

The following is a condensed version of the TRUCKEE TAHOE AIRPORT DISTRICT BOARD OF DIRECTORS regular meeting held Wednesday, April 23, 2014 at the Truckee Tahoe Airport District Community Room, 10356 Truckee Airport Road, Truckee, California at 5:30 pm.

CALL MEETING TO ORDER: 5:30 p.m.

DIRECTORS PRESENT: President John B. Jones Jr.
Vice President James W. Morrison
Director Mary Hetherington
Director Tom Van Berkem
Director Lisa Wallace

DIRECTORS ABSENT: None

STAFF PRESENT: Mr. Kevin Smith, General Manager
Mr. Phred Stoner, Director of Operations
Mr. Hardy Bullock, Director of Aviation and Community Services
Ms. Jane Dykstra, Director of Finance and Administration (outgoing)
Ms. Sally Lyon, Director of Finance and Administration (incoming)
Mr. Mike Cooke, Aviation and Community Services Manager
Mr. Mike Barrett, Aviation and Community Services Associate / Safety Coordinator
Mr. Brent Collinson, District Legal Counsel
Ms. Denae Granger, Administrative Clerk

VISITORS PRESENT: 9

SPECIAL ORDERS OF BUSINESS: President Jones announced that 83% of the cost of the Ground Power Unit that the District placed in service in February of 2013 has been recovered through fees charged for its use. He stated that the purchase was a good decision by the District.

PUBLIC COMMENT: Larry Abney, owner of Red Truck, stated that he appreciates being able to work at the Airport and build his business.

CONSENT CALENDAR

Director Hetherington requested that the minutes from the Joint ACAT/Board meeting of March 26, 2014 and the minutes from the regular Board meeting of March 26, 2014 both be pulled from the consent calendar. President Jones asked that the Red Truck Lease Renewal be pulled from the consent calendar.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None

- Monthly Service Bills and Fees
- Financial Report
- Operations and Comment Report – Q1 2014

MOTION #1 APR-23-14: Vice President Morrison moved to approve the items on the Consent Calendar, with the exception of the Minutes of the March 26, 2104 Joint Meeting, the Minutes of the March 26, 2014 Regular Meeting and the Red Truck Lease Renewal. Director Hetherington seconded the motion. President Jones, Vice President Morrison, Directors Hetherington, Van Berkem and Wallace voted in favor of the motion. The motion passed.

- Minutes: March 26, 2014 Joint Meeting

Director Hetherington asked that the word "just" be removed from line 77 of the minutes.

- Minutes: March 26, 2014 Regular Meeting

Director Hetherington stated that after listening to the recording of the meeting, she proposed changes to line 193 of the minutes. She provided the revised wording to Staff.

MOTION #2 APR-23-14: Director Hetherington made a motion to approve the Minutes of the March 26, 2014 Joint and Regular Meetings of the Board of Directors as amended. Director Wallace seconded the motion. President Jones, Vice President Morrison, Directors Hetherington, Van Berkem and Wallace voted in favor of the motion. The motion passed.

- Red Truck Lease Renewal

President Jones pulled the lease because he noted while reviewing the documentation that North Tahoe Commercial Real Estate had been consulted to report on market rates for the deli space. North Tahoe Commercial Real Estate is owned by President Jones and the employee Staff worked with was his daughter, Kayley. President Jones stated that he wanted to recuse himself from the vote on this item. President Jones clarified that there was not a financial impact, only one of perception, and that he was unaware that the District requested the rate comparison study. Ms. Dykstra stated that the final lease would be rounded to the nearest dollar and would not include cents in the amount of rent and utilities owed per month. Mr. Bullock stated that the ending term of the lease would be revised from May 1, 2015 to April 30, 2015.

PUBLIC COMMENT: Andrew Terry stated that Red Truck is a great asset to the building, and he sees a lot of people coming to eat there.

MOTION #3 APR-23-14: Director Wallace made a motion that the Red Truck Lease Renewal be approved as revised by Staff. Director Hetherington seconded the motion. Vice President Morrison, Directors Hetherington, Van Berkem and Wallace voted in favor of the motion. President Jones abstained. The motion passed.

AIRSHOW UPDATE

Mr. Smith notified the Board that the Airshow Committee is now meeting bi-weekly. Everything is proceeding as expected, and they are within their budget.

