

MINUTES
ABERDEEN REGIONAL AIRPORT BOARD
Regular Meeting
May 7, 2009

MEMBERS PRESENT: Mike Erickson, Rolf Johnson, Chuck Bensen, Steve Kaiser, Nate Zeeb

MEMBERS ABSENT:

OTHERS PRESENT: Dave Osborn, Bob King, Kevin Braun, Comm. Wiese, Joel Weig, Gary Dahlerup, John Aman, Mark Caven, Sam Muntean, Rhea Ketterling

Chairman Erickson called the regular scheduled meeting of the Aberdeen Regional Airport Board to order at 11:30am on Thursday, May 7, 2009.

Bensen moved approval of the minutes from the April 9, 2009 meeting, seconded by Johnson. Motion carried.

Old Business: (Radio – Rainey) Osborn received a call from FAA and they are not intending on changing anything at this time. One of the reasons that they stipulate is that there had not been any complaints from pilots from Aberdeen according to their records. Osborn stated he knows for 15 to 16 years since it was moved that there had been communication problem where Minneapolis Center (MSP) could not find a plane because the pilots could not communicate with them when they are on the ground, so this is not something new. They did let Osborn know that we can use entitlement money for a Ground Communication Outlet which basically will need a phone line to work. Osborn had talked to someone from MSP Center about this and this is actually utilized a lot in Minnesota and Wisconsin and had really good results. Osborn stated this is an alternate that can be utilized which is something we will look farther into and it is priced at about \$6,000. At this point in time FAA is having a lot of changes with staffing and they have other issues and this issue may not be as important to them. Osborn stated this might be something we can take care of locally with not a very large cost. This can be put in the statewide book to inform pilots that we have this control. Bensen stated this way our ground crew could also check with ATC whether anyone is inbound on approach during inclement weather. Kaiser asked where is the actual body that answers this ATC and how is the relay set up. Osborn stated it would be in Minneapolis and the relay would be transmitted through a transmitter that is already here. Kaiser asked if we would need an antenna to receive the pilot's signal to get this to work and it would be an add on to the \$6,000. Osborn stated this is not something he had checked into and was told \$6,000 for a complete item. Chairman Erickson asked if we have kept a complaints file on this. Osborn stated there are really not a lot of complaints filed in the office. More times we hear that a plane did not call MSP Center where the plane is already on the ground. What we are hearing is that they made communication when they were on the ground. So most of the time communications are made, but not received. Gary Dahlerup, a local pilot stated on your plane there is a bottom and a top antenna. If you are using the radio that has the bottom antenna most of the time you will not hear. There are certain spots in the airport that works and does not work. Bensen stated his concern on this is that if he is an aircraft coming in and he is not monitoring frequency 121.725, he is not hearing anyone trying to call ATC to find out if someone is coming in. It helps when the conversation is heard over the radio and monitoring it, but his concern is what if you are not. Osborn stated he is just bringing this up to the Board for discussion. Our FAA contact in Bismarck who Osborn made a complaint to is not in at this time and is out for 6 weeks. Osborn plans on continuing to talk about this and why FAA would say no. We also have some visitors coming from the Bismarck office next week and Osborn will try to visit with them on this. Braun from Quest Aviation stated there are actually two problems. One for aircraft on the ground trying to get clearance to get out and the other is for aircraft coming in don't get their clearance cancelled. Braun stated what they had numerous times is when MSP Center calls around to FBO's or whoever to see if a plane has come in because they lost communication and this ties up all other inbound IFR traffic until this is clear. Braun stated this is a bigger issue than the Airport realizes, it is an outbound and inbound problems and it is a weekly thing for them. (Beving – Motorcycle) The display is up, but the plaque is not and it should be here by the end of the week.

Johnson moved approval of the bills for the month of April, seconded by Zeeb. Johnson asked if there is any contract warranty on SRE Bldg in-floor heat pump. King stated back in January we had both heat pump go out at the same time. One part is under warranty, but we had to pay for Freon, labor and the control valve. Johnson asked what about the high voltage PCB. King stated this is for our REIL's and it went out. Kaiser asked about the yellow paint. This is to paint Txy C. Motion approving the bills for the month is carried.

