

From: [Rick Tavan](#)
To: [Comments](#)
Subject: Comment on Circulating Proposals
Date: Sunday, February 20, 2022 10:00:20 PM

Hi, Lauren. I just learned about the special meeting tomorrow to discuss some proposed actions at the airport. I can't make it on that short notice but would like to register some comments through you. I am responding to hearsay that I certainly hope is inaccurate or exaggerated, as the proposals I have heard simply do not make sense.

If there is any danger of retribution by the Board for these unfavorable comments, please submit them anonymously from a "current tenant."

1. Relocate and shorten Runway 20/02?!

The original runway was aligned and sized as it was to maximize safety for all aircraft in the variable wind conditions we experience in Truckee. Move it and you lose much of the benefit. Shorten it and you reduce safety for all. We've had enough accidents here without shortening a high density-altitude runway and turning it away from often-prevailing winds.

This might be an attempt to move some noise away from a more-favored neighborhood to a less-favored neighborhood. That's rather godlike if that's the intention. But moving noise doesn't work and the FAA strongly discourages such efforts. Airplanes will never be silent and someone will always complain about noise. Pilots work hard to follow noise abatement guidelines and that should be sufficient.

I've heard a cost estimate for this proposal of \$40-50M! How many person*dB*seconds of noise per month would this reduce? How many fewer noise complaints will come in? Divide total cost by estimated reductions to calculate the dollar cost of each reduced decibel and complaint.

Speaking of noise reduction, the District spent millions of dollars to install a barely functional "multilateration" transponder triangulation system to track aircraft and reprimand pilots who miss recommended tracks, a system that was quickly rendered obsolete by ADS-B. Then they spent more to enhance the (very good) ADS-B system. But has the airport measured the noise reduction achieved by either system? I haven't seen anything reported.

Similarly, the District spent millions of dollars to commission a contract control tower (contract at the airport's expense because there is insufficient traffic here to justify an FAA control tower). The tower is comforting for some pilots and some neighbors, but has anyone measured its contribution to noise reduction or safety? I haven't seen anything reported.

Similarly, the Board instituted a nighttime curfew some years ago by almost doubling hangar rent and then discounting it slightly for tenant pilots who agree not to fly at night. Of course, transient pilots are exempt. They're implored to fly quiet and I guess they are considered more reliable than locals who can be

penalized (but who care for the Town and its residents far more than the occasional visitor). But has anyone measured the overall noise reduction accomplished by the curfew? I haven't seen anything reported.

Don't spend \$40M+ just to show you're "Doing Something!"

2. Replace some hangars with solar power-supporting shade shelters?!

IN TRUCKEE????!!! Have you noticed that it snows here? A lot? Ask staff about that - they spend labor years every year clearing the stuff. Ask the hangar tenants - how many of them would park under a shade shelter? Their planes would be exposed to the wind, snow blown by wind and machines, sideways rain, and extreme cold without benefit of enclosed parking. They would lose secure space for snow shovels, airplane tugs, chains, traction sand, safely parked cars, and more. Block heaters and battery chargers would no longer be able keep our oil warm and batteries strong enough to start engines safely in cold weather. (Even if outdoor electricity were available, the devices would quickly die of exposure or just disappear.) This would be tantamount to an eviction notice for many of our friends and neighbors whose only sin was renting a hangar that was retroactively deemed doomed.

The airport has lots of land and buildings. If the District wants solar panels, put them on top of existing buildings that are strong enough to support them. Consider the many maintenance buildings or even existing hangars. If you don't have enough strong rooftops today, put more panels on sturdy scaffolding on other airport land. Or cover the long-term parking lot if you like - that would actually be an improvement over current conditions there! With the money saved by not relocating the runway and not demolishing hangars and not building useless shelters, the airport could probably install enough solar panels to power a small town. Well, at least a good part of it. (Of course, that should be a mission of the Town, not the airport, but it beats buying golf courses. And maybe the Town or PUD can help pay for it. Make money, don't waste it.)

3. Evict Soar Truckee and Sky Dive Lake Tahoe?

These are two of the several businesses at TRK that serve the non-flying public who enjoy access to glider rides and sky diving. An airport is supposed to serve the entire community, local and transient, pilots and non-pilots, and is required to support all sorts of aviation activity. It also creates jobs, education opportunities, fire and rescue resources, law enforcement facilities, and recreation for all. Don't cripple it!