AIRPORT COMMUNITY ADVISORY TEAM (ACAT) UPDATE

Mr. Bullock stated that the discussion on ACAT priorities at the March 26, 2014 Joint ACAT-Board meeting was reviewed at the April 8, 2014 ACAT meeting. The projects have been split to show ACAT projects and Staff projects. Mr. Bullock noted that most of the projects listed in the Board Report were discussed at the Budget Workshop, which was held earlier in the day. He highlighted that the ACAT had made one change to the Pilot Incentives project – noting that ACAT suggests the incentive program be linked with the preferred runway usage. The UNICOM assessment and the Standard Operating Procedure development were discussed by ACAT – they represent phase one of the project and have an estimated completion date in July of 2014. The second phase of the project will detail the enhancement options. It is anticipated that the Night Operations Subcommittee Report will be discussed at the May 2014 ACAT meeting.

COMMUNICATIONS AND OUTREACH REPORT – Q1 2014

Mr. Barrett noted that the first quarter of a calendar year is usually a slow quarter for events. There was an increase in community room usage of approximately 13% over the prior year. We have many return groups, but there are also new organizations that are requesting meeting space. On average the meeting rooms are used once per day by an outside organization. There were five events held: Aviation Safety Seminar, Civil Air Patrol's Open House, Truckee Downtown Merchants Association Mixer, Tahoe Community Nursery School Airport Tour and the North Lake Tahoe/Truckee Leadership Class Mixer. E-blasts were down slightly from the prior quarter, but the percentage of opened messages is consistent at 40%. Sponsorships are also consistent, a list of the organizations that received funds was presented in the

report. Mr. Barrett shared thank you letters from the Friends of the Library, the Land Trust, and the Truckee High School Track and Field Team.

MULTI-USE HANGAR PROJECT REVIEW AND FUNDING APPROVAL FOR DESIGN AND BIDDING

As an introduction to the topic, President Jones reported that on March 26, 2014, the District received a letter from Mountain Area Preservation (MAP) regarding their concerns related to the District's Multi-purpose hangar project. As a prelude to his comments, he reminded the group that the District held community outreach meetings related to the Master Plan, which included the multi-use hangar, in eight communities. There were 190 attendees at the meetings and comments were also received through an online survey; in total 3200 comments were received. The Godbe Survey was also completed in 2013; it surveyed 537 local residents, of which 60-65 were pilots. President Jones stated the reason that he mentioned all this information is that his reading of the MAP letter points out to him that the District needs to continue to do outreach. He stated the MAP letter implies that the knowledge about what our Airport District 'is', is not getting out to the community. He stated that the intent of the letter was clear. The letter asked that a decision not be made at the March meeting, because MAP believed there was more information to be analyzed. President Jones stated that the Board agreed with that, the decision was deferred from the March meeting to the April meeting and additional analysis was requested. President Jones stated that Truckee Tahoe Airport District includes 30,151 adult residents and over 50,000 homeowners – at least half of which are not voters, but who do contribute to the District through the paying of property taxes. He stated that it is possible to lose sight of the fact that the District extends from Kings Beach to Tahoma on the Lake Tahoe side of the District and from Cisco Grove to the California/Nevada state line on north side of the Tahoe basin. The growth in the District is increasing; it is coming from a wide variety of locations. The MAP letter implies that the growth is only coming from Martis Camp, Lahontan and Schaffer's Mill. However, other neighborhoods, such as Northstar and the Lake Tahoe shore, are booming. President Jones mentioned that the District's planning horizon is not one or two years, but ten to twelve years. During that period, the growth in the District is going to change. The growth projections used by Mead and Hunt were based on FAA data and projections of growth within all communities of the District, not exclusively the Town of Truckee.

Director Hetherington stated that it should be remembered that MAP represents a portion of the community and that perhaps they are representing community members who did not attend the meetings that were held. She agreed that outreach to the community is necessary, and stated her disappointment at there not being an article in the *Sierra Sun* during the past month that examined the issue of a multi-use hangar. Director Van Berkem asked if there had been any discussion of legal action being brought against the District regarding the multi-use hangar, and Vice President Morrison asked if the letter received in March was the last communication from MAP. Mr. Smith stated that he had been in contact with Alexis Ollar, the MAP Executive Director, and he had informed her that the topic would be on this evening's agenda. He let her know that the outcome of the meeting could be anything from a request for additional study to authorization to enter the design phase of the project. Director Hetherington reiterated her disappointment that there was not an article in the *Sierra Sun*. Mr. Smith stated that he has no control over the articles the newspaper elects to print. Mr. Smith stated that he would make the *Sierra Sun* aware of the District's desire to have public input as the design phase is entered. Vice President Morrison suggested running an ad in the paper. He also stated that as the programming phase is entered, input will be sought from potential users.

