

**CARSON CITY AIRPORT AUTHORITY  
MEETING MINUTES**

**WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 2009 – 6:00 P.M.**

***Public Meeting at:***

**CARSON CITY COMMUNITY CENTER  
SIERRA ROOM  
851 E. WILLIAM STREET  
Carson City, Nevada**

---

- A. CALL TO ORDER, ROLL CALL, AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM. The regular meeting of the Carson City Airport Authority was called to order at 6:03 p.m. Roll call was taken, and quorum was determined:

Present: Don Peterson, Alex Carter, John Kelly, Steve Lewis, Walt Sullivan and David McClelland

Absent: *None*

Staff: Steve Tackes, Jim Clague and Dirk Zahtilla

- B. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

- C. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF PAST MEETINGS OF THE AIRPORT AUTHORITY.

Regarding the minutes of the 21 January 2009 Regular Meeting, Mr. McClelland moved to approve the minutes as submitted. Mr. Kelly seconded the motion, and the motion carried, with Mr. Peterson and Mr. Sullivan abstaining from this vote as they were absent from that meeting.

Regarding the minutes of the 28 January 2009 Public Information Meeting, a quorum was not in attendance at that meeting, and Mr. Lewis stated that it was unnecessary to approve the minutes; however, Mr. Lewis asked that the minutes remain as a part of the Airport Authority's record. There was no objection to this request.

- 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.*  
There were no public comments at this time.

F. CONSENT AGENDA

\*\*\*\*\*  
\*\*\*\*\*

All matters listed under the consent agenda are considered routine, and may be acted upon by the Airport Authority with one action and without an extensive hearing. Any member of the authority or any citizen may request that an item be taken from the consent agenda, discussed and acted upon separately during this meeting. The Chairman or the Vice-Chairman retains discretion in deciding whether or not an item will be pulled off the consent agenda.

\*\*\*\*\*  
\*\*\*\*\*

- (1) APPROVAL OF ANNUAL BUDGET REVIEW PROCESS TO INSURE COMPLIANCE WITH NRS 354.626 BY ADOPTING AN ANNUAL PROCEDURE FOR THE TREASURER TO MEET WITH THE AUDITOR AT THE END OF APRIL EACH YEAR. THE MEETING WILL OCCUR TO REVIEW YEAR-TO-DATE REVENUE AND EXPENDITURES TO ENSURE COMPLIANCE AND IDENTIFY ANY MODIFICATIONS. ANY SUCH MODIFICATIONS WILL THEN BE SUBMITTED TO THE AUTHORITY AT THE JUNE AUTHORITY MEETING, WITH APPROVED MODIFICATIONS SUBSEQUENTLY REPORTED TO THE NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF TAXATION.

Mr. Peterson moved to approve the consent agenda item. Mr. Sullivan seconded the motion. There was no Board or Public discussion. The vote was called and the motion carried.

**\*\* END OF CONSENT AGENDA \*\***

G. PUBLIC HEARINGS

- (1) DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON ITEMS RELATED TO THE CARSON CITY HILL REMOVAL PROJECT, INCLUDING MONTHLY STATUS REPORTS, POTENTIAL CHANGES TO THE WORK OR WORK SCHEDULE, CONSTRUCTION CHANGE ORDERS, AND OTHER RELATED ITEMS (*J. Clague*).

Mr. Clague reported that the hill is down, but that the change order to do the earthwork for Taxiway Delta is on hold until the temperatures are more favorable.

Regarding the financial summary, the contractor is now on track. Mr. Clague stated that the additional allotted days were just what they needed. Approximately 90 percent of the budget has been spent, and approximately 90 percent of the days have been used, and the contractor is right where they should be. Mr. Clague added that the engineering services

are right at 90 percent, so the project is going well. Mr. Clague anticipates the contractor to be at work sometime next month. Mr. Clague asked the Board if they had any questions.

