Study. Mr. Gehrke stated that Dave Byers met with members of the Airport Commission and received input and information including some of the ideas the Commission Members had on how perhaps to solve some of the issues that occur in the pattern. Then Mr. Byers met with representatives of MTSU even getting the opportunity to fly a DA-40 and witness how the pattern operates here at MBT. Mr. Gehrke stated that Dr. Byers also spent time with Murfreesboro Aviation and received their input as well. Mr. Gehrke reported that he believed the real progress began when Dr. Greg Van Patton, Dr. Chaminda Prelis, Michael Gref, Brian Fields, and Larry Williams came on board representing MTSU and joined into this process. Mr. Gehrke stated that the Standard Operating Procedure document has taken on many forms over the last few months and it is at a point where the various parties involved in the creation of this document have gained trust with each other, have greatly improved communications, and have had weekly meetings to get to where the relationship is and the document is today. Mr. Gehrke stated that with these standard operating procedures in place the data is showing that what MTSU and Murfreesboro Aviation have adopted is helping reduce the number of aircraft operating in the pattern and therefore decreasing the number of complaints received from pilots and neighbors. Mr. Gehrke stated that he and the Airport Staff have observed improved communications among the student pilots and instructors and how they interact with the based and transient pilots improving the pattern and how it operates. Mr. Gehrke reported that both MTSU and Murfreesboro Aviation have contracted with Virtower so everyone is able to observe the operations and gather data. Mr. Gehrke stated that each flight school will receive data from Virtower specific to their own aircraft while the Airport receives data on all aircraft operations.

Mr. Gehrke then began to review the various sections of the documents. He started with the introduction. Mr. Gehrke described that he believed that the Standard Operating Procedures will be a living document changing from time to time. The introduction describes then the history and purpose for the adoption of standard operating procedures.

The next section is a standard operation procedure which has a title and date in which it is adopted. There is a description of what the objective is that the procedure is to address. Then there is the operating procedure followed by a list of action items. The action items describe perhaps how the procedure is going to be adopted or communicated. The action items may describe tasks that the Airport or the flight schools are responsible for. Then included in the document is the agreement which states that each party has received the Standard Operating Procedure. There are not penalties specifically assigned in this document except that now that these are Standard Operating Procedures, as described in our Airport Rules, Regulations, and Minimum Standards there are ramifications described for how any pilot, operator if they operate in an unsafe manner can be addressed. Mr. Gehrke stated as in anything the goal is to strive for compliance, safety, and efficiency.

Mr. Gehrke described next the Correction Action Report form. Mr. Gehrke stated that this was an item that Brian Fields from MTSU brought into the discussions. He stated that this is a form that pilots or the Commercial Operators can use to describe a problem, safety concern or issue that they have witnessed or were a part of. The document allows the various parties including the Airport to review the problem or issue and access what corrective action should be taken. Mr. Gehrke described that in some instances through this process in talking with the pilots involved there have been times that in the end it was determined that the pilot made the best decision they could have given the scenario and issues they were dealing with.

Mr. Gehrke stated that the exhibits include a map of the pattern, the Airport Rules, Regulations, and Minimum Standards, and the Advisory Circular describing operating at non-towered airports. Mr. Gehrke stated that the Airport Safety and Capacity Study will be included in document as well.

Mr. Gehrke stated that pilots do not have to read through this entire document to see what the Standard Operating Procedures are. Mr. Gehrke stated that a poster will be created that very clearly list with bullet points listing the various operating procedures. This poster will be located in the pilot weather briefing area and included on the Airport website as well. MTSU and MA will be provided posters as well if they would like to have them on display as well. Mr. Gehrke stated that not all of these procedures may be listed in the Airport Facility Directory or Supplemental Charts but some procedures will.

Mr. Gehrke then reviewed with the Airport Commission the first list of Standard Operating Procedures included in the first listing of procedures proposed for adoption which include:

1. Runway 36 is the preferred runway when the wind is calm, or the tailwind component is less than 5 knots.
2. 360 degree turns for spacing are not authorized. If spacing cannot be accomplished through extension of the upwind or downwind or throttle/airspeed adjustments, aircraft should depart the pattern and re-enter the pattern at the 45 to the downwind.
3. Aircraft should enter the traffic pattern on the 45 to downwind. To maintain proper separation and out of courtesy, aircraft in the pattern should adjust their upwind or crosswind turn to assist with the flow of aircraft entering the pattern from the 45 to downwind. For example, when a high -speed aircraft (120K+ approach speed) requests a straight in approach, pattern aircraft should announce their intentions and adjust their downwind or base turn to assist with this flow of traffic.

