

**CARSON CITY AIRPORT AUTHORITY  
MEETING MINUTES**

**WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 19, 2007 – 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 6:00 p.m. Roll call was taken, and quorum was determined:

Present: Don Peterson, Neil Weaver, Collie Hutter, Steve Lewis, Walt Sullivan, Gary Handelin and Richard Staub.

Absent: *None*

Staff: Jim Clague and Steve Tackes and Yvon Weaver

- B. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

- C. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF PAST MEETINGS OF THE AIRPORT AUTHORITY. Regarding the minutes of the 15 August 2007 regular meeting, Mrs. Hutter moved to approve the minutes as submitted. Mr. Sullivan seconded the motion and the motion carried, with Mr. Sullivan and Mr. Handelin abstaining from the vote, as they were not in attendance at that meeting.

- 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 agenda modifications 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 concerning people on the Airport who make a mess and don't clean up after themselves. Mr. Hublou maintained that every Airport

contract should include a clause stating that a contract will not be paid if the mess isn't cleaned up. Mr. Hublou explained that he jogs around the Airport each day, and sees a lot of what goes on. He cited a couple of incidents on the Airport, including a mower that cut the grass and hit a pile of rocks, scattering them all over the taxiway. The mower did not clean it up, and aircraft were taxiing across the rocks. The aircraft have the power to throw the rocks with great force, and Mr. Hublou contends that this creates a huge liability for the Airport. Mr. Hublou explained that he and another gentleman cleaned up the taxiway near his area, but hopes that next year the mower and sweeper could follow one another so that doesn't happen again.

Mr. Weaver thanked Mr. Hublou for keeping an eye on things at the Airport, and explained that the contract mower is also the contract sweeper. He asked Mr. Hublou to please call the Airport Manager to let her know this has happened. The Airport Manager will make sure that the sweeping is done.

Mr. Jerry Vaccaro addressed the Board. He explained that it has been more than 60 days since his request for information from the Board. Mr. Vaccaro explained that he had a conversation with Mr. Tackes, who promised to provide him with notes from the Title 19 workshops, and he also has not heard from Mr. Tackes and has not seen the notes.

Mr. Tackes apologized to Mr. Vaccaro, explaining that his offer was to provide Mr. Vaccaro with a copy of *his* notes, since there is nothing that's a part of the formal record. Mr. Vaccaro has been invited to attend all the meetings, which he has been attending. The meetings are public and they are publicly noticed.

Mr. Vaccaro asked Mr. Lewis if he was the project manager on the Jet Ranch project. Mr. Staub interrupted Mr. Vaccaro, pointing out that Mr. Vaccaro was in the public comment portion of this meeting and may not involve Mr. Lewis or any member of the Authority in a discussion. This portion of the meeting was designated for public comment only, and Mr. Vaccaro has the right to state his public comment for the record. Mr. Staub stated that if Mr. Vaccaro had an item for discussion, it must first be included on the agenda as an agenda item.

Mr. Vaccaro asked if his query of Mr. Lewis could be put on the agenda, and that item should include divulgence from each member of the Board regarding their relationship and involvement with Mr. Gonzalez and on the Jet Ranch project. Mr. Vaccaro stated that he was prepared to file an ethics complaint against Mr. Lewis and Mr. Handelin regarding a violation of the open meeting laws and how they were polling other Board members and collaborating on the vote. Mr. Vaccaro stated that it appeared that Mr. Lewis and Mr. Handelin were connected at the hip when it came to voting on items at the Airport. Mr. Vaccaro then invited Mr. Lewis to resign right then, stating that he would accept his immediate resignation and not move forward with filing the complaint. Otherwise, Mr. Vaccaro stated that he was prepared to proceed with his formal complaints with the Attorney General's office.

Mr. Tackes stated that it was up to the Board if they wanted to add an item to the agenda, but that the Board was under no obligation to do so.

Mr. Ralph Smith of Valley Construction addressed the Board to report on the progress of the Jet Ranch project. Mr. Smith distributed copies of his progress report to the Board and Staff, and reviewed the update for those present. Mr. Smith also had extra copies of his progress report for anyone interested in having a copy.