Mr. Lewis asked if any members of the Airport Authority had been out to look at the hill, stating that he had been out there a couple of times. Mr. Lewis noted that the contractor did a good job, and left the job site clean. There is some equipment left on site for the pending compaction work, but Mr. Lewis stated that this, too, has been left in an orderly manner. Mr. Lewis stated that taking down the hill was a tough project, but that the contractor did a good job and left the Airport in a great position for the future.

Mr. Lewis commented about the public information meeting, and stated that there were over 30 attendees, most of who were from the Apollo Drive area. Mr. Lewis stated that Mr. Clague made a power point presentation, and the pictures were very telling. Mr. Lewis stated that Mr. Clague made it clear that the newly piled mound of dirt is a temporary situation, and that it will be used as fill dirt to build up the lower side of the Airport. Mr. Lewis promised to hold more public information meetings to keep the public aware of the next phase of construction as it is planned.

Mr. Lewis asked if there were any public comments. There were none. This item will be carried forward to next month's agenda.

- (2) DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING APPROVAL OF TASK 4 TO THE CONTRACT WITH PBS&J TO PROVIDE DESIGN SERVICES FOR THE RECONSTRUCTION OF THE NORTH APRON; RECONSTRUCTION OF THE MAIN APRON; AND THE REHABILITATION OF TAXIWAYS B AND C (*J. Clague*).

Mr. Clague referred to this item as his 2009 project, and explained that the FAA desires to fund the first three years of the ACIP during this year, and that is still their plan to the best of his knowledge. Currently the Airport Authority is under contract to design the runway, Taxiway Alpha and Taxiway Delta east of Taxiway Bravo. The remaining work that shows up on the ACIP is not yet under design, and that would include the north apron, the main apron, and rehabilitation of the main taxiways Taxiway Bravo and Taxiway Charlie. Last month's request included Taxiway Delta west of Taxiway Bravo, but that work is ineligible for design, as an Environmental Assessment needs to be done for that area. The Environmental Assessment is underway so that the work can be expedited.

Mr. Clague stated that the fee for this work is \$270,000. Under the grant the FAA provided moneys for the design (95 percent), and the Airport Authority is responsible for 5 percent. The impact to the CCAA, therefore, is \$13,500, which is the equivalent of 5 percent.

Mr. Clague stated that he was requesting Board approval of this task contingent on receiving FAA funding. Mr. Clague stated he was making this a contingent request, as he did not want to put the Airport Authority in a bind just in case the FAA does not come through with the funding; however, if it is approved, even with the contingency, then once the funding comes through the work can begin immediately, without waiting for the

next Board meeting.

Mr. Lewis asked for clarification on the status of the Environmental Assessment. Mr. Clague reported that an archaeological find, which included some arrowheads, was discovered in the work area near Runway 9 just south of the North apron.

There were no additional Board comments, and no public comments. Mr. Lewis called for a motion.

Mr. Sullivan moved to approve Task 4, contingent upon receiving the FAA AIP grant offered to perform the task. Mr. Kelly seconded the motion. The vote was called and the motion carried 5 to 1, with one nay from Mr. McClelland.

- (3) DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING CHANGES TO THE AIRPORT DRIVING RULES AND REGULATIONS (*D. Zahtilla*). Mr. Zahtilla handed out copies of the driving regulations that he had recently revised. He reviewed a couple of the changes he had made, most significantly, those changes to the verbiage regarding driving on the taxiways, and clarified the intention of the rule when it was first adopted.

Under Section 2, Mr. Zahtilla explained that driving on taxiways is prohibited, with the exception of Taxiway Charlie and Taxiway Bravo, where driving is required to gain access to hangars.

Mr. McClelland stated that he is part of the emergency response team, and is required to drive his truck out to the emergency, wherever it might be on the field. He asked if there would be any exceptions in the rules for such an event. Mr. Zahtilla stated that he recently met with the Fire Department to talk about emergency response procedures and a recent event where more than 30 people were on the field yet only 4 were needed. Mr. Zahtilla asked Mr. McClelland to draft up something regarding personnel, as to who should be on the field in an emergency situation, and who should not.

Mr. Lewis stated that this submittal was a revision to the driving rules that were approved nearly a year ago.

