

Grand Haven Airport Board Meeting Minutes – August 25, 2026

Meeting called to order (Chairman) 530pm - Richard Clapp

Roll Call (Secretary):

Members Present: Richard Clapp, Dennis Swartout, Tricia Harrell

Absent: Dale Hagenbuch

Others Present: Earle Bares (Airport Manager), Tom Mandersheid (Airport Liaison)

Guests: Mayor Bob Monetza, Roland Ashby, Jared Bennes, James Hagen, Ben Ennenga,

Agenda approval: Clapp makes motion to add solar panel update to agenda. Swartout seconds. Motion carried.

First call to audience:

Jim Hagen: (400 Lake) Brings attention to plans for a 25mw power plant at newly purchased BLP property 14600 168 Ave, Grand Haven. This one will be twice the size of the one proposed at Harbor Island. Each of the 10 engines will put out 3500hp, and 1500acfm. Concerns about high temperature of output/ water vapor (approx 750 degrees F), condensation, impacts on aircraft and skydive operations. Requests a resolution from airport board, requesting that detailed studies are done to assess impacts. Points to BLP meeting packet presentation for more information.

Bob Rivard (16241 Grand Point Court) – speaks on the benefit of Say Weather and wind direction/speed accuracy as a IFR pilot. System seems reliable based on research from company website and concurrence with airport manager. Regular accuracy checks will ensure accuracy over time. Pilots will find benefit of having wind direction/speed despite some other concerns with lighting, etc.

Roland Ashby: (15003 Riverbluff PL) Final 2026 EAA Young Eagles rally will be this Sat, 115 kids signed up, 6-7 aircraft participating. Also speaks to the benefit of Say Weather and would like to have it operational this weekend and in the future.

Approval of May 26 Airport Board Meeting Minutes: Swartout motion, Harrell second, motion carries

New Business: none

Old Business: Say Weather Functionality (Richard Clapp)

Hangar doors plan on repair (Earle Bares)

Say Weather: Clapp discusses good accuracy of SayWeather station, which has been compared to RadioShack weather station and the skydive weather station (both unofficial). Clapp would like to see SayWeather published publicly, disclaimer can be included about it being “SayWeather”/unofficial weather to protect City from liability. Earle discusses the notes in the Airport Manager Report. Legal to send information over unicom because it is an approved unicom. No official policy from MDOT Aero on these kinds of weather stations. However, MDOT states that they will not put unofficial weather stations in the airport directory. **Clapp:** can we add it to federal documentation? Does the state have any say in this? Earle: yes, and that is partially due to our federal -> state funding. The question we have is the placement of the weather station- applies regardless if official FAA weather station or not. There are separate/multiple issues here, and the main one is we have equipment that reports wind direction and speed and we are not reporting it. **Harrell:** We had a bunch of issues come up all at once. It was insinuated, directly or otherwise, that an accident had