Mr. Clague observed that Mr. Smith indicates the project will be paving during November, December and January, and asked if this plan was dependent on weather and temperature. Mr. Smith confirmed that it was, and that temperature, etc., must meet Orange Book standards. Mr. Smith explained that they might just place the first lift, depending on the weather, NDOT and Orange Book standards, and they may wait until warmer weather to properly complete the paving.

There were no additional public comments at this time.

#### F. PUBLIC HEARINGS

- (1) SUP-07-122 ACTION TO CONSIDER, REVIEW AND COMMENT UPON A SPECIAL USE PERMIT APPLICATION FROM CUSTOM SIGN & CRANE, LLC (PROPERTY OWNER, TRES PINGUINOS, LLC) TO INCREASE THE PERMITTED HEIGHT OF A FREESTANDING SIGN FROM 20 FEET TO 40 FEET, TO PERMIT A SECOND FREESTANDING SIGN THAT IS 10 FEET TALL, AND TO INCREASE THE TOTAL PERMITTED ON-SITE SIGN AREA FROM 600 SQUARE FEET TO 800 SQUARE FEET ON PROPERTY ZONE LIMITED INDUSTRIAL (LI), LOCATED AT 2900 RESEARCH WAY, APN 008-922-08 (*L. Plemel*).

Staff Summary: A Special Use Permit is required to increase permitted sign area and/or sign height. The 40-foot sign, which would include an LED display face, is intended to be seen from the adjacent freeway, while the secondary sign would be oriented toward Research Way. The site is the location of the new Harley-Davidson building.

Mr. Sullivan stated that he has no financial interest in this project or any affiliation with the Harley-Davidson company or the property owner; however, this item would be heard by the Planning Commission in an upcoming meeting and since Mr. Sullivan's office was handling the application, Mr. Sullivan would be abstaining from the vote.

Mr. Lee Plemel of the Carson City Planning Division addressed the Board. He explained that a special use permit has been filed requesting an increase in the sign area for the new Harley-Davidson building. The item is being brought to the Airport Authority because it is within the Airport review area, and is therefore standard practice to bring the item to the Airport Authority Board for review and approval.

Mr. Plemel recommended placing the standard aviation easement on the property, noting that the Airport is within the vicinity of the parcel. Mr. Plemel asked the Board if there were any questions.

Mrs. Hutter asked how far the subject property is from the Airport. Mr. Plemel explained that it is within a mile radius of the Airport, and is due west of the St. Teresa's Catholic Church on Lompa Lane, and adjacent to the new freeway bypass. Mr. Plemel stated that at that particular location the property is basically at grade with the freeway, and will be approximately 40 feet above ground and about 40 feet above the freeway. The approximate sign location is on the westerly portion of the property abutting the freeway right-of-way, at the north end of the building, between the building and the freeway.

Mr. Lewis asked if the building was higher than the sign. Mr. Plemel explained that the building is 30 feet high, and the drawing was created in an attempt to estimate the height of the sign in relation to the building.

Mr. Lewis called for public comment. There was none. Mr. Lewis called for a motion.

Mr. Handelin moved to recommend to the Planning Commission the requirement that an aviation easement be signed and recorded on the subject property if the special use permit is approved for the sign. Mr. Weaver seconded the motion.

There was no further discussion, and the motion carried with Mr. Sullivan abstaining from the vote.

- (2) DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING A PRESENTATION FROM DAVID WOTASKI, INVENTOR OF THE SUPER AWOS/SUPER UNICOM (*N. Weaver*). Mr. Weaver explained that Mr. Wotaski could not attend, but in his place his partner, Mr. Gary Loff, would be making a presentation to the Board. Mr. Weaver explained that a few years ago Mr. Weaver had contacted the Super Unicom people, which became the super AWOS people, although the Unicom and AWOS are two separate products. Mr. Weaver had seen the benefit the super AWOS would bring to the Airport, and had invited Mr. Loff to make a presentation to the Airport Board and Community, and explain how the unit does or does not meet FAA requirements for the Carson City Airport.

Mr. Gary Loff addressed the Board. He stated that the short answer is that the super AWOS does meet all FAA requirements for instrument and commercial flight, and that no restrictions come with this AWOS or any other AWOS. The difference between the older technology AWOS and the new super AWOS is that there are different siting and maintenance criteria.