Note: The “45 to downwind” should intersect the midpoint of the runway as described in the Advisory Circular 90-66B. (See Exhibit A)

4. Traffic pattern aircraft always have landing priority and straight in approaches are best conducted with an empty pattern. Straight in approaches may only be conducted with the coordination and agreement of other aircraft in the pattern. Otherwise, straight in approaching aircraft should break off their approach two miles from the airport and enter the pattern as described above.
5. Pilots operating in the pattern should extend or adjust their downwind or base turn to assist the flow of traffic departing when a number of aircraft are holding short of the runway. Traffic holding short of the runway, when radio traffic allows, should make a call on CTAF announcing they are holding short and announce their intentions for departure of the pattern or staying closed traffic. Please note that closed traffic operations include touch and goes, stop and goes and land/taxi back operations.
6. When airport representatives observe more than four aircraft conducting closed traffic operations and/or three or more aircraft waiting at the end of Taxiway A for departure, or any number of aircraft have been waiting an extended period of time unable to access the active runway due to the number of aircraft repeatedly operating in the pattern:
 - a. the airport representatives will contact MTSU Dispatch

- b. MTSU Dispatch will communicate to all pilots monitoring Blue Raider Ops frequency instructing MTSU and MA aircraft operating in the pattern conducting closed traffic operations to depart the pattern to allow aircraft waiting for access to the runway time to depart.
7. Preferred departure procedure: Fly runway heading until at an altitude of 2,000' MSL. It is recommended to continue climb to at least 2,600' before leveling off.
8. Practice approaches on opposing runway is prohibited.

Mr. Gehrke described the supplemental procedures which are listed in the document. He stated that he felt that it was important that it be documented that MTSU and Murfreesboro Aviation have adopted supplemental procedures to address capacity issues. For example, MTSU is dispatching primary students to other airports to conduct pattern work and Murfreesboro Aviation is not allowing touch and go operations at Murfreesboro unless the pattern is open or has very few aircraft in the pattern. These supplemental procedures or measures help the airport a great deal.

Mr. Gehrke stated that one item that is listed in the document for MTSU to look into is that on the displays in the aircraft some MTSU aircraft are appearing not as their N number but as a number assigned to that aircraft by the FAA for example is MTU98. Pilots operating in the pattern are confused when MTSU pilots are announcing the aircraft N number but on the display seeing a different set of numbers. This is something that has been asked of MTSU to look into if pilots could announce the MTU number instead of the N number in those cases when appropriate avoiding that confusion in the pattern.

Mr. Gehrke stated that during the discussion with MTSU and Murfreesboro Aviation they could not agree on setting a limit to the number of aircraft operating in the pattern conducting touch and goes. The concern was who was going to be responsible or available to count, if that number is reached which aircraft has to leave the pattern, the first or last aircraft, etc. Representatives of MTSU and Murfreesboro Aviation asked that we first try the procedure listed where if aircraft waiting for departure start to line up a call is made to MTSU dispatch requesting all aircraft operating closed traffic to depart until aircraft on the ground are able to depart. Mr. Gehrke stated that he agrees to try that plan but if that does not work or that option is having to be conducted on a regular basis then assigning a number of aircraft operating closed traffic will be adopted.

Steve Waldron, Chair, stated that what Mr. Gehrke has described is a living document. It may not address all of the concerns that everyone wants addressed. It will be changed from time to time It is a starting point.

Clay Cook asked about the pattern training times and why it was not included in the document. Mr. Gehrke stated that since that was already existing and included in the Airport Facility Directory/Supplemental Charts the representatives of MTSU, Murfreesboro Aviation, and the Airport agreed to not list it.

Clay Cook pointed out in the FAA Directory the remarks do not list the number for which runway is the calm wind runway. Mr. Gehrke stated that he would make sure the FAA has the correct number and published as so.

Mr. Cook stated his concern about days when there is marginal IFR weather and there is a mix of IFR and VFR traffic and how to operate in those instances. He suggested that in future updates of the Standard Operating Procedures that be considered.