Mr. Smith stated that there are three things planned for the meeting: review of information gathered by Staff, consideration of funding the design and bidding phase of the project, and the formation of an ad-hoc committee of the Board. Mr. Barrett discussed the community usage of Hangar #1 when it was available for events and forecast potential use for Hangar #3. He stated that his analysis was done in a conservative manner. All of the groups that used Hangar #1 when it was available would like to hold their event at the Airport again. He has two events scheduled in May that will use A09. He estimates there are six events that would use the community room space and six events that are larger and would use the hangar space. Mr. Barrett stated that a few of groups that previously used the District's multi-purpose rooms have been displaced, either due to size or scheduling conflicts. He believes many of them would use the

community room in the new hangar. Mr. Smith stated that the District would like to see the Civil Air Patrol out of their endpocket, which could then be leased, and into a more appropriate space. The emergency management potential was discussed. The new space would provide more opportunities for cooperative training in the future. Additional community room space would decrease the demand on the Board room. Occasionally, users will move tables or the podium, which can cause issues and incur additional Staff time to reset the room. The largest event the District hosts on a recurring basis is the Santa Fly-in, at about 600 attendees. President Jones asked for the range of size in the groups that use the facility. Mr. Barrett stated that groups are between 20 and 600. President Jones asked about events that are currently held at the Truckee Donner Recreation and Park District (TDRPD) recreation center; he asked Mr. Barrett to comment on any potential uses. Mr. Barrett stated that the Crab Feed and Sierra Senior Services Bingo Fundraiser are the only two large events held at the recreation center that could potentially be held in the new hangar. Mr. Smith stated that he had spoken to Steve Randall, General Manager of the TDRPD, and that Mr. Randall was not opposed to those events being hosted at another location. Mr. Smith stated that the Staff time that could be involved in events has to be considered, and he believes the District has a grasp on those time commitments and may propose a fee for usage of the entire hangar. Mr. Barrett noted that he goes over staffing issues with users for all large events to be sure the users are aware of what the District can provide.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Andrew Terry suggested that the food drive at Christmas could be another potential use of the building. He stated that some groups that used the building in the past have been displaced, but that should not be the basis for a decision to build a new building.

MULTI-USE HANGAR PROJECT REVIEW AND FUNDING APPROVAL FOR DESIGN AND BIDDING (CONT'D)

Director Van Berkem asked for some background on how the concept of a community room developed. He was familiar with the interest in constructing a large hangar to park planes in the winter for safety, but he asked why the community room is now attached to the project. He did not understand where in the process the 'fairly large' community space was included in the project and how much of the three million dollars are related to that portion of the project. President Jones stated that in his opinion the project had always been a multi-use hangar with a reasonably small area for community use, but with the availability to use the hangar space for larger events, from time to time. Mr. Smith noted that the primary function of the building is to park business jets and provide space to de-ice. He believes the multi-use component has always been a part of the project. Director Van Berkem stated that his understanding had been that the District would construct a large hangar that could be used for community events when it was not needed for aircraft, not that an additional structure would be added to the side of the hangar, making the building 4,000 square feet larger. President Jones stated that Director Van Berkem's question was valid, and it could be analyzed. Mr. Smith noted that is a common component of this type of hangar and that the issue would be addressed in the building programming phase. Director Hetherington questioned how the priority for usage would be established; assuming that most community events would be held on weekends, which is also when the most planes would want to use the hangar. Mr. Barrett noted that there would be five or six events per year that would use the hangar portion of the building, but reiterated that aviation is the District's priority and if there was reason to anticipate a busy weekend, the hangar space would not be booked. The aircraft can be moved by Staff, if required, and he is confident that the two functions can both be served. Director Van Berkem asked if we had any feedback from the for-profit meeting room providers in the community, the Ritz-Carlton, the Cedar House or the Hampton, regarding the possibility of the District constructing a 3,600 square foot building which would compete with them. Mr. Smith replied that he had spoken to representatives of the Resort at Squaw Creek and the Hampton Inn and that they typically do not rent rooms to non-profit agencies and the District would not be renting space to for-profit organizations, unless they had an aviation-related use. We do not

have the same customers. Vice President Morrison stated that he feels it would be a mistake to not add the community room to the hangar, it is relatively inexpensive space.