Kaiser moved approval of the April financial report with the deletion of Great Lakes balance, seconded by Bensen. Chairman Erickson asked if Kaiser checked with legal counsel. Kaiser stated he talked to Altman, City Attorney who does not think that this will be collectable and we are just wasting our time. Johnson asked if the City Finance Office have any recommendation on a direct write-off like this, how it is handled accounting wise. Osborn stated basically the last

comment he had is to continue to do the billing as per request for our contract which we will continue to do. Base on this report makes no difference at all. If the Board prefers not to have it on this report, this is not a problem. If legal counsel says they have an issue with and does not think this is collectible, this is their job and we turn this over to them. Kaiser stated this comes down to Great Lakes never used the service, they moved out and they are gone. We are charging for something that we never give them a service for and this would be a tough fight in court. Osborn stated when this was discussed with the City Council; we had made a decision to go forward with this. The Council had given Altman advice that if it becomes where it is not a value to the City, Altman was to do an assessment in his opinion what is valuable to acquire. At some point in time if it's not worth his time the Council gave him an option of what he wants to do. When we approach this to be collected through the City Council this was their recommendation to Altman. Johnson stated for Altman to make the decision. Osborn stated this is correct. Zeeb asked would there be any value if we leave it on the report, would there be any reimbursable dollars. Osborn stated basically what we will do if we take it out of this report is give Altman a copy of the bill every month to show what the balance is and if he wants to continue with his effort. Johnson asked we are reuping a term on a lease to continue for how many more months. Osborn stated he believes it's through September of this year where they would complete their obligation. Motion approving the financial report with deleting Great Lakes balance is carried.

Osborn stated the Air Show committee met yesterday. They will be assigning jobs next month. The request to Hotel Alliance will have to be in by May 28th and from there the group will apply for the Governor's grant. Kaiser stated he made up eight points that we can put in to marketing idea and forgot to send this to be part of the agenda. One of the items on this was we hand out a card advertising the airport for everybody that shows up like "it's cheaper to fly from Aberdeen than it is to drive to Sioux Falls" or "Free Parking in Aberdeen" and put this in an advertising card which Kaiser thought that the Chamber's Bed and Booze fund can be use for this. Kaiser asked how many people we had on the last Air Show. Osborn stated we had about 5,500 people last year that went through the gate. Osborn reminded Kaiser that we have to be careful that we not only do this for the Air Show because of the Governor's grant. Kaiser stated this is just one of the ideas for marketing the Airport. When we did the marketing study a year ago, Kaiser stated the flag to him was that there are 47% of the people that were surveyed that has not use this Airport. They are either going someplace else or they are not flying. Kaiser will have something on this in next month's meeting.

Bensen moved approval of PE #5 in the amount of \$10,887.06 for work completed in the Environmental Assessment, seconded by Zeeb. Osborn stated Wednesday next week FAA is coming to discuss and review this program. FAA also would like to meet with Mr. Antonides. Muntean from Helms and Associates stated it is a progress report to make sure we are on track. Muntean reminded the Board that once the Environmental Assessment is done, this becomes an FAA document and they take ownership of it. Johnson asked will the EA gives us the current state of the Airport or the future expansion. Muntean stated the EA is covering two different things; one is the safety of the Airport which is the decoupling of the runway ends and shifting it to the South and the second half is the Wildlife mitigation which mostly filling in wetlands to eliminate habitats and look at the impact. Osborn stated the EA also has a limited life that we can use it. Muntean stated publicly we have three years to get the work started. Johnson asked what about the property that the Airport does not currently own yet, South from here with the expansion that could happen and what is the impact in this area. Osborn stated pretty much what had been discussed is that it will be limited out there with the expansion. We need the EA to go forward and we have to get this approved. We have to follow FAA regulations to make sure we are not creating another wildlife issues or things like that. Motion approving payment to Helms and Associated PE #5 is carried.