occurred that involved SayWeather, and it was coming into question. We turned it off to eliminate liability to the city for now. We looked into the issue with the lights, and determined that the pilot could figure out how to turn the lights on, accuracy seems to be fine, and the last issue is that you (Clapp) would like to see it published. We did not have enough information to make a decision on all of those issues but we have worked through them over the months. **Clapp:** Do you think we could publish it with the disclaimer? **Harrell:** What would you like to see published? **Clapp:** I'd like to see the SayWeather information on how to operate it be published in the AFD/supplement. **Earle:** Show me one example of where it has been published. **Clapp:** I don't have that information, but why not be the lead on it. **Swarthout:** What is the purpose? The liability question? **Clapp:** I think that's what we are dealing with. **Harrell:** If this is not published, what is the non-desired enstate for you? **Clapp:** Why would we spend the money on that? The greater good has been evidenced by the pilots who use this airport. There is a greater good in having it published, put the disclaimer in. Let people make the decision per the FARs and the responsibility on the pilot to land or use it in their pre-flight planning. **Harrell:** there is a difference between ASOS/AWOS and SayWeather, and that's why it's not published. Refers also to FAA JO6560.20C for siting. **Clapp:** we want to make the functionality of it known. **Earle:** Other airports put it on the bulletin board. No one can show me one example of SayWeather is officially published in a FAA document. Discussion on Ottawa Executive Airport (privately owned/public use) Z98 has it on the A/FD page in ForeFlight but not on the official FAA chart. Clapp pushes to get SayWeather on official publications. **Earle:** main question is do we want it on to provide wind speed/direction. **Clapp:** any other discussion, I'd like to make a motion. **Harrell:** Which one, do you want to turn it back on, or do you want to have it published? Can we do two motions so we can turn it back on? **Clapp:** makes a motion to turn it back on. Harrell seconds. Swarthout will vote yes. Motion carries. **Clapp:** second motion: should we publish the SayWeather information so that pilots have access to it in the federal facilities directory, also known as the chart supplement? Do I have support for that motion? **Harrell:** can we get more information from MDOT? **Clapp:** we can continue discussing, what more information can we get from this **Earle?** Earle: they will not authorize it. **Manderschied:** Who have you been speaking to? **Earle:** multiple people, but Mike. **Mandersheid:** he isn't the administration that makes the decision, he is the guy who works on it. I'd say what you do is try to publish it and if they say no, you have your answer. **Clapp:** agree. **Swarthout:** ask the questions on what they would do, be more proactive. **Clapp:** I'd like to change to change the motion to go to MDOT and ask them what they would do if we attempted to publish this. **Harrell:** can I read you what Zeeland has? It's not on the official federal charts, but this is in the A/FD page (on Foreflight): 4 clicks on CTAF for wind, temp and altimeter information (I know we don't have altimeter). What would you like to see wording wise if we published it? **Clapp:** wind and temperature at the very least. **Harrell:** as far as the disclaimer what would you like to see? Kevin Jarchow (201 S Beacon Blvd) offers that Wisconsin's 63C airport has weather information on their foreflight page weather tab, and lists that the information is provided by SayWeather. **Clapp:** Motion should be changed to asking MDOT to provide information as to how they would approve or deny 3GM trying to publish Say Weather information in the AFD. **Earle:** We'll check on further details. Meaning not just MDOT but the FAA. As airport manager I am going to have to say "no I don't think so because I don't have all the information to make that decision." **Clapp:** It is incumbent on the pilot to have all of the information required to determine if they should land safely at the airport. **Earle:** any weather system has to meet the FAA requirements for siting the system. **Clapp:** are you saying we need a certification from MDOT to set up the system? **Manderschied:** If SayWeather is out selling this equipment, it has to be somewhat FAA approved, doesn't it? **Earle:** No. **Harrell:** 63C has "SayWeather" in foreflight but not instructions on how to use it. Proposes adding the SayWeather information to ForeFlight for 3GM. **Clapp:** revises motion to publish SayWeather in Foreflight and add a remark in ForeFlight for instructions on how to use it. Harrell seconds. Motion carries unanimously. **Swarthout** notes that we have learned a lesson on due diligence when purchasing SayWeather. **Earle:** requests a written request for verbiage on what should be added to comments, via chairman.

Hangar Maintenance: **Earle:** We need to look at all aspects of hangar maintenance - floors doors etc. Went through hangars and listed items that definitely require attention in addition to rollers and guides and tracks. In the process, we have identified \$366k worth of maint. required.

Mandershied- what is priority? **Earle**: rollers. **Mandershied**- have you listed in order of most - least important? **Earle**: Appendix A has the estimated costs in order of priority.

Problem- we have a door/hangar. We know we should replace all of the rollers for sure, and we have track problems below, so we need to replace half of the guides. What we don't know is the straightness of the hangars. Those items can be contributing part of the problem to the hangar door issues. Ground heave, track crooked, hangar roof sagging, etc. So we don't know those things and we would have to get a contractor in to look at what the problems may be.

Mandershied- can you pick a hangar row to start with? You can't tackle it all at one time. **Clapp**: We should work on the hangars that are in decent shape, C row is going to be torn down.

