

~ FINAL ~

**CARSON CITY AIRPORT AUTHORITY  
MEETING MINUTES**

**WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 2007 – 6:00 P.M.**

***Public Meeting at:***  
**EL AERO SERVICES**  
**CONFERENCE ROOM**  
**2101 ARROWHEAD DRIVE**  
**CARSON CITY, NEVADA**

~ PLEASE NOTE SPECIAL MEETING LOCATION ~

---

- A. CALL TO ORDER, ROLL CALL, AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM. The regular meeting of the Carson City Airport Authority was called to order at 6:00 p.m. Roll call was taken, and quorum was determined:
- Present: Harvey Hornung, Gary Handelin, Collie Hutter, Steve Lewis, Walt Sullivan and Richard Staub
- Absent: Mr. Weaver
- Staff: Mr. Tackes (*excused*); Mr. Clague and Mrs. Weaver (*present*)
- B. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
- C. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF PAST MEETINGS OF THE AIRPORT AUTHORITY. The minutes of the 17 January 2007 regular meeting of the Carson City Airport Authority were reviewed. Mr. Handelin moved to approve the minutes as submitted. Mrs. Hutter seconded the motion. Mr. Lewis then offered corrections to pages 11, 14, 22 and 24. Mr. Handelin so amended his motion to approve, and Mrs. Hutter seconded the amended motion. There were no other comments or corrections, and the motion carried.
- D. MODIFICATION OF THE AGENDA. *The Chairman reserves the right to modify the agenda in order to most effectively process the agenda items.* There were no modifications to the agenda at this time.
- E. PUBLIC COMMENT. Members of the public who wish to address the Airport Authority may speak on *non-agendized matters* related to the Airport. Comments are limited to

three (3) minutes per person or topic. If your item requires extended discussion, please request the Chairman to calendar the matter for a future Airport Authority meeting.

Mr. Frank Hublou addressed the Board to request that the Board petition or recommend to the Board of Supervisors a vintage aircraft property tax category that would be lower than normal. If it has not already been changed, Mr. Hublou explained that a 100-year old aircraft is taxed at the same rate as a brand new one – and even the DMV has a lower tax category for old cars, but not old aircraft. Tax on aircraft is strictly a City/county function. Mr. Hublou stated that he has to pay \$1,400 a year for his ancient aircraft, and the price is shocking.

Mr. Sullivan asked whether other cities or counties in the state have looked at this issue. Mr. Hublou stated that he did not know; his source of information is Ms. Kitty Kulikowski in the City's tax department, and she might know. Mr. Hublou stated that Ms. Kulikowski informally hinted that such a decrement in pricing does exist, but that a petition would have to be made to the Board of Supervisors.

Mrs. Hutter stated that she would look into it.

There were no other public comments at this time.

## F. PUBLIC HEARINGS

- (1) ACTION TO CONSIDER THE STATUS OF THE MASTER PLAN (MP) AND AIRPORT LAYOUT PLAN (ALP); REPORT BY MASTER PLAN SUBCOMMITTEE (*C. Hutter*). Mrs. Hutter was absent during the previous Master Plan Subcommittee Meeting, so Mr. Handelin reported on this item.

Mr. Handelin reported that the Master Plan Subcommittee did meet on 13 February 2007, and during that meeting Mr. Clague had reported that the Airport Layout Plan had been submitted to the FAA. We are still awaiting FAA formal approval, but the FAA had indicated that they would approve it.

The primary discussion during this Master Plan Subcommittee meeting revolved around the RFP responses regarding gates. Mr. Handelin stated he wished to defer that discussion to Item (2) below.

Also during the meeting it was discussed that it would be beneficial to have a Subcommittee attend the NAMA convention in March, and so that discussion was added as agenda Item (4), below.

There were no additional comments or public comments on this item. The item did not require a motion.

- (2) DISCUSSION AND ACTION REGARDING FUNDING OPTIONS TO HELP MAINTAIN AND IMPROVE AIRPORT SECURITY, INCLUDING GATE MAINTENANCE, REPLACEMENT, UPGRADES AND SECURITY FENCING; REVIEW OF PROPOSED ANNUAL GATE CARD FEE STRUCTURE AND SUGGESTED ALTERNATIVES; REVIEW OF DRAFT BUSINESS IMPACT STATEMENT; REVIEW OF RESPONSES TO RFP FOR AIRPORT GATES (*G. Handelin*). Mr. Handelin briefly reviewed the history behind this item. He reported that he e-mailed the RFP synopsis to 13 gate installers and manufacturers on 2 January 2007. Mr. Handelin stated that he did e-mail a synopsis of the bids to Board and Staff, but not until after lunchtime on this date.