Muntean stated they had the go ahead from FAA that the AIP entitlement funds will be here for this year, so we are moving forward with our projects. The project as envision was to reconstruct all the hangar taxilane; 2 on the inside, 2 on the other side and a new one in the back to accommodate BII size aircraft. There will be issues like budget wise, we might not have enough entitlement funding to do all of this so they is working on the design and bid them. If we are short of fund, they might scale back and not include one or two of the taxilane as funding permits. The second issue is as they are working in the area we will be disrupting active hangar users. Muntean also have met with the Airport and discussed what would be the best way to work around this. What had been discussed is we want to minimize the time that they will be in front of one person's hangar. We also want to minimize the risk. The risks are if they can't use their hangar the aircraft is either stuck in the hangar and they risk not being able to fly when they want to or they have to relocate their aircraft somewhere else possibly not inside a hangar, so it is sitting out and it has the risk of being damage because of inclement weather. Muntean added they had looked at the number of hangars that will be affected in any one time and minimize the amount of time that we will be affecting anyone's hangar. The best way to do this is to put on the specification that the contractor will work on one taxilane at the time and get this done to be usable before they move on to the next one, so we are not displacing everybody out of their hangar; only displacing one section of hangars at the time. This way there maybe some arrangements that can be made between hangar owners, if they are displaced out of their hangar. Osborn stated prior to starting the project they will have a meeting with the hangar owners. Muntean stated they will also have start date on which taxilane will be worked on. One thing that Muntean will ask for if there are critical time for any users in any area where they use their aircraft more or where they have certain events that they need to have their aircraft to get this information to Osborn so this can be included in project specification. The middle taxilane will be open for users as this was done about 3 to 4 years ago. Johnson asked what kind of improvements will happen in this process.

Muntean stated all the existing pavement will be remove, soil boring had been completed this week, more than likely they will be going down 40", remove all the existing material out and will put granule material and they will be putting a separator fabric to separate the granule from the clay underneath, possibly putting geo grid to create structural support in the pavement layer, will be putting underdrain piping to remove ground water from both sides of each fence. With this there is an existing lift station that will be rehab and put a new monitoring system that the City has. They will look at possibly replacing the pump and also the control will be replaced. Currently the taxilane that are built now are inverted and the water is coming down to the centerline where most of the damage is now, like cracks. What they will do is reconstruct the outdated one way so we don't have water hanging up in the middle of the pavement. Chairman Erickson asked if Muntean will be taking any input as to which one is priority if we do not have enough funding to do the total project. Will the one in the back bigger priority than rebuilding the others. Muntean stated obviously this will come up for discussion at that time. The other thing that will come up is the condition of the existing ones as there are taxilane that are not usable which will be high on priority. One other issue Muntean is working with FAA is that none of the hangar taxilane meets the FAA standards for BI aircraft. They are so small by anywhere from 1' to 5'. There is not enough clearance between the buildings. This is not to say that they cannot be use by these aircrafts or they are not safe, it just does not meet FAA standards. What FAA does have is remodify their standards or to apply the equation they use for the safety areas and what this does is that we can use an aircraft up to the wingspan of 45'. Braun asked are we then prohibiting aircraft with more than 45'. Osborn stated basically since we are building a BII, Braun can come on the back side and this will take care of part of Braun's problem. Braun stated they can't get to this. Osborn stated basically by going to BII the availability when Braun can get in and out will be there. In the meantime Osborn stated he knows when Braun put a plane back in the hangar they are wing walking it and making it safe which really makes a difference. Braun asked how the new BII will benefit him. Osborn stated when Braun talked about the expansion he had talked having a door at that end of hangar #11. Braun asked but what about hangar #10. Muntean stated to keep in mind we are not changing anything right now. The clearance that we have now is the clearance that we are going to have. Chairman Erickson asked with the elevation change, how this will affect the apron on one side of the other. Muntean stated they will somewhat affect them and they are trying to keep this down to a minimum as much as they can. Chairman Erickson stated if someone is interested on building a hangar in the BII area to let the Airport know now so we know if we build the BII taxilane or not. Osborn stated to keep in mind that when we do a project and we impact someone we do have to consider this and this is where they talked about Braun's issue with the sewer line that actually goes through the areas, every taxilane we impact affects him. Osborn had a conversation with FAA on what can be done. Maybe it will resolve all the problems that Braun have down the road. Osborn stated we will impact almost all of Braun's line. Kaiser asked what the recommendation is until this gets resolve. Muntean stated they have put a request in to FAA. One of the things that can be done is the possibility of extending the line out. We will impact the line with the project. It is eligible to redo it, but it doesn't make sense to spend all that money if it still in the way. The best solution according to Muntean is to relocate it, which Braun prefers to relocate the line around the hangar area instead of it being repaired. It is project eligible, whether FAA would say partial or not, Muntean does not know. Johnson asked if this can be gravity flow situation rather than force. Muntean stated it can be. Kaiser asked will this affect Hangar 9. Osborn stated Hangar 9 will not be affected as they are going the opposite way where they would come to the main. Chairman Erickson asked what the timeframe is when this is ready to bid. Muntean stated the tentative schedule is that they would like it ready for bid before the end of May. Braun explained where their sanitary sewer is now, their lift station and where they are pumping now and it ends up to a manhole that is about 1,000'. Braun stated they have four floor drain pipes that comes out of their hangar one way and if they go to a different system these pipes will have to be reversed to go another way which is also work that needs to be addressed. Osborn stated one thing that will happen is that FAA will make a recommendation and they may say that whatever we interrupt is what they will consider and this is the figure we have to stick with.