Currently the older AWOS systems (the "legacy" systems) have technology that was developed in the 1970'S. They required a physical visit every 90 days, and an annual inspection. The new AWOS does not have those requirements. The new AWOS is monitored every day, 24/7. Should a component begin to fail or go out of specification, the unit will report via a satellite or internet link that there's a problem with a given sensor. First, communication is made with the unit to try to recalibrate or reset the sensor. If recalibration cannot be attained and it is apparent that the sensor needs to be changed, a new sensor is sent out, and you just change the sensor. It is a very simple task, as demonstrated on Mr. Loff's DVD.

There is no charge for replacement parts. The unit is paid for in advance. The price for the super AWOS is a turnkey price, delivered, installed and functioning. There is no charge for monitoring, website hosting, or maintenance. The batteries need to be replaced every three years, and they cost around \$300. The unit comes with a three-year warranty, and can be extended for \$1,000 per year. Mr. Loff stated that he does not recommend purchasing the extended warranty, as it has never been used in the past 15 years since its inception.

Mr. Weaver asked Mrs. Hutter the cost of the normal yearly fee. Mrs. Hutter stated that we were currently paying \$300 per month for the maintenance contract on our current system, and that's before paying for parts.

Mr. Loff explained that the super AWOS has a warranty, and showed the DVD that demonstrated what was involved. It takes four to five hours to install the unit. A couple of switches are flipped, visibility is calibrated, and you're on-line, visible and operational that very same day.

Mr. Weaver asked Mr. Loff to explain the siting requirements for the unit. Mr. Loff explained that it would be sited basically within the runway environment. The older AWOS units have to be sited within x-100 feet from this and x-100 feet from that, and by the time the math is computed we're dealing with nearly 19 acres of territory. That specific siting does not apply to this unit. The AWOS was developed for the National Weather Service, not aviation, and that's where the siting requirements came in.

Mr. Weaver asked Mr. Loff if there were any units installed locally. Mr. Loff stated that there were units installed at Silver Springs, Bryant, Mono County, a couple along the coast at Fort Bragg, one at Mendocino Coast Hospital and one at the Mendocino Airport. The Minden-Tahoe Airport will be installing their unit this week or early next week, and would welcome a visit.

Mr. Loff explained that the super AWOS would report to both the National Weather Service and NOAA, so data would be imported and available to pilots, both on-line or via a telephone call. The siting criteria needed for the older unit does not apply here. Basic requirements include 125 feet back from the centerline, and on the instrument approach end of the runway would be the best area for placement, and would provide the best indicator of wind. Mr. Loff explained that unlike the other AWOS', this unit does everything in real time, instead of computing and averaging the information.

Mr. Loff played the DVD he had brought that showed how easy it is to conduct maintenance on the unit and to replace a module, should one need replacing.

Mr. Loff explained that the standard life of the older AWOS seems to be around 15 years. He stated he was not sure how long the super AWOS would last, but it could easily be 30 to 40 years or more. Mr. Loff discussed the ELT (emergency locator transmission), and indicated that the super AWOS picks up these transmissions.

The question was asked about standard protocol for replacement modules, and if any company could make them. Mr. Loff stated that his company was open to any company

that wanted to develop a module for the unit, but that the modules would have to meet certain standards and be compatible with the system.

After reviewing the DVD and discussing additional information, Mr. Loff stated that he believed the super AWOS would not only provide longer service than any other AWOS, it would also save the Airport thousands of dollars per year on maintenance costs alone. Mr. Loff stated that he has records of other airports all across the country that have these units, and was willing to share their statistical information with the Board if they so desired. Mr. Loff stated that the Board could also talk with other airports that has the unit.

Mrs. Hutter asked Mr. Loff if the super AWOS required a continuous internet connection. Mr. Loff confirmed that it required either a DSL or broadband-type connection that would provide continuous service; not dial-up service. With the caveat that the unit be placed within relatively close proximity to power (within 25 to 30 feet), the usual turn-key price would be \$69,850, and that is the unit delivered, installed and operational. Mr. Loff stated that the cost for the super AWOS is AIP eligible.

Mr. Clague asked Mr. Loff if his company did the installation. Mr. Loff stated that the airports do their own installation. Mr. Loff stated that it's not like a typical AWOS that takes two to three weeks to install. The super AWOS installation is typically completed in less than one day.

