

**CARSON CITY AIRPORT AUTHORITY  
MEETING MINUTES**

**WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 17, 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 6:02 p.m. Roll call was taken, and quorum was determined:

Present: Neil Weaver, Collie Hutter, Steve Lewis, Walt Sullivan, David McClelland and Richard Staub.

Absent: Don Peterson *Excused*

Staff: Jim Clague, Steve Tackes and Yvon Weaver

- B. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

- C. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF PAST MEETINGS OF THE AIRPORT AUTHORITY. After making a correction to Page 11 of the minutes for the regular meeting of 19 September 2007 (it was Mr. Weaver who abstained from voting, not Mr. Sullivan), Mrs. Hutter moved to approve the minutes as corrected. Mr. Staub seconded the motion, and the motion carried 6-0, with Mr. Peterson absent for this vote.

- 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 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. Ralph Smith of Valley Construction addressed the Board to provide his monthly update of the Jet Ranch construction progress. Mr. Smith reported that the project is

basically on schedule for a late May 2008 finish for the entire project, and that he would continue to provide monthly updates until project completion. Mr. Smith provided a written 30-day schedule, and reviewed it for the Board. There were no questions for Mr. Smith at this time.

Mr. Frank Hublou addressed the Board with comments on the recent clean-up campaign as it pertained to the north side of the Airport. Mr. Hublou stated that the three associations involved in the clean-up effort did a good job, but believes that the Airport did not do their part very well. Mr. Hublou stated that some construction debris is still sitting in place where it was left 8 years ago, and suggested that maybe someone could ask the Jet Ranch people to use their large equipment and remove the debris. Mr. Hublou stated that there is a large "Shell" sign that belongs to Mr. Weaver. Mr. Weaver corrected Mr. Hublou, in that the sign actually belongs to Mr. Graber. Mr. Hublou stated that he would talk to Mr. Graber about it, as it needs to be removed. Mr. Hublou stated that he also wants to walk around with Dave McClelland sometime regarding his mess, too.

Mr. Joe Raphael addressed the Board to welcome Mr. Dave McClelland to the Board. Mr. Raphael stated that he and Mr. McClelland fly together a lot, and he believes that Mr. McClelland will be an asset to the Board.

Mr. Lewis also welcomed Mr. McClelland to the Board, stating that the Board membership is now full again, and he was looking forward to Mr. McClelland's four years of service.

Mr. Jerry Vaccaro addressed the Board. He repeated his request that his questions directed to specific Board members be included as agenda items on the next agenda. Mr. Vaccaro stated that he has made repeated requests for these items to appear, but they have yet to be included on an agenda. Mr. Vaccaro stated that Mr. Tackes had faxed him answers to his questions he has been asking about the Title 19 revisions, and asked if these were the final answers to his questions.

Mr. Tackes stated that what he had faxed to Mr. Vaccaro were copies of his own handwritten notes, but he had not provided this information to the Board; the faxed notes therefore could not be considered the Board's opinion on Mr. Vaccaro's questions.

Mr. Vaccaro asked how he could get his requested items placed on the agenda. Mr. Tackes stated that it would be up to the Board to decide if they wanted to hear an agenda item, and that it was the Board's opinion that they had already sufficiently answered Mr. Vaccaro's questions and felt it unnecessary to include them on an agenda.

Mr. Vaccaro stated that he had asked the Board to put items on the agenda last month, and the Board did not pay attention to him. Mr. Vaccaro stated that he would proceed with filing formal complaints with the necessary departments. Mr. Vaccaro thanked the Board for not paying attention.