Osborn stated we are sending two of our staff to Siemens training, Bob Pagel and Dale Thone on June 15th – 18th. We do not have anyone with a background in electrical to take care of all the lighting. We had spent a lot of money over the years hiring an electrician. Osborn thinks this is a benefit to our staff to understand electricity. The travel cost is about \$3,300 which we have budgeted. Johnson asked where are the staff going. Osborn stated they will be going to Ohio. King stated the staff will actually go to Siemens factory where they will have tech rep there as our airfield lighting gets advance with LED lighting and different signs. We just need to get more training for our guys to maintain proficiency on the airfield. Johnson stated either that or hire an electrical contractor. Osborn stated repair cost would be more, not that we do not need an electrician. Johnson asked are staff going to be running lines. Osborn stated this would be basically for repair. Bensen moved approval of travel request for Pagel and Thone, seconded by Kaiser. Motion carried.

Request to purchase a 2009 Ford Pick-up. Johnson asked what happen with the trade-in. Osborn stated the City does allow that we can trade-in, but more times than nothing it goes to City Surplus. Johnson asked if we are adding a vehicle. Osborn stated we are replacing the old Suburban which will be auction on Friday. The Board did approve this to be put in the auction which has 140,000 miles. Osborn stated what we do is look at State bids for vehicle. We had looked at Chevy as well as Ford. With the State bid there was a spec for a Chevy ½ ton with Ford there are many more options. We are asking for a ¾ ton Ford and we had ask local dealership to bid on a ½ ton Chevy and Lust Chevrolet decided not to bid. Pierson Ford said that they will match the State bid, if they are paid the travel and the items under the bid that is allowable. Osborn stated he is asking the Board's approval to get a ¾ ton Ford. Johnson asked how come this was in

the City's agenda already. Osborn stated we had a problem with ¾ ton under this year had a timeframe to be done. This was put in with the City to make sure that we have their approval at the same time. Ford was only making so many more and there was time limit when we can order and Tom Barber had asked that it be done in a fast timely manner. Johnson stated this might be the reason why we did not get a Chevy pick-up. Zeeb asked if we need a new vehicle, can we get by with what we have. Osborn stated we actually tried to move the Suburban a couple of times, where every year we asked for a request from the City as a budgeted item and this is the year we asked for that budget. Zeeb asked can we get by with a 2007 or 2008 slightly use that we can buy. Osborn stated when we do this we have to go through State bid where you don't see a 2007 or 2008. Zeeb stated so we do not have an option to buy anything other than what is on the State bid. Osborn stated we can go out and buy outside the State bid, but we have to bid it, spec it and cost of time our time. Johnson stated we also have to deal with cost warranty situation and current conditions and other things that need to be spec. Johnson added \$20,000 for a new vehicle ¾ ton is hard to beat. Kaiser moved to purchase a 2009 Ford pick-up, seconded by Bensen. Dahlerup asked about the color. Osborn stated they talked about color extensively and thought about the red would be the best. We are not buying white anymore. Discussion on having a red vehicle is better than having white as it can be easily seen when there are snow banks on the runway. Zeeb stated before he votes, did we look at used vehicles at all. Osborn stated that we did not. Motion approving the purchase of 2009 ¾ ton Ford pick up is carried with Zeeb voting ney.