For the 13 RFPs sent out, only two responses were received. One was a complete response (from Tholl Fence), and one was a partial response (from High Desert Fence). The prices for the gates came back at twice the estimated cost, or around \$25,000 per gate if the card reader is not changed.

Tholl Fence quoted replacing the gates as one line item, and replacing the card reader as another. Mr. Handelin reported that Tholl stated that we could get reliable gates if we change over to a cantilever-style gate. Meanwhile the card readers should hold out for a while. Also, Tholl pointed out the NRS statute 405.270 regarding gates, stating that automatic gates must comply with UL-325. In essence, if anything blocks or enters the line of the gate, the gate stops immediately, and re-opens. This statute was created as a direct result of an incident that occurred at the Carson City Airport, and now every airport in the state of Nevada must comply with the statute. One of the Airport gates is currently out of compliance, and must be brought up to compliance levels ASAP.

Mr. Handelin suggested that, rather than doing the gates one at a time, we should just bite the bullet and do them all at once and get it over with. On the south side of the Airport, Gate 1 needs to be replaced, but Mr. Handelin was not sure of the status of Gate 2 and whether it needed to be replaced. It should be related to the amount of traffic going through each gate. Mr. Handelin asked Mr. Staub if the City could install traffic counters at the gates to count how much traffic was going through each gate. Mr. Staub stated that he would get the counters.

Once Mr. Handelin added up all the numbers, he arrived at a total of \$25,271 to do all five man gates and three of the cantilever gates. \$32,758 would do all four gates, plus the five man gates, and that would include \$771 for Gate 4.

If the cost was broken down into a one-time gate card fee, that fee worked out to be somewhere between \$50 to \$75 per gate card to cover these costs. Mr. Handelin stated that there appeared to be more interest by the Airport users in paying a one-time fee rather than paying an annual fee for gate cards.

Now that we know firm costs for replacing the gates, Mr. Handelin suggested issuing a notice to the Airport community, asking for funding assistance to see if any moneys can be raised.

Mr. Lewis asked for Board comment.

Mr. Staub stated he would wait until the end.

Mr. Sullivan stated that he thought Mr. Handelin did an outstanding job on the RFP. He thought it was very well done, very comprehensive, and there were an excellent number of vendors and contractors to which it was distributed. Mr. Sullivan asked about Tholl's maintenance policy and warranty period. Mr. Handelin stated they would warranty their parts for up to five years, and labor for one year, so effectively the warranty is for one year.

Mrs. Hutter agreed with Mr. Sullivan, that it was a nice package. She asked about the gate card fee. Mr. Handelin stated that it wasn't discussed at the last Master Plan Subcommittee meeting, but that the general consensus of the discussions prior to that time were that most of the Airport users preferred a one-time gate card fee versus an annual, recurring fee.

Mrs. Weaver reported that she had attended a meeting of the Carson Air Group, where they polled their membership. They, too, prefer a one-time gate card fee versus the annual fee, and Dori Goss and Wendell Pea reported this information to the Master Plan Subcommittee.

Mr. Lewis asked if there were any public comments regarding the gate issues.

Mr. Clague asked for clarification on whether the \$25,000 was just for the automatic gates, or whether that price included the man gates. Mr. Handelin stated that it included the man gates, and that the man gates were bid within the estimated budget.

Mr. Bill Hartman addressed the Board. He asked if the Board had any feeling for the response from the community when they would be asked for donations. Mr. Handelin stated that he had no idea.

Mr. Will Fletcher of Carson Executive Hangars asked if the City could help with any funding for the gates. Mr. Staub stated that it could be proposed to the City, but that the City has its own financial problems.

Mr. Fletcher stated that the people in his association wanted to be sure that any donations or the one-time fee didn't just fall into the general fund. Mr. Fletcher also stated concerns over the Master Plan, and that he heard that the FAA funds have been put on hold for five or six more years and by then our Master Plan will have expired – and nothing will get done on the Airport.