Please tell me these rumors are unfounded and the District is not considering such ill-conceived actions!

/Rick Tavan
Former AOPA Airport Support Network Volunteer

--

Rick Tavan, Saratoga & Truckee, CA

From: [Hank Landman](#)
To: [Comments](#)
Subject: Shade hangars proposal
Date: Monday, February 21, 2022 7:40:48 AM

Email sent to Lauren and David....

Hello David,

I will be unable to attend the zoom meeting today because of a conflict with work, however I would like to comment on the proposed scraping of older hangars to make way for shade hangars. I rent a hangar on the J-row at KTRK and am familiar with the challenges of maintaining these older structures, but replacing them with shade hangars is not a logical substitution for proper aircraft storage. Having owned aircraft for 25 years and stored them in various climates around the country, I can say confidently shade hangars are the least desirable storage structure. They provide no protection against high winds, flying debris and freezing precipitation. During winter months with low sun angles, even the aircraft's paint suffers from UV exposure. Additionally, a shade hangar provides no security to the aircraft owner on an airport with no SIDA or perimeter fence.

If the sole reason for building shade hangars is to provide a base for solar panels, I think we as members of the aviation community have missed the mark in leading our neighbors toward a more environmentally conscious future. Tearing down steel structures and hauling them to the dump is not green in any sense. Reuse is the purest form of recycling. What if solar panels were placed on the roofs of existing structures? This alternative would save millions of dollars and still reach climate saving initiatives.

Please consider an alternative plan.

Regards,

Hank Landman

Sent from my Big Tech monitored communication device

From: [Barbara Wong](#)
To: [Comments](#)
Subject: Air Show
Date: Monday, February 21, 2022 8:31:47 AM

Dear Directors:

I urge you to reinstate the Air Show, and not turn it into a "static" event. It benefits the community not just in terms of the funds some non-profit organizations gain, but also the enjoyment of so many, especially those who cannot afford other forms of entertainment.

At the last board meeting, one Director cited greenhouse emissions from all the cars coming to the Air Show as a concern and possible reason to not reinstate the Air Show. While greenhouse emissions are certainly a huge concern these days, that statement ignores the emissions of the everyday planes, which are a huge revenue source. Does that revenue source justify the emissions? It makes no sense to me that it's acceptable for the wealthy to fly their private jets in, while the people who clean their second homes are denied the opportunity to avail themselves of the aviation environment in a fun and educational manner.

So, again, please reinstate the Air Show and bring smiles to many!

Barbara Wong

From: [Fred Zapponi](#)
To: [Comments](#)
Subject: March 23,2022 Regular Board meeting public comment Tab 07
Date: Monday, February 21, 2022 9:34:19 AM

Regarding approval of the Air Show:

The Airshow is the District's premier outreach event. It provides the best opportunity to engage and educate the general public in the benefits of the airport. At the same time, it provides funding to local non profits.

Please continue this long-time Truckee favorite.

Fred Zapponi

[Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPhone](#)

From: [Michael Penman](#)
To: [Comments](#); [Lauren Tapia](#)
Subject: Airport Suppoer
Date: Monday, February 21, 2022 10:23:15 AM

Dear Lauren and Truckee Airport,

I visit the airport 3-4 times per year, mainly to visit friends and grab dinner/lunch and reconnect.

Please consider the GA use of the airport an important aspect of the airfield. I know that piston usage can be considered the low end users as they don't purchase as much gas or spend as much, but please realize that they are a stepping stone for folks that move up the personal/corporate ladder who also move up the airplane chain.

Please support young eagles as a wonderful way to introduce young kids to the joy of flight but also the STEM engagement. We find many many young people are simply not aware of how many jobs there are in aviation both on the flying, administrative and mechanical side.

Also the airshow is a wonderful way to introduce aviation to the community and get them positive about the good impacts of the airport and it's use.

My local airport installed WebTrak to self investigate noise and in talking with the manager many times highway traffic on aggregate was louder. That being said we as pilots changed some of the flight tracks to improve the noise abatement procedures. Most pilots certainly don't want to create unnecessary noise.

Hopefully the team realizes the importance of young people and GA to the airport and strives to promote and foster that. I certainly enjoy seeing young minds come alive after their first flight.

Sincerely,

Michael Penman
KFXE/KMTJ based.

