

March 22, 2021

CPAD discussion regarding creating a fee for second and additional aircraft.
Item 7B.

I would like to submit my thought on the item regarding generating additional income
By assessing a fee for second and additional aircraft.

- First and foremost, let me say **I am in support** of the notion to charge a property owner additional fees for second and additional aircraft each year. I own three aircraft.
- The amount of predicted additional income for additional aircraft is modest relative to the future financial needs of this Airpark and Airport, estimated at something over \$6,000.00 per year.
- I believe we need much more income year over year for maintenance and operation.

The above being said, I offer some thoughts more general in nature.

It was disappointing to see Measure P fail. The owners who voted NO, I believe are very short sighted. Regardless of whether a property owner utilize the aviation specific facilities or not, the overall level of the quality of the Airpark and of Airport improvements has a large effect on all of the Property Values here.

Whether there is a personal objection to additional fees is Not material in the long run. The Value of each and every property here will be affected downward if we do not insist on a high level of upkeep.

It is old news that the taxiways need a slurry seal and the fuel facility needs updating. There are many other financial needs beyond just those two items. The current Board has done a very comprehensive study of the financial needs here.

I have heard often in discussions with customers and clients the opinions that the over all presentation of this place is substandard.

Understand, I am in a unique position to observe the over all opinions of New Possible Buyers of the properties here as I am a Real Estate Broker and have specialized in this Airpark for over 40 years. Many of the owners here are my past customer.

I receive feedback from many of my past customer and clients and more importantly, future pilots who investigate the purchase of homes and lots here. It is no mystery to me that we can not achieve high enough sale prices to justify the cost of building a home here now, or in the past.

I ask that my thoughts be read into the record and hope that they affect and motivate future votes in the affirmative when and if we pursue another Measure such at Measure P. Voting NO on a fee increase is counter productive to all of us, whether we fly or not, whether we are anti-tax people or not. Lastly, if we must fund future maintenance with a Bond as in the past, it will generate a huge interest expense which we can not use for maintenance and operation.

Respectfully submitted.

Dennis Nickson
DRE# 00777174