Mrs. Hutter stated that the first year of the Master Plan was just completed and was funded by the FAA. Mr. Clague reviewed the five-year schedule, then stated that he reviews the schedule with the FAA on a regular basis and has not heard anything at all like this from the FAA. The schedule goes through 2012.

Mr. Sullivan asked Mr. Fletcher if he would like a copy of the Master Plan schedule. Mr. Fletcher stated he could get a copy from the Airport Manager's office. Mr. Sullivan stated that he was concerned that this type of erroneous information was circulating in the Airport community. Mr. Fletcher stated that the information was coming from people at the Stead Airport, who had told Mr. Fletcher that all funding was mostly on hold for the area because the FAA was in a funding crisis for the next several years.

Mr. Sullivan explained that, through the Carson City Airport's congressional contacts and relationships, a lot of funding has already been set aside for the Airport's Master Plan projects, and he imagined that some of the other municipal Airport's could possibly be jealous of this. Mr. Fletcher was concerned that the runway alignment was not already completed, since he thought it was going to be done five years ago.

Mr. Hublou asked why the Airport would want a locking man gate when someone could walk underneath a cantilever gate. Mr. Hublou misunderstood the type of gate that had been discussed, so Mr. Handelin described a cantilever gate and how it worked.

Mr. Sullivan asked if there were any fence areas on the Airport that needed to be addressed at this time. Mr. Handelin explained that there were a lot of barbed wire areas that had been there for years. If someone really wanted to get onto the Airport, they could because of the fencing in some areas, but Mr. Handelin stated that he preferred to address the fencing as a separate item.

Mrs. Weaver asked for clarification on the card fee, and whether the \$50 to \$75 fee would be per card, or per card holder. Mr. Handelin stated it would be per card, but that he has not worked out the details since he does not know how many cards are currently in use.

Mrs. Weaver is aware that some people have given their cards away while others have thrown away their cards. She suggested determining the current number of cards when the announcement is made that if the Airport users wish to continue using their cards, they need to come to the Airport Manager's office to have their card number verified. At that time a current card count can be made, and the appropriate fee can then be determined.

Mrs. Hutter suggested that a separate bank account be established so that when the fees are collected the money is deposited to that separate account. That way there will not be a question of where did the money go and is it being used for the gates.

Mr. Lewis called for a motion on this item.

Mr. Handelin moved to proceed ahead with Tholl Fence to upgrade Gate 4 to bring it into compliance with UL 325 and NRS 405 in the sum of \$771; to issue a Notice Request for Participation in upgrading the gates, and make the dollar amounts available to see what comes in; and then next month to agendize gate card fees to address any deficiency from the fees received during this time.

Mr. Sullivan seconded the motion.

Mrs. Weaver asked for the total amount to do all of the gates. Mr. Handelin stated that the total amount is \$32,758 to do all of the gates. In federal dollars, this equates to \$655,000 in matching funds.

Mr. Staub asked if the Board wanted to extend the contribution period beyond 30 days, suggesting that sometimes 30 days is not enough time to receive financial commitments, especially during the tax season.

Mrs. Weaver added that more time might also be needed to verify the gate cards.

Mr. Sullivan stated that this would just be the notification period.

Mr. Staub stated that he didn't want to discuss this at the next meeting – he wanted to give it more time. He does not want to defer another item at the next regular meeting; he just prefers to have the item put on the meeting agenda for the meeting after the next one. Give the notice 60 days.

Mr. Handelin so amended his motion to give the notice more time, from 30 days to 60 days, and to put the item on the April agenda. Mr. Sullivan, who seconded the motion, concurred with this amendment.

Mr. Hornung asked for clarification, since there were two action items in the motion. One item was for authorization of an immediate expenditure of \$771 to fix Gate 4, and the second part was the notice period and the item on the April agenda. The Board concurred with this consensus.

Mr. Lewis called for the vote. The motion carried unanimously.

- (3) DISCUSSION AND ACTION REGARDING VEHICLE ACCESS AND USAGE OF TAXIWAY CHARLIE; AIRPORT SIGNAGE REQUIREMENTS FOR VEHICULAR TRAFFIC; SPEED LIMITS WITHIN AIRPORT BOUNDARIES; PENALTIES FOR VEHICULAR VIOLATIONS ON AIRPORT PROPERTY; RELATED VEHICLE RESTRICTIONS; RELATED FAA REGULATIONS (*R. Staub*). Mr. Staub reported that Mrs. Weaver has distributed to the Board and Staff e-mails received from the FAA, expressing their concern about reported vehicular traffic on Taxiway Charlie. The speed limit was discussed during the previous regular meeting, where a 20 mph speed limit was established throughout Airport property, with two exceptions: one being at the ring road from the turn to the porta-hangars, and the other at Taxiway Charlie, where it would be established at a 35 mph limit.