Mr. Ralph Smith of Valley Construction addressed the Board. He stated that he would like to clear up an issue he has heard repeated at the last few meetings regarding Mr. Lewis' participation in the Jet Ranch project. Mr. Smith stated that Valley Construction has been hired to do the project design. The architects work for Valley Construction, as do all the consultants. Mr. Smith stated that he acts as the owner's representative for the project. Mr. Smith stated that Mr. Lewis is not the project manager for the job, but that he is the information conduit from Valley Construction, who is building the project, to Mr. Gonzalez. Mr. Smith stated that Mr. Lewis' interaction with the construction process is limited; his role in the project was to provide information to Mr. Gonzalez. Mr. Smith is the construction manager, and Mr. Smith stated that when construction was completed, the keys would be given to Mr. Gonzalez.

There were no additional public comments at this time, and public comment was closed.

#### F. PUBLIC HEARINGS

- (1) DISCUSSION AND ACTION REGARDING APPROVAL OF THE CARSON CITY AIRPORT AUTHORITY AUDIT FOR FY 2006/2007 (*B. Kohn*). Ms. Beth Kohn of Kohn-Colodny, CPA, addressed the Board regarding the Airport Authority audit, which had been transmitted to Board and Staff.

Ms. Kohn reviewed a few items on the budget report. She stated that there were a lot of reports and footnotes in the audit, but it was fairly consistent with prior years. There were also a couple of audit findings. One of them was caused by the audit standards change in 2007 regarding the segregation of duties for an organization. The Carson City Airport Authority has only the Airport Manager, who does all of the accounting for the Airport Authority. It is not a problem, and everyone already knows this, but it is something that now has to be brought up every year, and the audit report now has to include verbiage that it is not cost effective to hire additional staff. Ms. Kohn stated that she has contacted the Department of Taxation regarding this, since it is something that affects many of her clients, and was told that no corrective action plan would be required for this finding, just the verbiage mentioned above.

Ms. Kohn stated that there was also a minor finding on a late report that was filed. Other than this, it was a clean audit, and as a Board, this would be the primary concern.

Mrs. Hutter thanked Ms. Kohn and Mrs. Weaver for all their hard work on the audit. Mrs. Hutter stated that she had held a meeting with Ms. Kohn and Mrs. Weaver, and they reviewed the audit with a fine-toothed comb. Unless anyone has any questions on the audit, Mrs. Hutter moved to accept the audit as presented.

Mr. Staub seconded the motion. There were no questions, the vote was called and the motion carried, 6-0, with Mr. Peterson absent for this vote.

Ms. Kohn thanked Mrs. Weaver for doing such an excellent job for the Board, especially considering how little she is paid for her work.

- (2) DISCUSSION AND ACTION REGARDING A PRESENTATION BY CARSON CITY PUBLIC WORKS ON THE PLANNED CONNECTOR ROAD BETWEEN GRAVES LANE AND ARROWHEAD DRIVE ACROSS AIRPORT PROPERTY; COORDINATION WITH HILL REMOVAL (*A. Burnham*). Mr. Andy Burnham had been called out of town, and Mr. Harvey Bratzman, Regional Transportation Engineer for Carson City, addressed the Board. Mr. Mike Bennett, Project Engineer from Lumos and Associates, accompanied him.

Mr. Bratzman stated he was present to address the connector road between Graves Lane and Arrowhead Drive across Airport property, and that the City was interested in coordinating construction of the road in connection with the hill removal project. Mr. Bratzman stated that the road would be a two-lane road, and would be a little wider at the beginning near the Graves Lane side to accommodate large trucks entering from Graves Lane. Mr. Bratzman had distributed and displayed conceptual drawings, and asked the Board if there were any questions.

Mr. Weaver pointed out that the drawing shows two different runways, and that the Airport Authority may or may not receive the grant money necessary to remove the hill in order to move the runway. Mr. Weaver asked, if the existing runway has to remain in its current location, whether the roadway alignment would meet FAA criteria.

Mr. Bennett stated that it does not.