Mr. Sullivan stated that the submittal mentioned what to do when the tower was closed; however, the Carson City Airport does not have a tower. Mr. Sullivan stated that when it gets to the final revision such references would need to be corrected.

Mr. Peterson asked about Paragraph 1.7.2.2, Proof of Insurance, and whether that paragraph was necessary. He stated that he found out the hard way that in Nevada you are not allowed to let your insurance lapse, even if the vehicle is not usable, as it's a \$250 fine. Mr. Lewis stated that there were some California residents who housed their aircraft here, and he was unsure if California had that same requirement.

Mr. Lewis called for public comment.

Mr. Bill Abbott addressed the Board. He stated that no driver training program exists on the Airport, and asked if reference to that could be removed in its entirety, and replaced with different verbiage that has something to do with acknowledgment of the written

rules. Mr. Zahtilla stated that he had left that information in the document in case we did have driver training in the future. Mr. Abbott suggested that a paragraph should be inserted to explain that. Mr. Abbott also stated that he has offered in the past to help develop a driving program on the Airport.

Mr. Abbott stated that Sentence 2.1 is confusing regarding taxi lane versus taxiway, and asked if this could be made clearer.

Mr. Harlow Norvell stated that all vehicles must be registered to operate on the Airport, but pointed out that there were certain vehicles on the Airport, such as the snow removal vehicle and tugs, that are not registered, and are therefore uninsured, which would put them out of compliance with the insurance section.

Mr. Abbott stated that, per the NRS, a vehicle that was used as an implement of husbandry was not required to be registered. Some discussion ensued concerning vehicles that are utilized as “implements of husbandry”, and it was agreed that this section should be clarified.

Mr. Kelly moved to approve the revisions to the driving rules and regulations, as amended per Board suggestions.

Mr. McClelland seconded the motion, and asked if the maker of the motion could add Mr. Clague’s drawings to include the tentative Taxiway Delta. Mr. Kelly agreed to this change.

Mr. Sullivan asked if the Board wanted to include something to address implements of husbandry, such as tugs, or if we were covered under NRS statutes. Mr. Lewis stated that all FBO’s have equipment that is tied to their business, including tugs, snowplows, fuel trucks, etc., and a line item should probably also be considered. Mr. Zahtilla stated that he could add that verbiage, but the opinion is that all the vehicles are individually owned by businesses, and since each business has its own liability insurance each vehicle should be covered as a business item.

Mr. Tackes commented regarding the snowplow owned by the Airport. The snowplow is not licensed to drive on public roadways, and therefore no registration is required. Its operation is covered under the Airport’s general liability insurance. Mr. Tackes stated that tugs do not require insurance. Mr. Tackes stated that he did not know the extent of other vehicles on the Airport, but thought that this was not a big deal.

Mr. Peterson stated that it was possible the people keep vehicles in their hangars whose only purpose is for driving around the Airport. Mr. Peterson took the position that those vehicles would not be an implement of husbandry, but rather were considered automotive vehicles, and therefore should be insured. Mr. Peterson suggested taking the position on maintaining the insurance, and simply following the guidelines.

There was no additional discussion. The vote was called and the motion carried 6 to 0.

- (4) DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING HOW THE TSA's LARGE AIRCRAFT SECURITY PROGRAM WILL EFFECT THE OPERATIONS AT CARSON CITY AIRPORT (*J. Kelly*).

Mr. Kelly reported that he had asked that this item be included on the agenda so that he could bring it to the attention of the Board and members of the flying public. Mr. Kelly stated that this program would establish a requirement on the pilot/owner's side to create a security program, where passengers have to be checked against a watch list, and where pilots, several days prior to departure, must provide notice of who will be on their aircraft. Mr. Kelly stated that Carson City is listed as a reliever airport to Reno, and this could mean that we would have to create a secure area for loading and unloading passengers and luggage. We would also have to create a security plan, with authorized staff to operate the security area on the Airport, such as the terminal building, and this could include a metal detector and a luggage x-ray machine. Mr. Kelly stated that this has expensive implications to the Airport and the flying public. Mr. Kelly stated that most of the lobbying groups agree that this is a bad thing for business.