Mr. Handelin stated that he had seen an e-mail from Mr. Tackes, who was doing an excellent job of diffusing this thing with the FAA. Mr. Handelin stated that he thought it was improperly handled in the beginning, and highlighted a problem that did not need to be raised with the FAA. Mr. Handelin stated that at the last regular meeting we didn't talk about driving on Taxiway Bravo or Taxiway Alpha. Mr. Handelin discussed that the only way to reach the hangars on the east end of the Airport was to drive down either Taxiway Alpha or go down a blind corner that is only wide enough for one vehicle, and either choice was a safety issue. When you enter the Airport from Gate 4, the only way to get to the center triangle area is by driving on Taxiway Bravo and Taxiway Charlie. Mr. Handelin stated that the issue was brought up incorrectly to the FAA, and has created a huge mess. He stated that the only recourse is to put up the traffic markers and counters to determine aircraft traffic on Taxiway Charlie. Mr. Handelin stated that in his recollection he has never seen an aircraft on Taxiway Charlie. He knows that aircraft use it because he has heard the complaints about dirt on the taxiway, but he personally has not seen an aircraft on Taxiway Charlie. Mr. Handelin stated it was not an issue of whether or not we drive on taxiways. He stated that he had spent the day reviewing FAA

documents and had pulled up FAA circular 150/5210-20. The circular is intended for a towered airport, and we don't have a control tower. Mr. Handelin stated that in order to appease the FAA he believed we were going to have to come up with policies and procedures concerning vehicle access to the Airport. It will have to be written and documented, and everyone who has a gate card will have to read the document and sign it, certifying that they have thus been trained in driving on the Airport. Mr. Handelin stated that one thing that may come up is that if we do continue with vehicular usage of the taxiways, it may become a requirement that drivers of those vehicles must have a radio in their car and they must monitor calls. Mr. Handelin thought that was absurd, but said that we might get stuck with that rule. Mr. Handelin suggested backing off on vehicular traffic on Taxiway Charlie until the speed limit signs are in place so that we do not get in trouble with the FAA. The sense of urgency in getting signage on the Airport is now higher than it was a month ago.

Mrs. Hutter asked Mr. Clague if there was provision in the Master Plan for separate or parallel roads, or if the Master Plan was written to assume vehicular traffic on the taxiways. Mr. Clague stated that he believed that the thought process was to come off of Gate 4, and access the ring road around the center triangle. One would still have to cross Taxiway Charlie to get to it.

Mr. Staub read from the circular, under Paragraph 3a, that "...airport operators should establish procedures and policies concerning vehicle access and vehicle operations on the airside of the airport. These procedures and policies should address such matters as access, vehicle operator requirements, vehicle requirements, operations and enforcement, and should be incorporated into tenant leases and agreements." Mr. Staub asked if, by us doing nothing, whether that jeopardizes what we've been working so hard to do (implementing our Master Plan), and, if it does, then we need to commission another subcommittee to work on this, or instruct Mr. Clague and Mr. Tackes to investigate how other airports our size handle this type of issue to avoid reinventing the wheel.

Mr. Sullivan had no comment at this time.

Mr. Lewis stated that he has been talking with Mr. Tackes, who has been working with people in the Burlingame FAA office, who have sent this matter to a safety compliance office in Los Angeles. Mr. Tackes has been working with Mr. Chris Diggins in the Los Angeles office, and is clearly trying to put the correct spin on the situation. Mr. Tackes did have e-mail conversations with Mr. Diggins, and on Tuesday, 20 February, received an e-mail from Mr. Diggins to Mr. Tackes that said that "I have not forgotten you and I will be putting together information to respond to your e-mail."

What Mr. Tackes is asking for from Mr. Diggins is for Mr. Diggins to show us the specific rules, regulations and/or advisory circulars specific to non-towered airports and how traffic on the business side of the airport should be handled. Mr. Lewis reported that this line of conversation began last Thursday, and so far Mr. Diggins has not been able to produce any documents, but he might be busy. Meanwhile, the advisory circular that Mr. Handelin has found is the only one that Mr. Lewis has found that is specific to vehicular operations on an airport, although it is written for towered airports.