Osborn stated Aman and himself visited earlier in the week about the contract. Aman stated he and others had gone through the contract. When the FBO was approved, it was also stipulated that would not commence business until such time as the security fence whether be it temporary or permanent is in place and then also can begin with construction for access road, parking lot, sanitary sewer system to make it habitable. Aman referred to Article III, Section D, item 7 – were it stated “the Lessee is to install access road leading to Property from the publicly accessible airport entrance and upon completion it shall be dedicated to the City”. This supposedly makes it reimbursable for this portion through AIP funds. The problem that Aman has with this which he had talked to Osborn about last Thursday is FAA does not like to reimburse the project that had gone after the fact. So with this Aman stated we have a private investor that is building our infrastructure and giving it to the City. They have no way to recoup their expenses other than if somebody else comes in and ties into it, now it then lies a problem for the sanitary sewer because they are not going to dig more than 4” main line which only handle one user. If Aman is to build a hangar and put a full service then they will have to dig up the road the second time to tie in again. It counts out about 13 hangar spaces that would be there including Arment's and where Hangar 9 sits right now. Aman does not think it is unreasonable to say Hangar 9 would dig out and connect at some point throughout the parking lot area or the area where encompasses where Hangar 9 is to have an infrastructure available for multiple tie-ins and not have to tear out the road on a continuing basis for future. If the cargo area would move down to the corner where they are at, then they will have extended business interruption for them on this part which is not recoverable. Aman realizes this is not in the AIP budget now, but it might be something that can go before the City for unexpected or unanticipated expenditures. Aman is willing to go to the City with Osborn with this request. Aman asked Muntean if the lighting handle that leads out from the transmitter relay to the taxiway and such is buried in 2” conduit. Muntean stated they are buried in conduit and there are some PVC's there, but size wise he is not sure. This would have to come from the electrical engineer. There are also manholes out there. Aman stated so when Hangar 9 is ready for the 100x100 space it would be possible to asphalt the area between the two spaces. If they so chose to put a gate access similar to what Quest has in the front to access the ramp area knowing that there is a cable laying underneath and should not be affected as Aman guesses it is down to a minimum of 12” probably 24”. Muntean stated he believes it is about 18” to 36” and he can check with the electrical engineer. Engineering wise they put pavement over top of conduit all the time. Typically underneath pavement they go to geo-conduit because it's not down as deep. The other thing is it is a City pavement and they may have other standard. Aman stated this is a question for Osborn then and the Board knowing at such time they do put in a gate. Osborn stated for Aman to keep in mind where the contract is now. We need to talk about the infrastructure that had been discussed. As Aman and Osborn had talked the City of Aberdeen and the Airport has never assisted anyone with their infrastructure. Those people that want it will put this in. We have a lot of hangar owners that does not have a tie in at all and choose not to have it and if they are going to have it they will put it in as well as the businesses here. As for Aman doing business here, Osborn stated as a business operator Aman was told going into to this that they will meet the requirement prior to doing construction. We had gone out to find that FAA would give Aman some value to a certain extent, if it is done but it has to be done on Aman's cost. Aman stated but Osborn also had said on Thursday that FAA will not generally provide reimbursement for projects done after the fact. Osborn stated if the project is completed and something is done after the fact, but Aman talked about taking the road out and this is done. What we are talking about is an item if Aman builds it; we will look at getting this reimbursed. Osborn stated there is a difference of what Aman is saying; Aman as a private entity putting this in. Osborn already had talked to FAA and that we do not have it in this year's entitlement, but we like it reimbursed and FAA already said they will considered it. Aman was given a figure in project choice of 1 or 2 and shows what FAA would reimburse. This was from the preliminary work from Helms and this is going to be solid that is why when the contract was done it says that Aman needs to do certain things and would be reimbursed based on the entitlement funding and this will be done. The other part of the contract that talks about turning it over to the City, Aman and Osborn already talked about the purpose of this. When Osborn sat down with the City Attorney, the City Attorney had to put this in the contract and this is because for the care of afterwards. Once the road is built, the first winter Aman will probably not have the equipment to clear the road. Do we have the right to go on