George Huddleston asked about a number of typos and corrections that he had highlighted. Mr. Gehrke stated that David Ives had done the same thing and he was able to go into the document and make those corrections and addressed his and David's corrections at the same time. He said that he would make sure that in the final document all of the corrections were made. Mr. Huddleston suggested that when describing how long aircraft waiting for access to the runway should wait no more than two minutes in item 6. Mr. Huddleston stated that he was hoping for a two-page documents that could be provided to the airport customers. He stated that his concern was that this document was too focused on flight training operations and not the operations of all the users. He stated for example five airport customers could be in the pattern conducting touch and goes and there is no way to address that. He stated his appreciation to MTSU and Murfreesboro Aviation for already addressing issues and changing their culture. He said that the data from Virtower is reflecting that.

Mr. Waldron asked George if he would like to make a motion describing a one-page document that lists these procedures to our customers and even have a meeting with our customers to describe and discuss these items with them.

Mr. Huddleston stated his concern that there are times that Airport Staff are not here and therefore some actions may not be able to be taken.

Mr. Huddleston moved to approve the Standard Operating Procedures and make a subset that can be presented to our based and transient customers and on the website. Clay Cook seconded the motion. All voted in favor.

Mr. Gehrke stated that his intention is to have that type of dialogue with the based customers as Mr. Huddleston described at the February 17th FAA safety seminar.

4. Consider approval of Property Maintenance Rules

Chad Gehrke reviewed the Property Maintenance Rules with the Airport Commission. He stated asked the Members of the Airport Commission to keep in mind that there are a couple of different scenarios to consider when reviewing the proposed Property Maintenance Rules. The two scenarios are that there are hangars and facilities that the City has built and leases to customers and there are scenarios where the City leases land to customers and they build hangars and facilities. In the future we may see more of the land lease situations. Mr. Gehrke stated that an important issue is how to address items stored outside of hangars; how to provide screening for such cases where that may be appropriate. Mr. Gehrke addressed customers who may fly out of the airport and park a car for several days and how that is handled.

George Huddleston stated that his concern was that he thought that the document was too broad siting some of the language regarding ensuring that all areas of grass are mowed, storage of cars, etc.

Mr. Gehrke addressed the question regarding cars being parked around the T-hangars. He explained various scenarios when the Airport Staff receives complaints from customers about parked cars around the T-hangar area. The Airport Commission members discussed certain auto parking situations around the T-hangars and the issues and how to possibly address it.

John Polk asked who monitors the rules and how often are hangars inspected. Mr. Gehrke stated that these rules apply to the exterior of the hangar and maintaining a good appearance around the airport. Mr. Waldron stated that this document is an effort to try to get the Airport up to date and compliant with other City regulations. He stated that the Airport is trying to enhance all areas around the airfield.

Mr. Huddleston pointed out 2.2 regarding the parking of automobiles inside the building. Craig Tindall, City Manager stated that may be an item that came from City Code that deals with ensuring the inside is free and clear of any fire hazards. Mr. Huddleston asked if the words regarding inside should be removed to keep it in line with the T-hangar Leases. Mr. Gehrke stated that 2.2 stated non-operational vehicles. In that case the Airport would not have an issue with an operable car parked in the T-hangar.

The Airport Commission discussed if there is adequate wing tip clearances throughout the T-hangars. Mr. Gehrke described the importance of the yellow lines on taxiways which tell a pilot they have adequate taxiway safety areas. He pointed out that there are no yellow lines in the middle of the T-hangars because the taxiway safety area is no longer able to be maintained. The Airport Commission agreed that either no parking should be posted or parking places painted in areas that there will not be problems or issues with aircraft wing tip clearances.

Benson Hadley stated that the standard design for the distance between hangars is 75 feet. Mr. Hadley stated that the distance would have to be 115 to 131 feet that would have to be kept clear in that area to maintain a Taxiway. The FAA refers to that ramp as a non-movement area.

Craig Tindall stated that 2.2 and 2.4 has to do with designated parking areas like what is in front of the Terminal. It is addressing how to keep the designated auto parking areas maintained. Around the T-hangars is not a designated parking area. Those areas are covered under other regulations.

