

Ms. McDonald;

Thank you for your email. I appreciate your time in responding, as well as Mr. Roach's spent in calling me last week to review this.

I have reviewed the PCTV video of yesterday's 'Rules and Operations' meeting; in anticipation of the agenda item being removed from the January 13th council meeting, I thank you for the partial 'stay of execution' so you all can further study 2014-108.

Approximately 8:40 into the video, a speaker only identified as 'Hugh' was looking to compare the current codified rules and regulations with the rules and regulations developed by the Department of Public Works & Utilities, AKA Ms Deb Wallace. He referred to current codified rules as being lacking, and the new rules more voluminous.

However, I am now left with a few more questions on the subject:

- If the new rules have already been written, where are they available for public review and comment?
- According to the Exhibit A to ordinance 2014-108, section 5.40.090 a committee was to review the Airport Rules and Regulations (AR&R). What committee? As a member of the TFAC, I know we were not involved in the AR&R process. If it was or is to be another committee, is this committee answerable to the citizens of the county?
- Is the public allowed to be present / submit comments at the January 27th Economic and Infrastructure Development meeting?

I am looking forward to the Council's visit to Thun Field to review the current gate situation; however, you must realize that the long delay from my first invitation to the county council (October, I believe) should warrant relief from the harsh treatment the current situation is imposing, and believe that is the real 'stay of execution' that is immediately appropriate would be returning the gate closure timing to the previous 12-hour security that was in place until a fair and mutually thought-out and implemented plan can be placed.

This is excerpted from the TSA's security guidelines: "Recommended Security Guidelines for General Aviation Airports and Users - IP A-002 March 2013 8

Recognizing that every GA landing facility is unique, there are recommendations and guidelines contained in this document that might be considered highly beneficial in one airport environment while being virtually impossible to implement at another. When stating in this document that a measure "should" be used it means the measure is recommended to the extent it is consistent with the airport's circumstances. "

Impossible to implement: The way the gates and fencing were constructed in the past does not make for an equitable implementation of current security.

Consistent with the airport's circumstance: There is also no 'inside the fence' road to travel around the airport without driving on the ramps specified for aircraft use. This is also a violation of equality.

After study, I feel it will be concluded that a fair and mutually thought-out and implemented plan cannot be put in place without extensive overhaul of the perimeter of the airports of Pierce County. As such, I submit that as a voter, taxpayer, and business owner in this county, the 24-hour security that was foisted upon us be rolled back to the previous 12-hour security while the discussion continues. That, my friends, would be fair.

I would prefer to think that my business's life won't depend on it, but I am unwilling to just sit back until the decision is made that this is bad policy; it needs to be nipped without delay.

Respectfully,

Michael Thompson.