that road to clear it, we don't'. The City Attorney had asked to put this in the contract simply for the fact that we then have the right to insure that it is maintained and clear so they can get in and out. Osborn does not think there is any difference of what he and Aman talked about and hopes that it was not a misunderstanding. Comm. Wiese stated if Aman turns over the road it would be advantageous to them. Osborn agreed. Aman stated what the lease also states is that reimbursement lies only with the Lessee, but the Lessee cannot apply for those funds. Osborn agrees that an individual cannot apply. They have to apply through the Airport as we are the entitlement guarantee. Aman stated the paragraph states that they are responsible for reimbursement. Osborn stated the purpose of this paragraph was that Aman has to notify Osborn that they are done with the project. We then notify Muntean to make sure that the standards are met to be reimbursable. We have to make sure that Aman had fulfilled the FAA requirements. Chairman Erickson suggested that this particular paragraph be rewritten (Article III, Section D, item 9). Osborn stated if this is the request he can take it back to the City Attorney that Aman do the application through the Airport. At this point in time the contract is with the Airport so this is where Aman will work with. Osborn suggested for Aman to draft something on how he wants it to read and Osborn will take this to the City Attorney and get his response. Aman stated as far as the security fence, is it feasible to forgo the back BII taxiway and reallocate those funds for the security fence as right now there is nothing back there except for dirt pile. Osborn stated entitlement wise what we could probably do is look on prior years, but we have to do our application back in March. We already given FAA our information, for us to go back again Osborn does not think it will work. Aman stated this is understandable, but all of this was on the table at that time. Osborn stated but he still does not have a signed contract. Aman stated we still do not have a contract because what the City Attorney sent before the March Board meeting was incorrect. It was for a hangar lease not an FBO lease. It was three weeks later when Osborn emailed the City Attorney the FBO lease and the City Attorney took the document and amended it and changed the settings and emailed it back and it was handed out to the Board the day of last month's meeting. So we had gone 60 days basically sparring wheels and this is one of the reasons why there is no sign document yet. Osborn stated he knows there had been delayed in the process and will not account for what the City Attorney does. What Osborn will tell Aman is basically we had done all our efforts. The reality is the comment that needs to be address from Aman is what their intentions are and go from there. The Board has been very acceptable in the fact that they allowed them to go into business portion that don't affect the fence. Kaiser asked where we are with this fence issue. Osborn stated he and Muntean can look at previous money to see if it can go through the entitlement and Osborn will ask the Feds for this. Kaiser asked is the security fence going to cost as much as the taxiway. Muntean stated he is fairly sure it is less than \$40,000. The hangar taxilane will be about \$300,000 to \$400,000. Osborn stated he is not saying that we can't look at if we have money left over like from last year's project and maybe this can be included, but he can't give Aman a timeframe. We have to go with our plan that is out there, what FAA knows we are doing. Osborn used the example of the Old Terminal building where we wanted to tear it down and then told FAA we wanted to use it for a business. FAA will say make up your mind. We had given them our plan for this year. Osborn understands Aman's circumstances, but Aman also knew going into this that they will be dollars upfront. We will try our best to get the funding based on the requirements. Kaiser asked how much of the \$40,000 for the security fence directly attributable to Hangar 9 and this is so to allow them to be in business. Osborn stated the fence is to secure the field. Aman stated what the security fence would be is it would come off of the airport access road and come in and tie-in in front of Arment's hangar would then come across corner to corner. For option 1 it was estimated at \$36,450. Kaiser asked if Hangar 9 doesn't want to put the fence up. Aman stated Hangar 9 wants to have the fence up. Hangar 9 does not feel that because they are the only one in the area however according to the approved Master Plan and Airport Layout Plan, they still don't feel it is their responsibility to make the entire alteration. Muntean stated which had been discussed. This is an eligible cost, the fencing, under AIP funding. The issue is as Osborn had stated is that in December we had to put in our Capital Improvement Plan and validate our project for next year with the FAA and December of last year none of this was on the table. It had been talked about, but we did not have any specifics. Aman stated this is correct, but on the application also it stipulated that it would be finalized at the March meeting at which time this was already all out. Osborn reminded Aman again that we do not have a signed contract and we do not have one today which Aman agreed. Osborn stated he has a hard time telling FAA he would need \$40,000 for a fence that we do not have a contract on. This is the same concept when Aman talks about the road. Aman has a hard time paying for the road when ownership will not stay the same. What Osborn had said is that we will look at other projects to see if there is money left over. Kaiser asked how long until we find this out. Osborn stated Obenauer from FAA ADO office is in Chicago for 6 weeks. Osborn will see if someone from the FAA office who will be here next week can talk about this and get an idea from them. Kaiser stated this discussion is really academic until we find out the answer. Kaiser asked if Osborn needs the Board to have a special meeting in about two weeks or whatever as they can do this. Aman stated the only other thing that he and Osborn had discussed so they can proceed while it is still ongoing is getting the concrete flooring done in the current hangar. A couple of a different routes had been discussed and one being utilizing the construction access on hwy 12 and having a gate keeper there. They all came to a conclusion that this is probably not the best way to bring a truck in right now because of the high water table; it would just cause undo damage. Osborn had offered to come through the terminal gate and Aman stated that they will still pick up the truck and escort the truck and not cause any damage the rest of the ground. Aman stated this is completely acceptable. Osborn stated so the only issue right now is Article III, Section D, item 9. Aman agreed. Chairman Erickson asked Muntean about the sewer main line for future expansion. Muntean stated there are two sewer system and a manhole. Any hangar that will be built in this area wanting a sewer service would have to tear the road and this would be the hangar owner's responsibility to repair the road. Aman stated you don't have to