The Airport Commission discussed people parking cars for periods of time when people fly out for periods of time. Mr. Huddleston was concerned that the amount of rules and how to communicate them. Mr. Waldron suggested installing some signs for people parking long term with a telephone as to who they should call to let them know that you are parking at the Airport for a period of time.

Mr. Huddleston stated that 48 hours should be struck and replace it with seven days. The Airport Commission discussed various times. Mr. Polk and Mr. Waldron suggested that 72 hours would cover a long weekend. The importance is that someone communicates that they are parking on City property for an extended period of time.

John Polk moved to strike the language regarding automobiles parked inside hangars in 2.2 and increase the time allowed to park and automobile on City property to 72 hours. Bill Shacklett seconded the motion. All approved.

5. **Airport Director's report regarding**

a) Future federal funding

Mr. Gehrke stated that the Airport has received word that it will be receiving \$295,000 in federal funding each year for the next five years. Benson Hadley stated that there has been no information as to how the funds will be dispersed or what projects will be eligible to use this funding toward. He stated that he will be attending a meeting with the FAA as they describe this funding program a bit more. Mr. Gehrke stated that his concern is that the State will require that this funding be used for only pavement and approach maintenance and ALPs and nothing else. He stated that he would report what he learn about this funding in the near future. Mr. Hadley stated that he hoped that as long as we are addressing pavement and approach issues we can use this funding toward site work for future hangars and perhaps use it along with NPE funds. Mr. Gehrke stated that he will be reviewing all state funding and where we stand to ensure those funds are spent within this fiscal year.

- b) **Airport Dashboard** Mr. Gehrke reviewed the number of meetings and events that have occurred and the revenues gained. Mr. Gehrke shared some pictures of some of the events and how many times the Business Center may have events in a few days. He reviewed the number of gallons of fuel sold and the increase compared to the previous year. Mr. Waldron asked questions regarding the new fuel farm tank sizes. Mr. Gehrke stated that the proposed Avgas will get a 20,000 tank and Jet A 12,000 gallons. He reviewed tie-down and T-hangar Waiting List.
- c) **Hangar One Project**
Mr. Gehrke reported that steel has been delivered but Morgan was searching now for a company to erect the hangar. He stated that the exterior metal was not ordered and there is a concern that there could be a delay in the manufacturing and delivery of that metal. Mr. Gehrke stated that the City was very clear that there is room on site for the storage of any materials for this project. Mr. Gehrke stated that he is working with the State to get the term of the Economic Development Grant extended to cover some additional time to get this project completed. The Airport Commission Members discussed some of the delays and issues with this project.
- d) **Approach Management Project**
- e) **Taxiway A and Ramp Pavement Rehab Project.** Mr. Gehrke reported that both planning projects are moving forward on schedule. Clay Cook asked about the timeline on that project. Mr. Gehrke stated that we are not quite there as to what the timing is. Mr. Gehrke stated that the concept is to close one approach and open the next approach as seamlessly as possible. He will be reporting
- f) **Airport Safety and Capacity Study**
Mr. Gehrke stated that he has requested that Dave Byers send the final report as soon as possible.
- g) **Airport Layout Plan**
City Council has requested some vision of the future of the Airport, how will it serve the community with some rather significant operational changes occurring. John Polk asked if the 5,000 foot runway would be included. Mr. Gehrke stated that that will be a subject we will talk about with City Council prior to our scoping discussions with the State.
- h) **FAA Safety Info Share – Traffic Pattern Operations 2-17-2, 7-9 pm**
- i) **Tennessee Airports Conference – March 28-30,2022 Embassy Suites**

6. **Consider any other business to come before the Airport Commission**

Steve Waldron asked that at the next Airport Commission meeting we discuss the fuel price schedule especially with the cost associated with the new fuel farm and other increased construction costs.

George Huddleston stated that he would like the Airport Commission approve the fuel flowage fee be raised from \$0.25 per gallon to \$0.50. The Airport Commission discussed whether that is appropriate now or at the next Airport Commission meeting when the fuel price schedule is discussed.

Cannon Loughry asked about the need for transient hangar space. Mr. Steve Waldron discussed with him the possibility of building a large hangar to rent out space to transients and and based customers. This would include hangars that would be large enough for

7. **Consider date and time for next Airport Commission meeting(February 28, 2022)**

The Members of the Airport Commission agreed to meet February 28, 2022.

8. **Adjournment**