Mr. Lewis stated that he knew we had discussed the item last month, and that it had been agreed that vehicular traffic would be allowed on the taxiways once proper signage was

in place. Mr. Lewis stated that we needed to be proactive and put signage on the Airport right away. He was unsure of what enforcement would be or how it would be handled; it would probably be self-enforcement. Mr. Lewis stated that the laws in Carson City should also apply to the Airport, and the Sheriff could be brought in to help if need be.

Mr. Lewis asked for public comment.

Mr. Fletcher asked if the unposted speed limit in the City was 25 mph if not otherwise posted. Since that is a City rule, and the Airport is part of the City, Mr. Fletcher asked why we should spend money on signage. Mr. Staub responded that the Airport was probably going to get a pretty good deal on the signs.

Mr. Fletcher stated that back when he was on the Board and worked on the Master Plan, the original intent was that Taxiway Charlie was a decomposing taxiway and eventually would be turned into a road, or simply an ingress/egress to the hangars.

Mr. Handelin asked Mr. Clague if, since the Airport received FAA funds to build Taxiway Charlie, whether the FAA would all that taxiway to be turned into a road instead of a taxiway. Mr. Clague said that they would not allow that.

Mr. Clague read an excerpt from the FAA design manual in reference to object free areas (OFAs): “The taxiway and taxi lane OFA clearing standards prohibit service vehicle roads, parked airplanes and above-ground objects that need to be located in the OFA for air navigation and aircraft ground maneuvering purposes. Vehicles may operate within the OFA provided they give right-of-way to oncoming aircraft.”

Mr. Clague stated that to him this would indicate that one could drive on a taxiway, as long as they gave right-of-way to the aircraft. Mr. Clague stated that he did show this document to Mr. Tackes, and believed he cited it when he discussed the issue with the FAA. Mr. Clague read another excerpt that defined giving the right-of-way to aircraft, which is to “...give right-of-way to oncoming aircraft by either maintaining a safe distance ahead of or behind the aircraft, or by exiting the OFA to let the aircraft pass.” Mr. Clague believes this is why Taxiway Charlie was built so wide, to allow vehicular traffic to get out of the way.

Mrs. Hutter stated that the long-term plan was for the perimeter road to be built, which would eliminate the problem on Taxiway Charlie, but not on Taxiway Bravo or Taxiway Alpha. Mrs. Hutter stated that in the short term we should keep vehicular traffic off Taxiway Charlie until Mr. Tackes has possibly reached some resolution with the FAA. Mrs. Hutter suggested having a written policy to show the FAA that we have considered and addressed the issue.

In an effort to *not* create yet another subcommittee, Mr. Hornung suggested working this policy into Title 19. There it could tie into leases, etc., and it seems like a proper place for it to reside.

Mr. Staub moved to defer action on Item (3), Discussion and action regarding vehicle access and usage of Taxiway Charlie; Airport signage requirements for vehicular traffic and speed limits within Airport boundaries other than what was established in our previous meeting, which was 20 mph on most taxiways with the exception of the ring



road, which would be 35 mph, and that it be so posted, and that this Authority revisit the issue after we have obtained some type of resolution with the FAA regarding just exactly what this Authority must do regarding vehicular traffic on taxiways and on the Airport side of its properties.

Mr. Handelin stated that he would second the motion if Mr. Staub would add to the motion that the Title 19 Subcommittee would pursue policies and procedures for vehicular traffic on the Airport.

Mr. Staub concurred with this addition, and Mr. Handelin seconded the motion.

There were no further comments. The vote was called and the motion carried unanimously.