necessarily trench across the entire road. We could just get a boring outfit in and directional bore over to. Muntean stated we can actually look at this too. Aman stated the cost would be about the same. The only benefit is that we are not going to have the support settling in and having to come in and patch the road. Chairman Erickson stated he just had the similar situation when he run waterline on to his property where they were going to put in 6" and they paid to put the line in and the City made up the difference in cost to go to 12". Chairman Erickson stated he wonders if something like this is in our best interest, let Hangar 9 pay for trenching the line and we pay for the difference from what they will originally put in to get service in that area. Zeeb asked would there then be hook up fees. Aman stated there's always hook up fees that is attributed to City's infrastructure. Osborn stated this was part of an earlier discussion which was some of the discussions from downtown was if there are discharge and there are issues with discharge it can go on the main line. This was discussed a while back; not that it can't be done, but this is one of the issues that the City had. Chairman Erickson stated we have all the other hangars and who knows what's they are putting down the drain already. Kaiser thinks that the staff should be directed to draw up the infrastructure in this area and asked King if we are capable of doing this. King stated we do not have the staff that are capable of doing locates and we do not have the equipment to do it. Osborn stated what we can do is when we do the hangar taxilane, we may have a form for the hangar owner to fill out of who has what. Comm. Wiese stated the hangar owner can put in a sewer line and the City will cost share with expanding the capability of the expectation. Kaiser stated the staff should work on this and whatever method they have to use, use it. We need to know this and is probably a smart thing for us to know to begin with. Osborn stated this might not be timely for Aman as they have to get going with their road. Osborn stated we are talking about a project that has not been bid. Kaiser stated we also need to take care of Braun's (Quest) problem and would rather make a decision when we know who has what in their hangar. Osborn stated this is something we can do and put on our master list on who has what. Osborn and Aman will get together on the issue on item 9 and send it to the City Attorney as soon as possible. Osborn stated not to slow Aman down; we will try to find out the other information from FAA on the fence. Osborn added to be honest he does not want to go in and take what is on the grant that we had hang on for that long. Osborn does not want Aman to feel push aside, but the reality is this is an obligation we have to do and accept. Muntean added this is an odd year too where FAA has their funding in two different parts where it made it more complicated. Because of this the FAA programming system is already a little skewed to make adjustment electronically. In past years what actually came was they got the money in one big lump and went forward. We have been able to say we wanted to do this, but because of this coming up we would like to add this, change it or modify it and FAA has tried to work with you. Kaiser stated there is no harm on asking, Muntean agreed and Osborn stated that we would. Aman stated having this and the application on the table for any additional stimulus funds that may become available too benefits the Airport. There are stimulus funds that came about and it's a first come first serve basis and Osborn and Aman had this conversation. Aman stated he knows that there are none right now and in talking to Obenauer the same person Osborn talks too, Obenauer had also stated that there is nothing available. However this does not mean the there will not be something that would not come down the pipe tomorrow or the next day and it is a first come first serve basis. If Aman's application is there it gets dealt with. Osborn stated one of the things that are advantageous to us is to look at some of our old projects that we might have some money that will be expiring and this would be a lot easier conversation rather than going after of what we already have set up to do. Chairman Erickson asked about the item #9. Osborn stated once the City Attorney looks at the revision on item #9, this will be sent to the Board for their review. Chairman Erickson stated the Board did vote on this contract. Osborn stated the Board did vote on the contract and we did say if there were changes on their request we would bring them back to the Board. If there is something the City Attorney does not agree with, this would be between the City Attorney and Hangar 9 and this would be sent back to the Board once it is finalized.