Mr. Kelly stated that this item was getting a lot of negative review, and that final comments would be received until February 23rd. Mr. Kelly pointed out that it is a funded mandate, and the Airport Authority should look at it as something that we do not need to have in the regulations.

Mr. Lewis read a portion of the proposal, and stated that the rule is approximately 122 pages long. Mr. Lewis commented that there are a couple of determining factors for involvement. One of them is that the Carson City Airport is designated as a reliever airport, so we are in the mix. The other determination is based on those airports that regularly serve or charter flights, but Mr. Lewis stated that he could not find out what "regularly" means. Regardless, the Carson City Airport's classification as a reliever airport already puts us in line for this regulation.

Mr. Kelly stated that this wasn't much of an action item; he just wanted to let everyone know it was coming up. Mr. Lewis stated that the Board could take a stand on this item, and send a letter of either support or displeasure concerning it. Mr. Lewis called for public comment.

Harlow Norvell stated that he pilots a 28,000-pound aircraft, and that what is being proposed is the current requirement for his classification of aircraft. This proposal is simply an extension of the current rule, and Mr. Norvell stated his belief that it will be implemented in some form or another after the current comment period is over. Mr. Norvell stated that he currently already must receive approval from the TSA on any passengers that he carries, and that the TSA people have permission to "lurk" and watch how baggage and passengers are handled. Mr. Norvell also stated that, under the current TSA rules, pilots have to be fingerprinted by the FBI and undergo an extensive background investigation, at their own expense, and that these requirements will be extended under Part 91.

Mr. Gary Phillips stated that this would be destructive to the economy of the Airport and the economy of the City, and would be difficult for general aviation airports to comply. Mr. Phillips suggested that the Board write a letter of disagreement to the TSA.

Mr. Kelly moved that the Carson City Airport Authority provide a written comment to the TSA regarding this item, indicating disapproval of the proposal.

Mr. Sullivan seconded the motion, with an amendment to the motion, that it would be a very expensive endeavor for a general aviation airport that has to so closely watch its funds. Mr. Kelly concurred with this amendment to the motion.

Mr. Lewis stated that he would take a draft at writing the letter on behalf of Board and Staff.

The vote was called and the motion carried 6 to 0.

- (5) DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING A REPORT FROM THE SUBCOMMITTEE REGARDING THE RECRUITMENT AND HIRING OF AN AIRPORT MANAGER AND MATTERS RELATED THERETO; AUTHORITY SELECTION OR RANKING OF TOP CANDIDATE(S); AUTHORIZE BOARD MEMBER TO TAKE ADDITIONAL ACTION TO HIRE THE AIRPORT MANAGER SELECTED BY THE AUTHORITY (*W. Sullivan*).

Mr. Sullivan reported that he, Mr. Kelly and Mr. Peterson had been exchanging e-mails regarding their applicant review, and believed they were at a point where the applications had been reviewed and ranked, the top candidates had been chosen, references had been checked, and they were ready to move forward with making recommendations.

Mr. Peterson asked Mr. Sullivan if he had spoken to his top candidate. Mr. Sullivan stated that he had done so only to inquire if he could contact her references. Mr. Sullivan stated that he did contact her references, and they were exemplary.

Mr. Peterson stated that he circulated a numerical matrix of the rankings of each Subcommittee member's top candidates. He has not received back all of Mr. Kelly's numbers yet, but the goal is to narrow the field down to the 10 top candidates in the group, with another 20 that are not in the top 10. Mr. Peterson stated that there was enough disparity in the top 10 candidates that all 10 of them could be considered.

Mr. Peterson proposed adding up Mr. Kelly's rankings, which should leave 10 or possibly 11 as top-ranked candidates. The top candidates could be divided among the three members of the Subcommittee, who could then determine if there were any disqualifiers, such as required pay, moving expenses, etc. A public meeting could be scheduled where the findings are reported, and this would lead to a true short list of the top 3 candidates, who would be interviewed. The Subcommittee could then come back to the Board with its recommendations.