Mr. Staub stated that he was on the Regional Transportation Committee, and that this roadway was on the list of projects, but it was not a priority. The RTC has agreed to provide some interim funding with assistance from the Airport grant funding to create a temporary road surface to allow egress and ingress of the construction trucks utilized for removing the hill. Mr. Staub stated that it would not be seen as a permanent roadway unless the Airport came forward as a partner in building the roadway. The RTC has too many projects that are far more of a priority than this roadway, but they recognize that the road is needed to facilitate the runway realignment and the removal of the hill.

Mr. Clague asked Mr. Bennett why the roadway would not meet FAA criteria. Mr. Bennett stated that it was because of the Runway Protection Zone, and the grades do not meet criteria. With the existing runway layout, 15 feet of separation from the crown of the road to the glide slope is required, and it cannot meet those grades. It does further down the roadway, but it does not near the Graves Lane end with the existing runway layout.

Mr. Lewis asked if this item required approval at tonight's meeting. Mr. Bratzman stated that it did not; the proposal is for a temporary haul road. Mr. Bratzman stated that the City wants to accommodate the Airport in the design process, but the roadway could be something lesser, since the exact location of the haul road has not yet been defined.

Mrs. Hutter pointed out that a temporary haul road would not be required unless the Airport was prepared to take down the hill. She asked how far ahead the City would need to be notified if that were going to occur, and if a year's notice would be the requirement.

Mr. Bratzman stated that a year's notice would make it very easy.

Mr. Lewis asked how much time it would take to properly engineer the road. Mr. Bennett stated that if they had 4 to 6 months it would be good. Mr. Bratzman also pointed out that no utilities would be installed in conjunction with the roadway, except maybe water.

Mr. Staub stated that the reason this item was on the agenda is because Mr. Tackes wanted us to come forward with some sort of imminence of what's going on around the road. First, however, a budget must be created, and a decision must be made as to who is going to pay for it and where that money is coming from.

Mr. Tackes concurred that this was correct. Mr. Tackes stated that he had initiated the request with the City a year ago, because if the Airport needed a haul road in conjunction with removing the hill, it wouldn't make sense to put in a haul road and have it be placed where it would not work for the City's connector road. The general thought was to put in the haul road basically in the area where the connector road would ultimately be placed. Mr. Tackes stated that the RTC has made it very clear in their communication that this road is not in their near-term plans for construction. Mr. Tackes was just moving it along because he didn't want to see a duplication of effort or a waste of funds.

Mr. Lewis deduced that a motion was therefore not required for this item. Mr. Lewis agreed that we were looking for the design and placement, and stated his appreciation in the effort in bringing forth this initial plan.

Mr. Tackes asked about the detention basin, as he knows it was shown on the City's plans but it is not shown on this connector road plan. Mr. Bennett stated that it was not shown on the plan because tonight's discussion was only concerning the alignment of the road. Mr. Bennett described that the detention pond would be placed on the westerly side of the road, near where the roadway turns toward Arrowhead Road. The planned detention pond would be less than 20-acre feet of storage.

The question was asked if Mr. Bennett meant to state that the detention basin would be on the LEFT side of the road, closer to the runway. Mr. Bennett confirmed that the detention basin was in fact planned for placement on the left side of the road, close to the runway. Mr. Bennett stated that preliminary calculations have shown that, with a 25-year storm, the pond would empty within two days.

Mr. McClelland stated his concern with the detention pond at the end of the runway, and thought it would be a concern to other pilots as well, since water, birds and planes do not mix well.

Mr. Weaver stated that when the City built the original pond, without notifying the Airport that it was being done, he had the misfortune of discovering it by finding the birds with his plane. He was able to safely land his aircraft, despite the near-catastrophe, and, after making his landing, investigated the pond. He found that it was full of standing water, and had apparently been full of water long enough to support several bird nests and a very healthy growth of cattails and other plants indicative of a pond. The City had to come out and re-engineer the pond's placement, since it was not intended to

indefinitely hold water. Mr. Weaver stated that placement of a detention basin needed to be carefully thought out.