From: [J.L. Posson](#)
To: [Comments](#)
Subject: TRK Airport activities
Date: Monday, February 21, 2022 11:04:57 AM

Comment to the Board,

Please be receptive to continuing Young Eagle Flights from the Truckee Airport. Over the last twenty years, nationwide, those flights have proven to be a concrete method to introduce youth to aerospace careers.

Please be receptive to continuing the Truckee Air Show. I believe it to be a positive handshake with the community.

The Truckee Airport is a valuable resource for the area. It benefits business and provides general air services which includes MedEvac. The U.S.A. has a general aviation network that's unequaled in the world. TRK is a quality example of our country's community airports.

Respectfully,

John Posson
jposson@me.com
Patriots Jet Team Foundation (*A youth aerospace education foundation*)
Andrea Rice Memorial Scholarship (*A scholarship of the Reno-Tahoe 99s*)

From: [Lance W](#)
To: [Comments](#); [Lauren Tapia](#)
Subject: Runway comments to be read into the public record for Feb 21 2022
Date: Monday, February 21, 2022 11:36:37 AM

Dear fellow neighbors of the Truckee airport,

I'm concerned about the expense and safety and overall impact of building a new runway, especially when it doesn't solve anything.

Making slight turns for noise abatement and terrain avoidance is common practice for pilots like myself at airports like Truckee, Auburn, and many others, such as turning north towards the truck scales after departing runway 02, avoiding Glenshire and Olympic Heights.

Building a new runway in hopes of getting non-conforming pilots to adhere to a flight path is overkill - there are more effective and less costly means to improve compliance, such as better communication, signage, and education that will provide easier and better results.

Additionally, this proposal removes the safety advantage provided by orthogonal runways that reduce crosswind factors.

Lance Welsh
12605 Prosser Dam Road
Truckee, CA. 96161

From: [Lance W](#)
To: [Comments](#); [Lauren Tapia](#)
Subject: Hangar comments to be read into the public record for Feb 21 2022
Date: Monday, February 21, 2022 11:37:25 AM

Dear fellow neighbors of the Truckee airport,

As a local pilot waiting wait for a hangar for years, already competing with out-of-town owners, it's discouraging to see underutilized hangars, whether they are exclusively used for projects or storage, rarely used, or consistently empty.

I understand it's a complicated problem with history, but please continue working on a solution so that local pilots can utilize our wonderful airport.

Lance Welsh
12605 Prosser Dam Road
Truckee, CA. 96161

From: [Kristen Mansel](#)
To: [Comments](#)
Cc: [Lauren Tapia](#)
Subject: EAA Young Eagles Flights
Date: Monday, February 21, 2022 11:49:42 AM

Hello,

I am writing to support the EAA and Young Eagles programs at the Truckee Tahoe Airport.

I am a professional pilot myself. I started flying at the young age of 15. It was because of programs just like this that encouraged me to get into aviation myself. To put any restrictions, cancel, or make adjustments to these kind of programs would be detrimental not only to the aviation community but to the kids that dream, blossom, and are encouraged by these flights from such a young age.

I have first hand experience seeing my young neighbor benefit from the Young Eagles program offered at Truckee Tahoe Airport. Every time she sees me, this is all she talks about and is looking forward to taking her next flight in Truckee. She is thinking about becoming a pilot and pursuing this the older she gets. To have this program cancelled or restricted by any means would shatter this young girls dreams of taking flight again in Truckee. We cannot do this to the youth that count on this program.

There are ways to work together regarding noise and safety concerns. The tower has been a big help with traffic management, traffic flows and patterns. I have already seen a marked difference in aircraft departures since the unfortunate Challenger accident last year. The aviation community wants to work together with the airport, but cancelling or restricting this Young Eagles program is not the answer. Please consider all the kids this program positively impacts and how it would be detrimental to these kids if something changed with this amazing gift the pilots and airport offers these kids.

A program just like this changed my life. If it hadn't been for someone believing in me as a kid and the programs offered by EAA, 99s, and Women in Aviation, I wouldn't be where I am today. Let's all work together for the best resolution possible and keep kids flying. Thank you for reading my concerns and support for this program,

Kristen Mansel

From: [Michael Golden](#)
To: [Comments: lauen.tapia@truckeetahoeairport.com](mailto:lauen.tapia@truckeetahoeairport.com)
Subject: TTAD Meeting 02/21/2022 - District Goals
Date: Monday, February 21, 2022 12:28:19 PM
Importance: High

Honorable Members of the Board of Directors-

I am taking the liberty to opine on a number of matters which you are considering today in discussions regarding your goals and objectives for the airport. Typically, my comments are reserved, refined and well organized. Unfortunately, these comments are a bit scattered as I am responding to your stated aspirations and objectives. Please pardon my lack of organization here as a result.