Mr. Lewis asked Mr. Clague how Silver Springs was able to provide the internet connection, since they are a remote location. Mr. Clague explained that they use a satellite link, which is what Carson City would have to use for a back-up system. That way if the internet provider failed, the system would revert to the satellite link, and would never be out of touch.

Mr. Sullivan asked if the unit was compatible with GPS. Mr. Weaver explained to Mr. Loff that the Airport was putting in a GPS approach or instrument landing system at the Airport, which engenders the ability to access the Airport in more inclement weather than in the past, without having to utilize the more expensive land-based system. Mr. Weaver asked Mr. Loff again if the super AWOS met the FAA's criteria for a GPS approach system. Mr. Loff confirmed that it met the FAA requirements for any instrument approach or flight operation system, and could even be used at Chicago's O'Hare Airport.

Mr. Handelin asked if any of the systems' data being supplied to the national weather service to generate a terminal forecast. Mr. Loff stated that yes, the information was being supplied to the national weather service and to NOAA, and that the Navy link would be going away.

Mr. Staub asked about back-up power. Mr. Loff explained that the unit was battery operated, and that when the lights at the airport would come on at night, the unit would recharge. The charge is sufficient to operate for several days, should the power go out. The unit also has headphones and a speaker system if the ability for emergency transmission is required.

Mr. Tackes asked Mr. Loff about siting requirements. Mr. Loff explained that the antenna needed to be 16 feet off the ground, and 125 feet from the centerline. The distance from the centerline is to place it far enough away to avoid the longest possible wingspan that might be operating at the Airport.

Mr. Tackes asked Mr. Loff about placement relative to nearby buildings. Mr. Loff stated that it was mostly common sense. He stated he has visited our Airport a couple of times. The triangle piece is not suitable, and rather sees placement of the super AWOS at the approach end of Runway 27. It could be placed at the threshold or even further in. Placement should be somewhere in the transition area between flight landing or takeoff.

Mr. Staub stated that the Airport Authority was saving every penny they had, and asked Mr. Loff if his company did financing. Mr. Weaver pointed out that the super AWOS was fundable, plus it won't cost the Airport Authority \$3,000 per year in maintenance fees, so it would virtually pay for itself. Mr. Loff stated that Minden was paying over \$10,000 per year for maintenance on their older unit. His company does not do financing, but they would lease the unit, although he did not know any advantages to leasing.

There were no additional Board comments at this time.

Mr. Lewis called for public comment.

Mr. Frank Hublou addressed the Board. He stated that the wind gusts cause a lot of difficulties at the Airport, but on the current system the winds are averaged before their broadcast. He asked how wind gust information would be handled.

Mr. Loff explained in some detail how the super AWOS would handle wind gust reporting, and believed the super AWOS would report the peak gusts. Mr. Loff stated that he would find out precisely how the unit would handle wind gust information, and report back to the Board.

There were no other public comments.

Mr. Lewis asked Mr. Loff if he could provide the Board with updated specifications and information on the system. Mr. Loff stated that he would do so, and would also supply a list of installed sites and references, including at least 20 board members and state officials, for the Board's review.

Mr. Weaver thanked Mr. Loff for adding an extra day to his travel schedule to make this presentation to the Airport Authority. Mr. Weaver stated that he considers the super AWOS to be a significant leap in technology and safety for the Airport, and thanked Mr. Loff for his time.

***There was a brief recess in the meeting while Mr. Loff packed his equipment. Approximately 8 minutes later the meeting was called back to order.***

- (3) DISCUSSION AND ACTION REGARDING A REQUEST FROM THE NEVADA MUSEUM OF MILITARY HISTORY TO ACQUIRE PROPERTY ON THE CARSON

CITY AIRPORT FOR THE PURPOSE OF CONSTRUCTING A MUSEUM (B. Lumbard). Mr. Robert Lumbard, President of the Nevada Museum of Military History (NMMH), provided his proposal to the Board, and discussed it in some detail, including the siting of the museum building and space set aside for the AWOS site. Mr. Lumbard explained that the proposal contained the items discussed at the previous two meetings.