Mr. Lewis asked if there were any public comments. There were none. Mr. Lewis thanked Mr. Bratzman and Mr. Bennett for their presentation, stating that he would keep them apprised of the Airport's schedule regarding the hill.

- (3) DISCUSSION AND ACTION REGARDING REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF THE LEASE BETWEEN THE NEVADA MUSEUM OF MILITARY HISTORY AND THE CARSON CITY AIRPORT AUTHORITY (*B. Lumbard*). Mr. Bob Lumbard, Nevada Museum of Military History (NMMH) addressed the Board. He reported that he has tried to fulfill all of the requests for information, and that the Board should have nearly all of the items they had requested, with the exception of two of the items. One of them concerns where the NMMH is going for funding. The other request is a five-year financial plan.

Regarding the funding, Mr. Lumbard stated his group was undergoing the process of learning how to write grants. Mr. Ted Melsheimer has a friend who is a grant writer, and that person is also helping. To date Mr. Lumbard has identified 30 foundations that can supply funding, and is seeking more. Currently they are seeking capital expenditure funding, which is the building expense.

Regarding the five-year plan, Mr. Lumbard is collecting as much of the latest and most accurate information he can possibly assemble. Further, Mr. Lumbard stated that the five-year plan will be frequently updated as additional facts and figures are being collected.

Mr. Lumbard asked the Board if there were any questions.

Mr. Lewis asked Mr. Tackes about the lease document, and if it were the final document being proposed. Mr. Tackes stated that it was, and was created per direction received at the last meeting, including provision of the five-year review and language to say that the property could not be left to look like a salvage yard. Also, as a result of a meeting with Mr. Sullivan, language was also included that a Record of Survey be conducted after the lease is let, which will supply the mechanism by which a parcel number can be applied, and this will get the building process started. The language regarding a Record of Survey will be included in all future leases. Mr. Tackes stated that he did correct the signature line, as it should have been for Steve Melsheimer's signature as the secretary, and not for Ted Melsheimer's signature.

Mr. Lewis asked if sufficient space was set aside to allow for the future AWOS/ASOS relocation. Mr. Tackes stated that space was reserved for the AWOS, but that if the AWOS does not need to be placed in that location, the Board can always revisit the boundaries of the lease and enlarge it if that is appropriate.

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

Mr. Weaver stated he had no questions, but would like to move to approve the lease with the NMMH.

There was no second for the motion, so the motion failed.

Mr. Lewis asked if there was any other discussion.

Mrs. Hutter asked about the timeframe, pointing out that when the lease is signed the time clock starts ticking, and the museum has three years to complete construction. Mrs. Hutter stated that she wanted to see the project succeed, and wondered if we should be allowing a little more time.

Mr. Lumbard asked if changing the timeline would impinge the museum from starting immediately. Mrs. Hutter stated that, no, NMMH could start immediately, but that maybe a three-year plan to completion was too aggressive.

Mr. Lumbard stated that the construction time in the lease was set for three years, and he was under the impression that was mandatory. If not, Mr. Lumbard stated that it would be nice if a five-year plan to completion could be arranged. Mr. Lumbard stated that he hoped to have the building up and functional within one to two years, but if the NMMH could be allowed four or five years without impinging on the Board, he would greatly appreciate that. Mr. Lumbard stated that his concern is with the current economy, which might somewhat slow down the funding acquisition. Mrs. Hutter stated it would be up to the Board to make such a decision.

Mr. Sullivan stated he had no questions, because Mrs. Hutter asked the question about the timeframe. Mr. Sullivan stated that other City permits would have to be applied for, and that also takes time to accomplish.

Mr. McClelland had no questions at this time.