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

Mr. Tackes stated that the Subcommittee wanted to avoid any violation of the open meeting act, and that included no private deliberation. Mr. Tackes pointed out that any deliberation needed to be held in an open meeting. Mr. Tackes suggested getting the

rankings down to a manageable number, contact references, hold a public meeting, and hone the number down to a final selection.

Mr. Tackes pointed out that, independent of the fact that the three members of the Subcommittee are doing all of this work, all of the candidate resumes are available to every member of the Authority, as maybe not all of the members would agree with the others.

Mr. Lewis asked if the list of 32 applicants included everyone. Mr. Peterson stated his belief that it did include everything he has received to date, and has also double-checked with Mr. Sullivan and Mr. Kelly. Mr. Lewis stated that the resumes had been shared among the Subcommittee members, and that Mr. Tackes was the focal point for receipt of the applications, and that he made distribution to each Subcommittee member.

Mr. Peterson moved that the Subcommittee update the individual rankings of the applicants to arrive at a ranked list, that the list then be divided into 4/3/3 among the three members of the Subcommittee, who will then make telephone inquiries to determine answers to any missing information and whether there are any disqualifiers for these applicants; to notice a public meeting on Friday to be held next Wednesday, where final telephone interviews will be held; and from that point a final short list of no more than 5 applicants will be created. This list will be submitted to the Airport Authority Chairman, who will be empowered to extend invitations for a personal interview or a telephone interview with the Chairman. From that point a public meeting will be scheduled and held for the short list of up to 5, 3 of which are determined by the Airport Authority Chairman and 2 of which are determined by the Subcommittee. Telephone interviews will be held with the top 5 candidates, after which a special public meeting will be arranged and held, and a person chosen based on the interviews.

Mr. Tackes stated that the key thing is deliberation, commenting that if the Subcommittee was just gathering information they should be safe, but that wherever there's a quorum, it's considered a meeting.

Mr. Lewis asked if there were any public comments.

Mr. Bill Abbott stated that the process of hiring and firing was difficult, considering there were three members of the Subcommittee and there would therefore be three sets of opinions. Mr. Abbott stated that the Subcommittee was formed, and the Subcommittee should continue, and that the Subcommittee should be the venue to review all 10 of the top applicants, or the objectivity will go out the window. Mr. Abbott also suggested getting the applicant's permission to run a background check on them before they are even interviewed.

Ms. Ginna Reyes of El Aero Services stated that each Subcommittee member should have the same set of questions that they ask of each candidate. The questions should be asked, and the answers recorded.

Mr. Peterson asked Mr. Tackes if the list of candidates had to be reviewed in a public meeting. Mr. Tackes commented that there would most likely be different directions for different candidates. Certain questions would apply to each candidate, but the Subcommittee should be looking for the best fit overall.

Mr. McClelland stated that he would like to bring all 10 applicants here, and have each of them be open to questions from the entire Board. Mr. McClelland stated that he has a problem with segregating people, commenting that we are picking our future manager, and it's a big deal.

Mr. Lewis stated that, in defense of Mr. Peterson, we should find out if there are any disqualifiers, such as if they've already accepted another job, or if they want a very high salary. Mr. Lewis stated that he would tend to lean toward sorting them out to find out if we do have final candidates willing to come forward.

Mr. Peterson stated his concern over having all 10 top applicants be required to appear, as people from all over the country have applied, but given the current economy maybe they cannot make a flight to this area.

Mr. Sullivan concurred with Mr. Peterson, stating that if he were in the top 3, he would seriously consider a flight for the interview, but not so much if he were in the top 10 or so. Mr. McClelland commented that maybe this would help weed out some of them and that would help in making the decision.

Mr. Lewis called for a motion.

Mr. Peterson moved that the Subcommittee conclude its arithmetic ranking process, divide the top 10 applicants for individual telephone interviews, seek permission to contact their references, and determine if there are any automatic disqualifiers; the resulting list will then be turned over to the Airport Authority Chairman to arrange telephone interviews for a group of the top 3 applicants, from which a finalist will be derived; and the Airport Authority Chairman will be given the authority to make an offer to this top candidate based on the results of this process.