- 1) There is a discussion ongoing about adding solar panels to the hangar roofs and possibly demolishing some of the older hangar rows and replacing the same with plane ports. The District has made money, hand over fist, on the hangars. The ROI on the hangars is off the charts. They've been paid for again, and again, and again. The one thing that irks me is that the District refuses to adequately maintain the hangars, even with the enormous profits that have been made over the years. Years ago I was in a hangar in Echo row. I had to leave it, because the structural elements in the hangar were warping. To my knowledge, that hangar may still very well be vacant. The fact that you have hangars that are in a state of disrepair is nobody's fault but your own. Fix them. Tearing them down and replacing them with plane ports is an enormous waste of resources. If these hangars are structurally deficient, replace them, with hangars.
- 2) The control tower is a tremendous asset to the airport. While on the TTAD board, I lobbied along with Don Starbard, for a tower. At the time, the pilot community was against it. I am thrilled that we have a control tower. It is an added layer & element of safety which can only make our airport better. Planes fly in BECAUSE we have a tower. Reverting to a non-towered facility would not be in our best interest.
- 3) I noticed some references to "GHG", which I had to research as I wasn't familiar with the terminology. Once I figured it out, I couldn't help myself from being bewildered at this nonsense. If you're so concerned about Greenhouse Gas emissions, stop selling fuel, period. Otherwise, you shouldn't even be discussing this matter. It's an absolute joke. You can sell fuel, or not. There's no middle ground here. Petrochemicals and hydrocarbons have taken us from "Little House on the Prairie" to where we are today as a society. If you don't like it, you're in the wrong place. Truckee wouldn't exist as you know it today without hydrocarbons. Aircraft require hydrocarbons to operate. It's just that simple.
- 4) Director Hetherington made a very valid point – baggage handling is going to lead to a worker's comp claim. I fly into a lot of airports; nobody from an FBO is hauling my bags off the aircraft. While FBO operations do that, there is a FEE associated with baggage handling. What do you charge for baggage handling? I am guessing ZERO. It's the flight crew's responsibility to unload the aircraft, don't take on that liability without getting paid for it. Is District staff heading out to the west ramp and helping the fella in a C210 with his bags? Obviously not. So why are you providing services to some aircraft but not others, and not even charging for that service??? Baggage handling charges are typically \$200 per aircraft when FBO staff are involved in providing that service.
- 5) The concept of building another runway at TRK is beyond ridiculous. What is the purpose? Have you done a wind analysis to determine how often winds favor a proposed runway 16/34? Why are you proposing spending millions on this, when RWY 02/20 is so beat up that many of us will no longer depart RWY 2 because the District fails to maintain it. So you want to build another runway that you won't maintain? Take care of what the airport has before you go build more. The hangars as mentioned above are another excellent example of this.
- 6) A commendation to Director O'Dette for her comment on messaging – the airport is a tremendous economic generator to this community. Nobody every talks about that, they only gripe about aircraft flying overhead.
- 7) Director Hetherington appropriately pointed out that in the terminal building, there is a sign promoting General Aviation – I've always said "Friends don't let friends fly the airlines."