Mr. Lumbard explained that the focus of the museum would be on education, and in getting students from all of the school districts to come visit the museum. Mr. Lumbard stated that he wanted to start a youth club or something similar to create interest among the young people in something other than drugs or alcohol. Mr. Lumbard explained that he also wanted to involve the community, especially on weekends where museum activities would not interfere with scheduled community events. Mr. Lumbard believes this will enhance the Airport and everything around it.

Mr. Lumbard explained that the museum group needed to have the Board's approval for the property so that they can submit grant requests to various foundations, and those submittals are required to be received in October and November. Mr. Lumbard expressed concern that if the Board's approval is not soon received, the museum would have to wait another year for the grant window to open again. Mr. Lumbard requested that, if it could be done, Board approval for the project be granted at this meeting so that his organization could move forward.

Mr. Lumbard asked the Board if they had any questions.

Mr. Peterson asked about the clear storage height requirement for the B-25. Mr. Lumbard stated it was 16 feet, top to tail. Mr. Peterson asked if the museum planned to utilize permanent long-term outside aircraft or vehicle storage. Mr. Lumbard stated that the museum currently did not have enough vehicles to store them outside, although they might eventually acquire military aircraft or vehicles that could be stored on ramp space outside, but they would be kept in good condition. Mr. Lumbard also stated that in the summer some of the vehicles might be placed outside the hangar for public viewing.

Mr. Peterson asked Mr. Lumbard if it would create an issue for the museum group if the lease contained language regarding cleanliness or the caretaking and upkeep of aircraft so that the lease space didn't look like a salvage yard. Mr. Lumbard stated that it would not be a problem to have such language in the lease. Mr. Lumbard explained that the hangar space and all of their equipment would be kept clean and in as excellent condition as they could keep it at all times. If the pieces looked like they belonged in a salvage yard then no one would want to come see them. Mr. Lumbard added that they would want to see a slight change in the wording of the lease model document provided to him that was originally offered to the EAA, so that they could run a restoration facility in the wing on the west side. The museum has received a letter from American Airlines giving them permission to paint a DC-3 in American's 1931 colors and fly it.

Mr. Weaver brought up the access to the property off College Parkway discussed at the previous meetings. He reported that he had taken it upon himself to talk with Mr. Chisel at NDOT, who stated that he thought a right turn in and a right turn out would be a great idea and should be easy enough to do, but it was not within his purview. That would be found with the RTC, which is represented by Mr. Staub. Mr. Weaver asked Mr. Staub

for his comments as to the entry lane, which appears could be done with virtually no impact.

Mr. Staub stated that, yes, the lane could be done with no problem, as long as the City engineers don't say otherwise. Mr. Staub repeated that he believed it would not be a problem to get the right-turn in, right-turn out lane completed.

Mrs. Hutter asked about the grants to build the facility, and whether grant funding was the source of the majority of the museum's funding. Mr. Lumbard stated that it was the primary source, but that the museum website would also be set up as a funding source. Mrs. Hutter asked Mr. Lumbard if the museum had a board. Mr. Lumbard stated that they did, and that the members were listed in the non-profit papers.

Mr. Tackes stated that he has received the articles of incorporation for the museum and checked with the Secretary of State to confirm that they are in good standing. Mr. Tackes stated that he has also received copies of the museum's IRS 501C3 non-profit status.

Mrs. Hutter asked about the museum's aircraft registration. She stated that she was not sure if aircraft were taxable since the museum is a 501c, but the aircraft do need to be registered in the state of Nevada if they're staying in our hangars. Mr. Lumbard stated that all the aircraft the museum owns would be registered to the museum in the city of Carson City, but had not understood that they were still considered "personal property."

Mr. Lewis referred to the handout on the schematic showing the future taxiway and runway. The drawing shows an area marked as additional area acquired and enclosed. Some discussion ensued concerning this sliver of land that would become available once the future taxiway is constructed. Mr. Lumbard stated that it would be the museum's desire to move their fence out to that line, opening up the area for more parking, view and ramp space.

Mr. Lewis asked Mr. Lumbard if he would like to have that land in the future. Mr. Lumbard stated that they would. Mr. Lewis asked Mr. Lumbard if he was requesting the land now, or if he would come back in the future to make his request. Mr. Lumbard stated that he would come back to the Board in the future and ask for the land when that land becomes available, as he believed it was not appropriate to include it in this negotiation.