Mr. Sullivan seconded the motion.

Mr. McClelland stated that he would like to see that the questions asked of each candidate are alike so that the process is equal. Mr. Peterson concurred with this amendment, pointing out that questions for the top 10 will be to determine disqualifiers, and that questions for the top 3 will be identical for the interview process.

Mr. Sullivan, maker of the second, consented to this amendment. The vote was called and the motion carried, 6 to 0.

- H. AIRPORT ENGINEER'S REPORT (*Non-Action Item*). Mr. Jim Clague, Airport Engineer, reported that he has revised the 2009 grant application to become a design grant. Mr. Clague stated that his concern with the FAA and the offer is that he does not want to jeopardize the construction of the runway, but the FAA has insisted that this is not the case, and that there will be a grant for the runway and the taxiways this year. With this in mind, Mr. Clague has gone ahead and submitted a new grant application for the apron work.

Regarding the work on the runway and taxiways, Mr. Clague stated that he could schedule a meeting with the pilots and FBO's on the Airport, and wanted to do that within the next couple of weeks. Mr. Clague mentioned that he has gotten new aerial mapping for the Airport now that the hill has been removed. The mapping company is under contract to provide oblique photographs, and they are taking more photographs this Friday. The initial photograph is \$250, and each print is \$150. Mr. Clague stated this was somewhat expensive, but if anyone wanted a copy he could take orders.

Mr. Clague stated that he would like to schedule the meeting to be held in the Terminal Building, whenever it is convenient, and that he wanted this to be a publicly noticed meeting. Mr. Clague stated that everyone would be interested in seeing the proposal, and that the main purpose of this meeting was to determine phasing of the work.

- I. AIRPORT MANAGER'S REPORT (*Non-Action Item*). Mr. Dirk Zahtilla, Interim Airport Manager, thanked Mr. Bob Dickinson and EAA Chapter 403 for installing the signs on the Airport. Mr. Zahtilla stated that their efforts saved the Airport several thousand dollars. Mr. Zahtilla stated that six more signs needed to be added to the backs of the existing signs. The cost is \$84 each for signs of that size.

Mr. Zahtilla reported that there have been several unauthorized runway crossings, including one lady walking her dog across the runway, truck and forklift crossings, three to four different vehicles, all in the past month. Mr. Zahtilla stated this was partly why he updated the driving rules.

Mr. Zahtilla stated that he repaired the rotating beacon by replacing a blown photocell.

Mr. Zahtilla stated that he was looking into the nuisance abatement process, and stated that this was probably the worst possible way to remove anything derelict as the process means that the City tells us that we have a nuisance, and this puts the burden on the Airport without helping the Airport enforce the issue with the owner. In the case of the albatross, it would mean that the City would haul it off but still charge the Airport for the effort. Mr. Zahtilla stated that he was working on the lien sale process, which is in the NRS and the method specified for this type of situation. Mr. Zahtilla stated that a lien sale process gives us the power, as either someone buys the albatross and hauls it off, or we can have it scrapped.

Mr. Zahtilla stated that he has been talking with Melanie of the District Attorney's office, and that she understands that we are the property owner, but not the owner of the aircraft. Per NRS 108.270, we can place a lien on the aircraft. If it's abandoned, there is a section in the NRS regarding abandoned property on public land. Mr. Zahtilla stated that he brought up the lien process because it's simple and straightforward, and takes only one or two months to complete.

Mr. McClelland pointed out that Mr. Kelly has experience with the lien process, as he has

had to utilize it against aircraft on his property.

Mr. Zahtilla stated that he has a meeting with Fire Chief Stacie Giomi regarding ideas on safety procedures for the Airport in the event of emergencies, accidents, etc. The radio frequency is 121.5, in case anyone calls in. The Fire Department has personnel sitting there, and Mr. Zahtilla stated that there is no reason why they could not tune in a radio and monitor that frequency. They will also have a quicker response time. Mr. Zahtilla stated that he plans to issue safety vests so that if there is an emergency that requires response, the ones wearing the vests are the authorized people to be onsite. Mr. Zahtilla stated that this would help the fire department and the police, especially in an emergency situation. Mr. Zahtilla stated that he has asked the Fire Department to have the Airport Manager's number at their dispatch location so they could notify the Airport in case of emergency. Mr. Zahtilla stated that when the fencing is redone at the east end of the runway, we could add a gate for the Fire Department, and they can add their own locks.