Osborn stated occasionally the Airlines itself comes out with their own requirement. One of the things we are seeing new coming from the Airline is a Service Animal Relief area. We have to designate an area which Osborn had told the Airline they can use the east and the west side of the building because their requirement states that they have to have bags and other things to do clean up. Osborn had told the Airline this is part of their responsibility when they use this area.

Osborn stated as part of marketing during this time of year, we still get a number of requests for the FBO's and/or the Airport to takes kids through. Next week Wednesday, Aberdeen Flying Service has three groups coming from Britton-Hecla, Edmunds Central and Fullerton Colony. Afterwards they will be coming to the terminal. They go to the FBO's to see planes as we cannot always guarantee them here. This is just one other way we do a little marketing of the Airport.

Osborn stated just a reminder that the City Surplus sale is tomorrow.

Kaiser stated Absolutely Aberdeen Downtown Development Association and the Chamber of Commerce went together and hired a consultant to look at basically the wrongs and rights the way we are promoting visitors to the community as well as presenting to those visitors. Among of the things Roger Brooks (Destination Development) brought up was the Airport. Brooks had said that we really have a nice airport and he really likes it. Brooks does consulting studies, surveys and makes recommendations. Brooks had a lot of recommendations, but what he said about the Airport was that he really likes when you first arrive when you get your bags right across is information about the City. Brooks was very complimentary about this and that when you walk into the terminal you see what's in the City on the banners. The only thing that Brooks may have tweaked us on was our signage as it does not explain very well. When Brooks was driving

out here, Brooks thought that he can turn to the other place (GA Entrance) to get to the terminal. Brooks felt that this could be better explain to the motorist as they are going by; where the main terminal is versus where General Aviation is.

Braun from Quest asked about the turnstile access gate used for after hours if this is in allocation for this year. Osborn thought that this was in the spec from last year, but had not done this part of the project yet. Muntean thought that it was in the grant description and just had not done it yet.

Bensen moved to adjourn, seconded by Zeeb. The meeting adjourned at 1:15 pm.