Mr. Sullivan thanked Mr. Lumbard for returning to this meeting with all the documentation the Board had previously requested. He explained to Mr. Lumbard that he could come to the City for a major project review, which is a service the City provides free of charge. Mr. Sullivan stated that Mr. Lumbard has already assembled enough information to complete the project review. The City takes the information and in turn submits it to each department for comments and requests so that Mr. Lumbard would have the comments in hand before beginning construction. Mr. Sullivan commended Mr. Lumbard on his assemblage of complete information.

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

Mr. Handelin asked about the additional area that Mr. Lumbard would be requesting in the future. He asked if it was Airport property or BLM restricted area. Mr. Tackes stated that it was all Airport property. Mr. Handelin asked if it had to go out to bid. Mr. Tackes stated that it did not have to go out to bid, since the museum was a non-profit organization. Mr. Handelin stated that the area that would be coming available in the future might serve a better use as a vehicle access way off the taxiway, to keep vehicles off the taxiway.

Mr. Staub asked how long it would take for Mr. Lumbard's group to assemble enough money to begin construction. Mr. Lumbard stated that if possible, this month and next month's grant requests submitted to the various foundations should reveal by November whether they will generate enough money to begin. One of the variables is that some foundations issue 100 percent of their money at once, while other foundations issue their grant funding in quarterly chunks.

Mr. Staub asked if there was a one-year building restriction in the lease. Mr. Tackes explained that the lease contained a three-year phased schedule, but that was based on discussions with the EAA. The first year was set aside for permits, proper access, and leveling and preparing the site for improvements and utilities in place, and installing the fencing. The second year was set aside for paving for aircraft access and vehicle parking, installing the utilities and completing the final site grading. The third year was set aside for completing the final design and construction.

Mr. Staub asked Mr. Lumbard if his group had any problems with that schedule. Mr. Lumbard stated that they did not, but wanted to go along faster than that, if that was allowable. Mr. Tackes stated that there were no limits on going faster, as this was just an outline on how to get things done. Mr. Tackes added that there was also nothing that would prohibit the museum for requesting an extension of time.

Mr. Tackes explained that the lease model document originally provided to the EAA had also contained a 50-year term, a payment provision of \$1 per year plus 200 manhours of labor to the Airport Authority per year. Mr. Tackes stated that he was unsure if these terms fit this lease. The lease did not have to go out to bid, but that did not mean that the Board should not look at the terms to determine their appropriateness.

Mr. Peterson stated that he was on the board of a museum in Texas, and explained that it took ten years to build it, with major time spent on seeking grant funding. Mr. Peterson stated that it was his belief that the lease should be somewhat rewritten to address the possibility, and somehow anticipate that moneys might not come in as quickly as believed.

Mr. Lumbard stated that they museum already has some very wealthy backers who will support a good portion of it, but that they won't support anything if the museum has no land on which to build. Mr. Lumbard stated that it may take longer than necessary, but that they are attempting to counteract time delays by aggressively seeking the grant funding.

Mr. Weaver stated that some of the donation inquiries and donations have come to his attention and his customer base. To date, the museum either has the hardware in hand, or has a handshake intent on well over \$1.5M of equipment, including aircraft, vehicles and

military equipment. Mr. Weaver stated that Mr. Lumbard has also been provided the understanding that with the lease comes a man who will do all of the dirt work in return for nothing more than a thank-you letter for his donation of time and equipment use. Mr. Weaver stated that he sees it as a win-win for Carson City, its citizens and the museum. Mr. Weaver stated that Mr. Lumbard was being too humble when he did not expound on all the things he has already done, all the people with whom he has already spoken, and all of the letters of intent he has already received. At this point all he *can* receive are letters of intent, until the lease is approved.

Mr. Weaver asked Mr. Lumbard if he could make the museum envisioned work on the original piece of property known as BLM property, on the chance that maybe the extra pie-shaped piece of land will not be available in the future.

Mr. Lumbard explained that their drawings show a 12,000-sf hangar, which can store a DC-3, a B-25 and various other pieces of equipment. Mr. Lumbard stated that he was willing to sign the lease on the BLM property.