Earle- A row is our oldest hangar and has 9 aircraft. **Mandershied**- is it worth putting money into those hangars? **Earle**: Yes Clapp verifies that B row cannot currently be used for aircraft, and suggests prioritizing newer hangar maintenance and put it up for bid. Earle gives example that hangar D5 has 8 rollers in it and we have 5 in stock. But the rollers may or may not be useable for that hangar because they were designed for hangars in G/H row, slightly different dimensions. Earle says the biggest priority is replace ALL the rollers. Harrell: where is the point of diminishing returns for replacing all rollers/doors compared to lifetime of hangar. Compared to building new hangars. How long can we keep A and B row going? Is it worth putting money into those? **Earle**: yes it is worth it. Clapp mentions airport fund. **Mandershied**: reminds about tree removal costs. **Swarthout**: we are going to have to put this in a schedule for years down the line in sequential order of needs but still leave money for emergency and regular maintenance. **Clapp**: 25% of the hangars are used for storage instead of aircraft. **Mandershied**: recommends starting with Row D. Emergency fund for A. **Earle**: D row is the oldest "good" hangar besides A row, but A is pretty active with airplanes. **Harrell**: (gives examples) should we prioritize critical components and major problems over specific rows? Keep the hangar in useable condition for the tenant and no leaky roof. **Earle**: contractors are coming in to gather information **Mandershied**: recommends using Prein and Newhof. **Swarthout**: up to Earle to take the information and break it into segments and make a recommendation based on knowledge and experience. Then get pricing and make a staged approach over 3 years, with extra money for emergency. Earle agrees to do that report for the Sep meeting. **Harrell**: recommends we focus on functionality of the hangar first.

Solar Update: **Harrell**: I received a BLP pamphlet with my electric bill soliciting community solar participation. The FAA obstacle evaluation site listed the proposal as terminated. Unfortunately it sounds like we put a lot of trust in BLP to do their due diligence as they promised they would at the City council meeting to submit the appropriate studies and requirements with that request and it sounds like they didn't do any of that. They just submitted their proposed building site. They also didn't seem to articulate very well that it was on airport grounds. The FAA terminated the study due to what looks to be lack of information because they didn't do those things. It appears to be due to lack of providing the information required. They went ahead and proposed and requested it without providing a lot, I won't say all. But a lot of the studies that we expected them to do and submit were not done. **Clapp**: is there anything that we should be doing as an advisory to the city council? **Harrell**: Many city council members came here to hear from us directly, which I respect. We were at different points in the process for some of those meetings and discussions. What it came down to was, what are the grant assurance requirements in order to even make this proposal with the Federal Government. We noted that in the past, our City has been reprimanded for improper use and improper sale of airport land and we don't want to continue that trend. I had many desires for the agreement that the city voted to approve. I thought that agreement was severely lacking, not the least of which was that it was proposed as an easement instead of a land lease. It can't be an easement. I would like for the city attorney, or whoever is proposing these things to understand what the requirements are. That agreement was severely lacking and I'm disappointed that the city council voted to approve it without knowing how truly lacking it was, partially due to the fact that the airport manager and chairman were not allowed more than a 3 minute say at that meeting. The presentation by the BLP could have gone on for 45 minutes with no forum besides just being a member of the audience to contribute to that conversation. I would like for the BLP reach out to the airport manager to keep him apprised of submissions to FAA/MDOT Aero and to honor what they said they would do. **Swarthout**: I think you're making some assumptions. **Harrell**: I talked to the FAA personally. **Swarthout**: they sent it back to them, the ball is in BLP's court. They can either do what they FAA says they didn't do and resubmit if they want to pursue the project. **Harrell**: my problem is that we trusted BLP to do

what they said they were going to do and they didn't do it. **Swarthout:** you're making a gross assumption. If its true, than I guess BLP will back away. **Harrell:** I see the pamphlet in my bill soliciting participation the same month that it was terminated. **Swarthout:** Factually that may be correct, beyond that it doesn't say a lot to me. **Harrell:** to me it doesn't sit well. I don't have an update, I'd like to know if you (Earle) have been contacted since the presentation to city council. **Earle:** No. **Clapp:** do you believe that we should ask the BLP to keep us advised of the progress. **Harrell:** I don't suppose they have an obligation to but I'd like it. **Clapp:** think it would be good to have from BLP, perhaps we could ask Rob Shelly to come back. **Harrell:** he has no obligation to, we could request an update, I'd be fine with an email. **Clapp:** City council needs to know where this stands at the BLP. **Harrell:** these were our concerns when we discussed this project and part of why we recommended no - it didn't meet the requirements for land usage according to the definition, and in order to continue the proposal to the FAA and MDOT, there was a list of like 13 requirements and it doesn't sound like those things were done after we were assured that they would be done- the City Council was assured that those things would be done, and they weren't.

