

**JOINT MEETING OF THE TOWN OF GIBRALTAR
AND VILLAGE OF EPHRAIM BOARDS AND THE
EPHRAIM-GIBRALTAR AIRPORT COMMISSION
GIBRALTAR TOWN CENTER
4097 MAIN STREET, FISH CREEK WI
WEDNESDAY, MARCH 9, 2016
7:00 P.M.**

Approved: August 15, 2017

Call to Order: Dick Skare called the joint meeting of the Town of Gibraltar and Village of Ephraim Boards along with the Ephraim-Gibraltar Airport Commission to order at 7:08 p.m. Mike McCutcheon called the Village of Ephraim to order at 7:08 p.m.

Roll Call / Quorum:

Town of Gibraltar – Dick Skare, Karl Stubenvoll, Steve Sohns, Brian Hackbarth and Brian Merkel
Village of Ephraim –Mike McCutcheon, Jane Olson, Tim Nelson, Steve Sauter and Jim Stollenwerk
Ephraim-Gibraltar Airport Commission: – Marty Franke, Myrv Somerhalder, Don Freix, Brett Lecy, and Gary Chaudoir. John Cox was absent.

Motion: (Skare, Stubenvoll) to accept the agenda as changed. Carried Motion: (Sauter, Olson) to accept the agenda as changed. Carried

Airport Owners operations agreement: Skare stated that the town and the village should have a written agreement beside the statutes. The draft agreement was a discussion starting point. Skare stated in 2014 the draft agreement was sent to the village for their consideration. McCutcheon stated the village felt the agreement was redundant and that most of what was said in the agreement was a part of the State Statutes that the commission was operating under. If the commission was allowed to act as a commission there would be no need for the agreement.

#11 The possible exception would be #11 Annual Appropriations; the methodology is to take the lower of the 2 amounts and double it. It is hoped at some time in the near future the airport would be self-sufficient at which time the appropriation would be mute. Olson expressed concern on one of the municipalities would have a zero appropriation then there would be no funding could there be a minimum considered. If there was a minimum that could be palatable. Hackbarth felt this related to special project appropriations. Sauter stated there was not an appropriation for 2015. Merkel recapped previous years where the town and village budgeted for break even and split the shortfall. Franke stated the 5% sponsor share that matches the annual federal appropriation of \$150,000 should be budgeted for annually and held in reserve until needed. Skare could call #11 Budget Appropriation.

#7 Sauter stated under #7 Management, he was under the understanding that the FOEGA was taking over much of that responsibility. Franke responded the town has always taken care of the maintenance. The amount of maintenance done by the town has been reduced over the last few years and has become a reasonable expense. Sauter added that the commission asks the town to do work in certain areas. Commission members agreed. Sauter pointed out that the items are under the commission purview but this item is under the town; he questioned if the commission wants to or should manage the daily operations. Somerhalder responded that it did not matter which municipality handles the operations. McCutcheon suggested having the commission would manage for the next X years with one of the municipalities oversee. There would still need to have a check and balance. Does the commission want the responsibility for? Franke felt the commission already had that responsibility by the statute. Where there are taxation issues it needs to come back to the town and village.

#10 The boards also have not met for the budget process as described. Hackbarth feels cash flow management is part of the agreement discussion as well. Cash flow issue repayment of small loans to the airport vs capitalize over future years. The town and village should stop just giving the airport money. Lecy stated that there are simple things that can be done by the commission for example billing out hangar leases with a due date of the end of February.

The last discussion on this subject was in 2014 in a closed session. Good idea to have a written agreement between the municipalities. McCutcheon will put together something together and bring back to the boards in short order.

Role and limitations of the Airport Commission: Skare stated Hal Davis, BOA Compliance Manager gave the following information: the state statute section 114.14e show the commission is in control. Baraboo and Rice Lake found alternate means to the commission role using an airport committee or municipal management. McCutcheon asked what the commission wanted that they are currently not getting, freedoms wanted, etc. Responses included:

- Franke - the ability to enter into agreements without being micromanaged
- Freix – see no issues with the management, has seen steady improvement
- Lecy – financial issues that are imposed on the town and village, give the commission the benefit of the doubt on running a sound and responsible operation
- Somerhalder – commission must balance needs/wants of the airport vs. the community

Sauter stated the only thing the commission has to come to the boards for is money. It would be better to give responsibility and then measure.

Franke introduced Hal Davis of the BOA – Airport Compliance Manager. He stated rely heavily on the sponsors; the town and village are the sponsors and know best how to manage their airport and the state is not going to tell you how to do that. Statutes are made for the whole state. The state will not weigh in on management unless the grant assurances are not being met. Statutes do not require a commission. Putting things in writing so expectations are known is a positive step. Typically an airport that has multiple municipalities have written agreements. The statutes say “may” in the responsibilities. The Wisconsin Town’s Association stated the municipalities choose what responsibilities the commission has.

Airport Commission Project of Intentions 2016 – 2021 and funding: Franke reviewed the project of intentions; it is used as a planning tool. The BOA determines the estimated costs for the projects. The future hangar prep was the first priority, and land acquisition was second. The profit from the new hangars is estimated a \$7,500 per year. Franke stated a land loan through the state has a 5 year repayment schedule. Repaving of the runway was listed as a \$900,000 project. Funding of the projects and of the airport as a whole should be gone over by the commission with a financial plan created and brought back to the town and village prior to further movement on projects. Should there be an unforeseen maintenance issue there can be a modification of projects.

Potential land division of Williams property: Skare spoke with the town attorney and all the issues being addressed here are considered open session. Franke stated he will continue the conversation with the Williams to see if they would be willing to split the property. It was questioned but not answered if safety or hangar construction was the reason for the purchase; primarily hangar construction. It was asked if the town/village wanted to purchase the property. If the purchase process began and was backed out of there would be about \$30,000 in cost owed to the state. The village has consented in concept to the project. There are sticking points that the town and village ferreted out in a previous meeting that need resolution (policing and village property being given to the town) prior to making a commitment on the purchase. McCutcheon stated answers to the town have been sent.

Airport maintenance funding: See project of intentions.

Airport fuel purchase: Franke stated that fuel prices are trending up and would like to make a purchase now.
Motion: (Sauter, McCutcheon) to give up to \$8,000 for fuel. Carried Motion: (Sobns, Stubenvoll) to loan \$8,000 for fuel purchase. Carried

Adjourn: *Motion: (Sobns, Stubenvoll) to adjourn at 9:27 p.m. Carried Motion: (McCutcheon, Olson) to adjourn at 9:27 p.m. Carried*

Respectfully submitted,

Beth Hagen, Clerk