Mr. Lewis thanked Mr. Bob Dickinson and the local EAA Chapter 403 for getting the sign work done, getting it done quickly, and saving the Airport Authority a lot of money.

- J. LEGAL COUNSEL'S REPORT (*Non-Action Item*). Mr. Steve Tackes, Airport Counsel, commented that if a special meeting was going to be held regarding the Airport Manager hiring process, that the special meeting agenda should include an item to approve the next expected FAA AIP grant, as those usually have a short lead time. That agenda should also include action to approve the federal stimulus bill funds that may come our way. Both items could happen relatively quickly.

Mr. Tackes stated that he received a voice mail from Abel Tapia of the FAA, saying that he would be putting the grant offer in the mail in a couple of days, and that it would need to be approved by February 24th, which is impossible. Mr. Tackes stated it would be a good idea to estimate the amount of the grant, have this body approve in advance the estimated amount, and Mr. Tackes would take that approval before the Board of Supervisors.

Regarding the stimulus bill, Mr. Tackes reported that there are three paragraphs regarding aviation funding. The house version had \$3B; the senate bill had \$1B. The house version required a 5 percent match; the senate bill did not. The version that has been adopted is the senate version. It includes \$1.1B at 100 percent financing, and could happen very quickly. Mr. Tackes explained that the bill requires that funds are obligated in 120 days from the 21-day period contained in the bill for each state to certify that it wants the funds. Mr. Tackes stated that the Board should approve up to \$19M, since that is the amount requested. It will be up to the FAA to decide who gets the funds and in what quantity.

Mr. Tackes stated that he was working with Mr. Sullivan and the City to establish an interlocal personnel agreement so that the Airport Authority could use City personnel and

equipment. Mr. Tackes stated that the agreement already exists, but the method does not. The interlocal agreement will provide the method.

- K. TREASURER'S REPORT (*Non-Action Item*). Mr. Alex Carter, Airport Treasurer, commented on the consent agenda item, stating that it would be a great method of responding to the Department of Taxation, and will help the Authority remain in compliance during the coming year.

Regarding the budget, Mr. Carter mentioned that Mr. Zahtilla is now handling the books and has generated the budget report. The budget currently shows an operational deficit, but in the form of forward anticipating property tax revenue. Mr. Carter stated that the last report showed \$54K, which is half of the anticipated tax revenue of \$108K. When the tax revenue is added in, we're okay.

Mr. Carter stated that the bank account has \$512,870.66 in the money market account, and \$15,031.96 in the checking account.

- L. REPORT FROM AUTHORITY MEMBERS (*Non-Action Item*). Mr. McClelland thanked Mr. Zahtilla for a good job, and thanked the Dickinson's for their work on the signs.

Mr. Sullivan, Mr. Kelly, Mr. Carter and Mr. Peterson had nothing further to add.

Mr. Lewis stated that he has closed out AIP Grant 004-14, which is the second phase of the Serpa purchase. This was closed on January 13, 2009.

- M. AGENDA ITEMS FOR NEXT REGULAR MEETING (*Non-Action Item*). A special meeting is required for grant approval. It was determined that this meeting would be held on February 26, 2009 at noon at the Terminal Building.

Mr. Clague requested a meeting be publicly noticed and held for the purpose of the Airport users to look at the ALP in its final layout and discuss the pending work schedule. Mr. Clague stated that he would arrange to get the drawing to Mr. Zahtilla in advance of the meeting so that it could be published with the agenda. Mr. Clague stated that he would like to hold the meeting sometime in the next two to three weeks, but prior to the next regular meeting.

- N. ACTION ON ADJOURNMENT. The regular meeting of 18 February 2009 was adjourned without objection at 7:58 p.m.