- 8) There were some comments regarding Young Eagles flights. As one of the pilots who has flown hundreds of area children, volunteering my time, and resources, my response to you is to think before you speak on this one. Don't offend me, or my fellow Young Eagles pilots, or you'll lose us as volunteers. Again, if you're so concerned about the "carbon footprint" of the airport's operations, stop selling fuel. Short of that, we're flying kids, end of discussion.
- 9) Director Hetherington has some excellent comments, I don't want to go into them all, but she makes some very good points. And some very bad points too. But take them all into consideration. Another topic she brings up that is worthy of discussion is the "Noise Abatement Procedures". I was personally involved in the development of this, which I regret. She is correct in her assertion, the value of these procedures is questionable, at best. The control tower does a better job at directing traffic than anything else.
- 10) On the matter of "NAP", I presume everyone is subjected to the same incentives, even Mountain Lion Air, who fly after 10PM, like last evening when I heard them flying overhead. Doesn't bother me, but I trust that they don't participate in the "Fly Quiet" incentives and that the airport isn't providing them with the same.
- 11) The District has no business subsidizing housing costs and providing funds to community resources off airport. This is beyond reprehensible. At a time when the District is looking to properly allocate costs, you're dumping money into social programs that have no direct benefit to the airport. I'd like to see how much funding the District spends on airport operations as opposed to off airport sources. Get your financial house in order, and stop being a social services program to those local programs looking for a handout. It's not up to the airport to solve affordable housing issues.
- 12) Finally, I will respectfully remind you that you're running an airport, not a social services program. It's apparent that you've lost your way on this. I'd encourage you to focus your resources on the airport, not everything else under the sun. As Director Diamond aptly pointed out, you're not going to solve things like aircraft noise, GHG emissions, affordable housing, etc. You're running an airport; keep that in mind and run the airport for the benefit of those who use it. As Director O'Dette correctly pointed out, the economic impact to this community as a result of the airport is "staggering". Capitalize on that.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments.

Respectfully,

Michael Golden
P.O. Box 11192
Truckee, California 96162
530-582-1717 Direct Dial
tahoelocal@litol.com

From: [Vincent Bruno](#)
To: [Comments](#)
Subject: Letter to Airport Board February 21, 2022
Date: Monday, February 21, 2022 1:55:51 PM

A copy of this letter will be sent to the National EAA Organization

I had very little time to review the board's proposed priority list for 2022. In doing so, I noticed that the EAA Young Eagles program is on the chopping block. Reasons for doing so, noise? Carbon footprint impact?

Your suggestion reflects the attitude that the present board may not be supportive of the Airport District's parents or their children.

Are you suggesting that the Young Eagles Pilots who donate their time should stop inspiring our children?

That practical education stops on weekends?

I would venture to guess that one jet coming to Truckee with two people and a pilot makes much more of an impact than five single engine aircrafts flying for 20 minutes on a Saturday at 8:00 am in compliance with the noise abatement once a month.

The EAA Young Eagles program is an integral part of this community. Five of our youth are being sponsored with full scholarships

To the EAA Air Academy. To qualify, each has had to have experienced a young Eagles flight.

Since the EAA's inception in 1994, 5,109 youth from Truckee have been flown. It is very difficult for me to believe that an Airport Board would not realize the impact this makes on children.

Why are our children are being caught in the middle of ideological beliefs?

This truly is a sign of a very unhealthy culture within this board when our children are being denied opportunities.

I ask you to reconsider you priorities in your 2022 proposal.

Vincent Bruno
EAA 1073
Young Eagles Coordinator

From: [Vince Bruno](#)
To: [Comments](#)
Cc: [Giansiracusa Barry](#)
Subject: Fwd: Young Eagles
Date: Monday, February 21, 2022 2:15:36 PM

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Barry Giansiracusa** <bgtahoe@sbcglobal.net>
Date: Monday, February 21, 2022
Subject: Fwd: Young Eagles
To: Vince Bruno <truckeeeaayoung eagles@gmail.com>

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Barry Giansiracusa <bgtahoe@sbcglobal.net>
Date: February 21, 2022 at 10:31:41 AM PST
To: Lauren.Tapia@truckeetahoeairport.com
Subject: **Young Eagles**

FYI,

The young eagles monthly event on the second Saturday is now only quarterly, not monthly. Both of my daughters are young eagles, and my oldest is a Civil Air Patrol cadet. Rank of Chief Master Sergeant. Recruited from the Young Eagles. She is a Volunteer for the Air Show. Is an assistant counselor for the Truckee space camp. Earned scholarships from the EAA to attend the Oshkosh Basic Air Academy. Without our YOUNG EAGLES she wouldn't not have had these opportunities. She has aspirations of becoming a Navel Aviator. They both continue to attend the young eagles EAA free flights. They miss the monthly flights, and not having anything is just not creating any aviation opportunities for kids. I only wish I had the opportunity as a kid. I haven't met 1 EAA member that is not about the kids....such a great group of people.

That's my take,

Barry Giansiracusa

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Cliff Grimm](#)
To: [Comments](#)
Date: Monday, February 21, 2022 6:18:59 PM

Please keep the kids fly for free. Thank you. Cliff grimm