- (4) DISCUSSION AND ACTION REGARDING FORMING A SUBCOMMITTEE FOR AIRPORT AUTHORITY ATTENDANCE AT THE NEVADA AIRPORT MANAGER'S ASSOCIATION (NAMA) SPRING CONFERENCE (MARCH 25-28, 2007 IN GARDNERVILLE) TO DISCUSS THE STATUS OF OUR FAA GRANT FUNDING PROGRAMS DURING THE FAA ONE-ON-ONE SESSIONS (*S. Lewis*). Mr. Lewis explained that, as Mr. Clague and Mrs. Weaver had explained last month, the Airport Authority has the opportunity to drive 19 miles south and visit with the FAA during the one-on-one conference sessions during the NAMA conference. Mr. Lewis would like to attend, and would like to have a couple of volunteers to join him for that meeting along with Mr. Clague, Mrs. Weaver and Mr. Tackes. Mr. Lewis stated that this was a great opportunity to have valuable one-on-one time with the FAA without a great deal of travel expense. This time could be used to help find out where we stand with our grant, and if the Taxiway Charlie issue is still looming, to talk with them about it, plus any other item that might arise.

Mr. Lewis asked for volunteers for the meeting. Mr. Handelin volunteered to attend.

Mr. Sullivan stated that it didn't have to be a subcommittee; as long as a quorum did not attend, it would be okay.

Mr. Staub pointed out that the NAMA meeting would be held after the March regular meeting. All we had to do was establish an agenda, adopt it and post it, so that when we meet with NAMA there won't be an objection by any member of the Authority as to what would be presented to the NAMA representatives. This agenda could be worked out during one of the subcommittee meetings we already hold, and approved at the next regular meeting.

There were no additional comments. This item did not require action.

- G. AIRPORT ENGINEER'S REPORT (*Non-Action Item*). Mr. Jim Clague, Airport Engineer, had nothing further to report at this time.

Mr. Lewis asked Mr. Clague if he had any updates on the flood zone fill area. Mr. Clague stated that he has not heard anything.

Mrs. Weaver reported that she had spoken with Russ Tillock the day before, expressing her concern to him about the schedule. Mr. Tillock told Mrs. Weaver that he would be on-site today, unless it was too windy. Mrs. Weaver did pull the building permit inspection record that shows that the grading drainage inspection, the grading fill inspection, the final engineering inspection, grading fill comp test and the grading revegetation inspection for the first two lots has been signed off, and they're done. Mrs. Weaver is holding Mr. Tillock to his word that he will be done within the next couple of weeks. Our commitment to the Weikels is April 12<sup>th</sup>. Mrs. Weaver has put a copy of these documents in Mr. Tackes' file with a note that the Weikels' attorney might also be interested in this information, since it shows that the work is within compliance.

- H. AIRPORT MANAGER'S REPORT (*Non-Action Item*). Mrs. Yvon Weaver, Airport Manager, reported that she is still working on the Open House with assistance from Dori Goss, David McClellan and Joe Raphael. Mrs. Weaver stated that they were doing a super job in helping make phone calls and contacts. Dwight Millard has graciously comped the five rooms for the B-17 pilots, and Mrs. Weaver is arranging for him to get a ride in the B-17. Mr. Millard's comping the rooms is beyond the call of duty, and he always does this for the Airport whenever we need it done.

Mrs. Weaver reported that when the roof in the terminal building leaked, it leaked on the uniforms. Inspection of the leaking area revealed that apparently Buzz Devol took the roof-mounted swamp cooler off the roof when he left, but didn't bother to cover up the hole. Mrs. Weaver has arranged for the repair.

Mrs. Weaver reported that this coming Saturday the Girl Scouts would be having an aviation seminar with members of the 99's in the terminal building. Mrs. Weaver reported that she is getting a lot of requests to use the building, and she is very happy about that.

On April 21<sup>st</sup> the Carson Jazz Band and the Carson High School Drill Team will be holding a function to raise money for their upcoming season. Susan Melsheimer is coordinating the function.

The Navy Sea Cadets recently had their change-of-command, and Scott Finley is the new commander.

Mrs. Weaver has been in contact with the Airport Business publication, and is working on publishing an article. It is a rather large magazine, and Mrs. Weaver asked Mr. Lewis to join her for the interview when it happened. Mrs. Weaver was pleased to let everyone know about our Airport and how it is maturing.

In March a meeting will be scheduled to demonstrate aircraft patterns to people on and around Apollo Drive. Mrs. Weaver is working with Bill and Dottie Kelley on this project, and Mr. Handelin has graciously agreed to fly his aircraft to show the current pattern versus the proposed pattern so that we can receive comments from the residents.

Mrs. Weaver wanted to acknowledge Mr. Bill Burger's donation of a computer for the terminal building. The Navy Sea Cadets are using it for now, and it is a nice addition to the building. There is a phone line in the Cadets' office, so eventually an internet connection could be a possibility.