Airport Manager Report: (Earle) Applications that were sent in for state local grant program- SOM Aeronautics granted us over \$91k for airport maintenance such as REILS, painting. N/S runway rehab project has been completed. July was 2nd highest month of fuel sales and the city's 25/26 FY ended with record gallons of fuel sales. Discussed this year's completed projects. Three year pavement inspection completed, should see results in approx 1 year. Overall ratings were encouraging. In addition to possible solar panel project, there are other obstructions/projects being proposed. Discussed Harbor Transit Building (crane lifts), house, pole to the east, and power plant. Harrell questions one additional tower from the FAA obstacle assessment website, pending for 199ft tall. Any proposed structures on or by an airport that exceeds the ratio of 100:1 needs to be reported to the FAA. Township and City needs to be aware of those situations, **Harrell:** hows the relationship with them? Who typically contacts you with proposals like this? Do the township/city typically seek information from you? **Earle:** I went over to the house because I saw something was being built. **Harrell:** how can we increase the communication between those who are approving these projects & permits and you, making sure they know they have to send it up. Its lucky that you saw it, but if you hadn't how would you have found out about it? Why are people not submitting those? Where is the communication breakdown, is there education that needs to occur within the City staff? Sounds like there were a few instances of that this year. Do you have any suggestions about how that could be avoided? **Earle:** Grand Haven Township has been doing a pretty good job. They called me about the house that is being built and did not issue the permit until they got the FAA document in hand and called to confirm. Harbor Transit did the same thing. Possible power peaking plant located on the property adjacent to the airport- we have heard nothing on that. **Mandersheid:** might be in the early stages, it was just released to the public the other night.

July 11th Young Eagles 91 kids in 7 aircraft, in addition to the 110 at Dawn Patrol (which brought an estimated 300 people to the airport). Skydive GH reports this is one of their best years, and is indicated by the fuel sales for Jet A. MOSAIC, special airworthiness certification. May increase demand for GA and possibly new hangar demand. In 10 years, airport activity was up. **Harrell:** was there more interest in building hangars? **Earle:** Yes. Biggest concern was being the first to build and the cost of utilities , etc. Mayor signed the provisional license.

Airport Liaison Report: **Mandersheid:** Cash in hand \$427,804.23, \$200 petty cash, acc receivable: 4684. Good balance but east approach is hanging over our head. State grant that we got for 91k, its approved locally but we are still waiting for an email on it, and then Earle starts the process. Hangar design is somewhat started, not like as far as they thought they would be. Things are busy with the people doing our tasks.

Second call to the audience:

Kevin Jarchow (201 Beacon Blvd.) MCC code defaulting to "other", therefore no points to credit card company. Can be fixed by talking to the Terminal Payment processor to change default code category code 5599 aircraft services, or 5541/5542. Second: distrusting issue- billing - got bill from city of grand haven but when bill was received, we were instructed to pay within 7 days. Not in keeping with normal payment principles. Normally 30 days from receiving to pay without penalty. (June Bill). (Mandersheid notes that FY affects this month's bill only)

Ben Enninga: (14315 Briarfield lane) Community Solar Project, and the agreement between City and BLP, does that have a dead date? If they don't do it by a certain time, is it dead? **Mayor**: no. **Enninga**: so this could be hanging over our heads 2027, 2028? **Mayor**: the realistic answer is that the BLP is not going to pursue it. We gave them the opportunity to go after the approval and if they can't get it, they have a time where if they run out of time they will no longer be interested in pursuing it. Estimated by the end of the year, they would like to know if there is going to be a project. Without permission from the FAA, the project won't proceed. **Enninga**: so they could pursue it into 2027. **Mayor**: they could pursue it til the year 3000, but I don't think they will. They are not interested in doing that, they are a realistic business operation as well.

Meeting Adjourned (Chairman) Clapp motions to adjourn 706pm, Swartout seconds. Motion carries.