Mrs. Hutter asked Mr. Lumbard for his estimated budget for the building site improvements. Mr. Lumbard stated that he believed it would cost approximately \$1M, although they are trying to reduce the cost by having services donated, such as the grading work mentioned above.

There were no additional Board questions or comments at this time. Mr. Lewis asked if there were any public comments. There were none.

Mr. Staub moved to approve the request from the Nevada Museum of Military History to acquire the property on the Carson City Airport known as the BLM property in the triangle shape for the purpose of constructing a museum in accordance with the lease to be negotiated between the museum and Airport counsel, to be submitted to the Airport Authority for approval.

Mrs. Hutter seconded the motion.

There was no further discussion at this time. Mr. Lewis called the vote. The motion carried with six ayes and one abstention (Mr. Weaver, as explained above).

Mr. Tackes stated that he would incorporate the items discussed. Mr. Weaver asked if the total ban on outside storage could be removed or adjusted, as the federal government will give the museum a plane of our choosing of any fighter they have for outside display – but that's "outside storage." Mr. Weaver asked Mr. Tackes if he could include a codicil to allow for that.

Some discussion ensued as to the timing of final approval of the lease, and whether it would be completed in time for the next regular meeting to meet Mr. Lumbard's grant funding timeline. Mr. Staub pointed out that the lease has essentially been approved, so that should be enough information for Mr. Lumbard to proceed with his grant funding requests.

Regarding timeframes in the lease, Mr. Staub stated he would like to leave them as they are. The term of the lease, however, is for 50 years, and Mr. Staub restated his interest in

periodic lease reviews. He pointed out that 50 years is a long time, and even though this space is for a non-profit group, Mr. Staub requested that language in the lease be included to allow a five-year review schedule so that the Airport Authority can review the lease every five years. Mr. Lombard stated that this would be acceptable.

There were no additional directions for Airport Counsel concerning the lease documents at this time.

(4) DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION TO ADOPT VEHICLE RULES AND REGULATIONS IN ACCORDANCE WITH AC 150/5210-20 GROUND VEHICLE OPERATIONS ON AIRPORTS (*G. Handelin*).

Mr. Handelin explained that several months ago the issue was brought forward concerning vehicle traffic on Taxiway Charlie and what could be done about that. The Board had finally decided to allow vehicles to drive on the taxiway once signage was put up, but that has been put on hold. Mr. Handelin stated that allowing vehicles on Taxiway Charlie was a moot point, since vehicles have to be allowed to drive on Taxiways Bravo and Alpha in order for them to get to their leased hangars. Mr. Handelin stated that he reviewed Advisory Circular 150/5210-20, which addresses ground vehicle operations on airports. In the back of it is a sample of airport driving rules and regulations, which Mr. Handelin took and modified to be applicable to the Carson City Airport, and distributed it to the Board.

Mr. Lewis stated that Mr. Handelin had done a great job, and he thought that it was high time that the Airport adopted airport vehicle traffic rules that can be enforced. Mr. Lewis asked the Board for their comments.

Mr. Peterson asked if this was a proposal intended to be acted upon at this meeting, or whether Board members could have the opportunity to read and review the proposal prior to making a motion. Mr. Handelin stated that a motion needed to be made at this meeting, tonight.

Mr. Weaver thanked Mr. Handelin for his work on the document, recognizing that it had taken Mr. Handelin some time to complete the task. Mr. Weaver asked if the document had been reviewed by Airport Counsel and signed off, the District Attorney's office for impact or overlap of rules, and whether the FAA had been offered the opportunity to review and sign off on it. Mr. Handelin answered no, no and no, respectively.

Mr. Tackes stated that he actually had reviewed the document and it looks good, but recommended a slight change at the beginning to reflect the Authority provided to the Board by NRS 844, Chapter 10, regarding regulating traffic at the Airport. Mr. Tackes stated he would be surprised if the District Attorney's office would provide any meaningful input regarding the document. Mr. Tackes stated that in his opinion the document was ready for distribution after some minor edits. It resolves some issues for the Airport, and takes care of the bigger issue, which is safety of vehicles on the Airport.

Mr. Weaver asked how the rules and regulations would be enforced. If a ticket were written against a violation, the District Attorney would not enforce the ticket because we are not representative law enforcement officers.