Mr. Staub disagreed with Mrs. Hutter regarding the timeline. Mr. Staub stated that when the Authority acts, it was reasonable to demand performance. Mr. Staub stated that he did not believe in holding Mr. Lumbard's feet to the fire, but also wanted to see some movement on what the group was trying to do. Mr. Staub stated that the museum would be a substantial asset to the community and to the Airport, and he wanted to see it done sooner than later. Mr. Staub stated that the Authority would review the lease in five years, since that's in the lease, and in five years Mr. Staub stated that he would like it if the museum could report that they've been in operation for at least three or four years. Mr. Staub stated that Mr. Lumbard could always come back to the Board and say they've hit a bump, and ask the Authority to grant an extension of time on that particular item, and that would be the appropriate way to handle things. Mr. Staub stated that he wanted to leave the lease as it is, and see the museum make progress.

Mr. Lumbard stated that he had already planned to come to the Board on a frequent basis to provide progress reports, such as Mr. Smith of Valley Construction is currently doing, although not necessarily on a monthly basis. He asked if this would be okay with the Board. Mr. Staub stated that he would appreciate it.

Mr. Lewis stated that he appreciated Mr. Lumbard's comments, and would appreciate it if he could update the Board at least every six months to allow the Board to decide if that's what they want.

Mr. Lewis called for public comment. There was none at this time.

Mr. Lewis called for a motion.

Mrs. Hutter moved to approve the lease of the Nevada Museum of Military History (NMMH).

Mr. Weaver seconded the motion.

There was no additional discussion at this time. Mr. Lewis requested that Mr. Lumbard or one of his associates come to the Board at least once every six months to provide a status report update on the project. Mr. Lumbard agreed. Mr. Lewis asked if the maker of the motion would so append their motion. Mrs. Hutter agreed to amend the motion. The second, Mr. Weaver, also agreed.

The vote was called and the motion carried, 6-0, with Mr. Peterson not present for this vote.

Mr. Lumbard thanked the Board for their time, and presented a fifty-dollar bill with which to pay the lease.

- (4) DISCUSSION AND ACTION TO CONSIDER THE STATUS OF THE MASTER PLAN (MP) AND AIRPORT LAYOUT PLAN (ALP); REPORT BY THE MASTER PLAN SUBCOMMITTEE (*C. Hutter*). Mrs. Hutter stated that no formal meetings have been held, although a number of people have been active in various ways, and among other things have been looking at how to get the hill taken down for free. So far there are no takers, and Mrs. Hutter stated she would take any idea anyone could come up with.

Mr. Clague has prepared a long, involved document on infrastructure estimates and costs involved with the center triangle development. Mrs. Hutter reported that this soon should be ready to read and review.

Mrs. Hutter stated that the Master Plan committee has been constituted for about three years, and that most of the original members have either left the Board or soon will be leaving. Mrs. Hutter stated that at the January meeting she would like to have a discussion of whether to continue having a Master Plan committee at all, leave it as it is, or create a new committee.

Mrs. Hutter stated that she and Mrs. Weaver had a good meeting with the City, and working with a young man named Edward, who's preparing the business plan for the land development use, and they are looking forward to seeing the results of his report.

Mrs. Hutter stated that there would be no action needed on this item at this time, and hoped to be able to present Mr. Clague's documents sometime during the month.

Mr. Lewis asked if there was any public comment on this item.



Mr. Jerry Vaccaro addressed the Board. He asked who controls the amount of money charged for an Airport lease. Mrs. Hutter responded that the Authority controls the amount, and there is a bid process that must be followed.

Mr. Vaccaro asked if he could ask questions of the Board. Mr. Tackes stated that this comment section was only pertaining to this agenda item, and was not the appropriate forum to be used for cross-examining Board members.

Mr. Vaccaro stated that the Airport property is City property, and therefore a City asset. Mr. Vaccaro stated his belief that the City is being cheated out of fair market value for the property, in that leasing land for 15¢ per square foot is an unheard of rental fee. Mr. Vaccaro suggested that the leases be adjusted up to fair market value for the property.