Mrs. Weaver reported that NAMA is planning a barbecue for the senators and assembly men and women in the terminal building on March 27<sup>th</sup>. We currently have 200 people on the list of attendees (the terminal building can hold 250). They won't be there all at once, but are anticipated to rotate in and out.

Mrs. Weaver reported that Katy Durbin of WNCC had requested to do police car skid training at the Airport. Mrs. Weaver sent her to the DMV to inquire if the DMV would allow her to use the motorcycle training area instead. Several years ago they were allowed to undergo this training on the Airport, but it interrupts the leaseholders and flight traffic, plus it is unknown of what type of wear and tear the skid training places on the asphalt. Considering that our asphalt is already in need of repair, the thought is that skid training would not be beneficial to our asphalt at this time. Mrs. Weaver will continue to work with her to find a suitable place, but doesn't think it is the Airport at this time.

- I. LEGAL COUNSEL'S REPORT (*Non-Action Item*). Mr. Steve Tackes, Airport Counsel, was excused from this meeting, and there was no legal counsel report at this time.
- J. REPORT FROM AUTHORITY MEMBERS (*Non-Action Item*). Mr. Staub had nothing additional to add.

Mr. Sullivan reported that last summer he had attended a meeting with residents from the Apollo Drive area. Mr. Sullivan requested that a meeting be scheduled for either March or April to follow up with the residents.

Mr. Staub stated that the bigger issue with the residents is having someone at the end of the runway to take down tail numbers of the aircraft that do not follow the flight pattern. At a meeting held last summer or last fall at the terminal building, the Airport Authority stated that they would have someone – a student or a Scout or someone – sit at the end of the runway and do this task, but it did not happen. This is the biggest issue that has upset the Apollo Drive residents.

Mrs. Weaver stated that a gentleman had attended that meeting whose son had volunteered to do that task, but his son did not do it. Mrs. Weaver had spoken with Dottie Kelley a couple of weeks ago and stated that she would follow up with the gentleman, but they have not gotten back to Mrs. Weaver as yet.

Mr. Lewis pointed out that the Sea Cadets were using the terminal building, and wondered if they could be asked to take this on as one of their weekend projects for a few weekends. Mrs. Weaver stated that she would ask them if they would do this.

Mr. Handelin stated that he believed the EAA also owed the Airport Authority some hours, and wondered if they could also be asked to monitor tail numbers.

Mr. Lewis stated that the Civil Air Patrol Cadets from Minden were always looking for aviation-related projects, and maybe they could help, too.

Mr. Sullivan said that he would also like to hold meetings with some of the neighbors maybe once or twice a year to keep the lines of communication open and to provide them reassurance that we are trying to be good neighbors to them. He recently received a call from Dottie Kelley, complaining about the same person flying over her home, and that she could not reach Mrs. Weaver.

Mrs. Weaver explained that she (Dottie Kelley) had called while she (Mrs. Weaver) was on another line and could not take the second call. Mrs. Kelley then dialed Mrs. Weaver's cell phone, but again, Mrs. Weaver could not take the call. Within a couple of minutes, Mrs. Weaver dialed the number that had appeared on her cell phone, and did return Mrs. Kelley's call, but apparently Mrs. Kelley was quite anxious, and that's why she called Mr. Sullivan. Mrs. Weaver had asked Mrs. Kelley to call her (Mrs. Weaver) when it (the fly over) was happening, and that was why Mrs. Kelley was so anxious to speak with her. As a follow up, Mrs. Weaver did memorialize her conversation with Mrs. Kelley in an e-mail that she sent to Mr. Sullivan. Mr. Sullivan stated that he did receive the e-mail.

As a point of record, Mr. Lewis stated that we have not been ignoring them, since part of what we are doing in the work on Title 19 is to propose changing the pattern altitude, which will be demonstrated to the residents when we have the fly-over meeting.

Mrs. Hutter stated that, granted, we did not have the kid sitting at the end of the runway, but Mrs. Weaver has done a remarkable job of maintaining an open line of communication with the Airport's neighbors. Mrs. Hutter stated that Mrs. Weaver has made herself available to them virtually 24/7, and has also helped educate them with the website address and various phone numbers.

**TAPE CHANGE: *Tape 1, Side A, to Tape 1, Side B***