Mr. Tackes stated that Mr. Vaccaro did make a legitimate point, and explained that, according to Nevada law, the Airport Authority is required that areas eligible for lease follow a specified competitive bid process. During the past 15 years of Mr. Tackes' experience, the Airport Authority has always taken the highest offered qualifying bid. In some cases, the Authority has rejected all of the bids, as they were insufficient. The terms for the leases were for what the market would bear at the time of the bid. Based on recent activity, Mr. Tackes stated that there wouldn't be any leases on the Airport going out at 15¢ per square foot, as property values have substantially increased in the past few years. Mr. Tackes stated that Mr. Vaccaro was correct, however, in that the older leases on the Airport have a very low lease rate.

Mr. Vaccaro stated that the Jet Ranch was leased out at 25¢ per square foot for a 50-year term, and that he believed this was a ridiculously low rate.

Mr. Tackes stated that if Mr. Vaccaro had any ideas or suggestions on how the Airport could realize a greater revenue stream, to please make that suggestion.

Mr. Vaccaro stated that he was merely asking the Board to consider the fair market value in the City, and to review all the leases. Mr. Vaccaro stated that the Airport was a City asset, and he believes that the Board is cheating the taxpayers of the City.

There were no more public comments at this time.

- G. AIRPORT ENGINEER'S REPORT (*Non-Action Item*). Mr. Jim Clague, Airport Engineer, reported that he attended the conference for the Association of California Airports. While there, he met with the FAA and discussed the Carson City plan for the next four years. The FAA indicated to Mr. Clague that next year they have programmed funds to take down the hill. Mr. Clague stated that, with this in mind, the next step in the process of obtaining those funds is to prepare plans, contract documents and technical specifications for removal of the hill. Next month Mr. Clague will submit a fee proposal to get these tasks accomplished. The job would be put out to bid, and typically the FAA would approve the low bid from a responsive bidder. The grant is based on the cost of the bid, plus administration and engineering expenses.

Mr. Lewis asked if the potential engineering fees for the potential haul road could be incorporated into that bid, as the potential haul road would be a legitimate part of the grant award. Mr. Clague stated that he would include those costs.

Mr. Weaver asked if RTC would add money for the haul road, which would eventually become the City's connector roadway. Mr. Staub stated that the Authority could work with Mr. Bratzman and Mr. Bennett, who could provide some good ideas about what could be done with the road.

Mr. Weaver stated that he was only asking because a nickel goes a long way to getting a dollar, so thousands of dollars from the RTC would be an inexpensive donation from the RTC, but would mean a very lucrative donation in terms of Airport Authority money.

Mr. Staub stated that he also hoped that someone would want to buy the dirt, as that would also help quite a bit.

- H. AIRPORT MANAGER'S REPORT (*Non-Action Item*). Mrs. Yvon Weaver, Airport Manager, stated that she appreciated the kind words of the Auditor, Beth Kohn, and Treasurer, Mrs. Hutter, who made it look like Mrs. Weaver was the one doing all the work on the audit. Mrs. Weaver thanked Mrs. Hutter because she really does her share regarding the bookkeeping.

Mrs. Weaver reported that a week ago she met with an earth-moving company who approached the Airport about the hill, with a project on Spooner Summit in mind. They discussed the Airport's expectations of taking down the hill, and some of the restrictions with the co-owner of the hill. Mrs. Weaver asked them to put their comments in writing, addressed to the Board, so they can discuss it, and they appear to be very interested.

Mrs. Weaver was also approached by Verizon regarding placing another antenna on our beacon. There is also the possible lease of space within the area where the beacon is sitting. Mrs. Weaver asked Verizon to put their request in writing so that Mr. Tackes can help negotiate the lease when the time is right.

Mr. Lewis reminded everyone that the EAA has been doing some viewing and patrolling of pilots flying in and out, and asked Mrs. Weaver if she could arrange to have the EAA bring a report to the Board next month. Mr. Lewis asked Mrs. Weaver about the number of complaints this summer versus last summer, since the EAA has been doing their monitoring program.

Mrs. Weaver reported that the complaints from the Apollo Drive area totally dropped off after the observers were in place. She does not have numbers assembled yet, but stated her intention to get the numbers based on a resident from the west side of town, who has stated a noticeable increase in jet traffic. There were three local jets flying in formation

last week, but the resident disagrees that this was the disturbance in question. Mrs. Weaver asked the resident to call her when the disturbance is happening so she can determine its cause, and provided her with the office number as well as Mrs. Weaver's cell phone number. The resident lives in the Lakeview area.

Mrs. Weaver will contact the EAA and ask them to provide a summary report presentation.

- I. LEGAL COUNSEL'S REPORT (*Non-Action Item*). Mr. Steve Tackes, Airport Legal Counsel, addressed the Board. Regarding Verizon, Mr. Tackes asked Mrs. Weaver to send him the information and he will begin the process with them. The tower can accommodate four wireless companies, and the terms are already drafted. Since there is only one more space available, the remaining space is getting more expensive.

Mr. Tackes reported that last week he held a discussion with Mr. Able Tapia and Mr. Ray Chang of the FAA on difference ideas for the hill removal. The single recommendation they had was to have Mr. Clague do the engineering so that we have an engineering plan ready when the time to remove the hill finally arrives.

Mr. Tackes asked Mr. Tapia and Mr. Chang about getting the funding to us early. For instance, if we can get the funding in March, we can get the hill pulled down during the construction season. If the funding does not arrive until the end of July or August, it doesn't give us much time until the snow flies.

- J. TREASURER'S REPORT (*Non-Action Item*). Mrs. Collie Hutter, Airport Treasurer, thanked the Board for accepting the audit. Mrs. Hutter reported that she has looked at the quarterly reports, and will have that ready for distribution next week. They are pretty much in alliance with the budget so far this year. Ms. Kohn did all the adjustments this year, so the reports have a clean slate and next month's numbers will be solid numbers to work with.

- K. REPORT FROM AUTHORITY MEMBERS (*Non-Action Item*). None of the Authority members had anything further to report at this time.

- L. AGENDA ITEMS FOR NEXT REGULAR MEETING (*Non-Action Item*). Mr. Lewis reported that, after 18 months of reviewing and rewriting Title 19, it was now ready to deliver to Airport Counsel for one final review. Mr. Lewis asked that this item be placed on next month's agenda. The process is for the document to undergo two reviews at the Airport Authority level, and then it must be reviewed at the Board of Supervisors level. After review and approval by the Board of Supervisors, it can become a final document.

Mr. Staub asked if the document would be placed on cd or e-mailed, or how it would be distributed to the Board. Mr. Lewis stated that it could be distributed both ways, if needed, and that the distribution would include the proposed document and the old document with redlines included.

Mr. Tackes stated that he also wanted to include some procedural items in the rewrite, such as Robert's Rules of Order, in case there is a dispute.

Mr. Staub stated that he would like to agendize a meeting in the early spring, since that's the time that the City has to consider the package for the legislative session. Since we are preparing the Title 19 document, Mr. Staub thought it was time to also review the statutes that brought the Airport Authority into existence, to take a comprehensive look at those statutes, and see if how we operate and are made up is a good way to go.

The next regular meeting will be held on Tuesday, 13 November 2007 at the Terminal Building, and will be a combined November and December meeting.

- M. ACTION ON ADJOURNMENT. Mr. Sullivan moved to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Staub seconded the motion. There were no objections, and the meeting was adjourned at 7:25 p.m.

\* \* \* \* \*

**NOTE:** A tape recording of these proceedings is on file, and available for review and inspection at the Airport Manager's office during normal business hours.

\* \* \* \* \*

The minutes of the 17 October 2007 Regular Meeting of the Carson City Airport Authority are so approved on this 13<sup>th</sup> day of November, 2007.

BY: \_\_\_\_\_

TITLE: Steve Lewis, Chairman