Director Wallace asked that the review of the Return on Investment calculation be very explicit, so that all could follow the process. Ms. Dykstra reviewed the return on investment calculation provided in the C&S Needs Analysis. There were two elements that were missing from their calculation. The first issue was that they did not include operating expenses for years beyond 15 – although they claimed revenues in those years. If the calculation is assuming revenues, you must include the expenses of operating the facility in those years. The payback period they calculated also did not take into consideration the time value of money. The outflow in the year of construction of \$3.3 million cannot be offset by a cash flow extending out twenty years or more, without discounting that cash flow to show it in current dollars. Ms. Dykstra used the C&S data as a starting point for the cash flow and then expanded on it by adding additional related revenue and expense items. The C&S report had three different scenarios for revenues from the rental of the new hangar. The first scenario assumed an average of 1.7 aircraft per day would use the hangar. Recognizing that estimate is overly optimistic, C&S then used the overnight historical data from TTAD's records and reduced it by 50% to produce what they termed the Method II revenue assumption and then by 60% (Method III). Ms. Dykstra stated that she did not do any calculations using the first scenario. She did calculate the Net Present Value, Internal Rate of Return and Discounted Payback Period using the '50% reduction' and '60% reduction' revenue estimates. To those revenue streams, additional amounts were included related to the lease of hangar A09 and the Civil Air Patrol's endpocket, fees for de-ice service (calculated at \$500 per event, five events per month, during the period from November through April each year - \$15,000), and rental fees for usage of the community room of \$3,000 per year – for those calculations that include the community area. From those additional revenues sources, \$8,300 were deducted, which represent the amount of executive hangar overnight rental the District earned by renting out A09 – if it would be leased to a tenant, those revenues would not be available. On the cash outflow side, the operating expenses put forth by C&S were adjusted as follows:

- The insurance amount was adjusted based on discussions with our insurance brokers. The amount of increased premium assumed was increased from C&S's estimate of \$4,000 to \$8,000.
- The building maintenance expenses were reviewed by Peter Beaupre, Prosser Building and Development, and he estimated maintenance expenses for both the hangar portion and the community room portion of the structure going out 40 years. The expenses were then broken down into recurring and non-recurring categories. The recurring amount was added to the other anticipated operating expenses, and the additional maintenance items were deducted from the cash flow in the year he estimated the expense would be incurred.
- Mr. Beaupre also reviewed the utility expenses put forth by C&S. His calculations resulted in a lower annual cost, and so the analysis performed by Staff used the more conservative estimate from C&S.

The result is a net revenue forecast of between \$124,905 and \$148,905 per year over the forty-year life of the building using the '50% reduction' hangar revenue forecast scenario. The Net Present Value of the project was calculated using the two different revenue forecasts, the cost of the larger (120x120 hangar) and smaller (100x120 hangar) building, and the cost of construction including and excluding the community space portion of the building. The Net Present Value is between a negative \$1.6 million and a positive \$1.5 million – depending on the scenario. The Internal Rate of Return was calculated and the results were between a negative 2.75% and a positive 5.1%. An Internal Rate of Return would be compared to the yield you could receive if you invested the funds in another way. The funds being considered are currently invested in LAIF, which is currently earning .236%. The Discounted Payback Period was then calculated by taking the cash flow out over the 40 years and discounting it to today's dollars. Those discounted cash flows are accumulated and the year in which the initial investment has been recouped is determined. The lowest payback period is 22 years, and many of the calculations resulted in a payback

period which was beyond the 40-year useful life of the building. President Jones then reviewed the results of the return on investment report, noting that the best return results were based on the construction of the large building, rather than the small one, and that the best payback period was if the community area was not included. Ms. Dykstra explained the calculations excluding the community area were not made with the idea of not constructing the community space, but rather to reflect the impact the community space has on the results. If the hangar, which is an aviation asset, is not burdened by the cost of construction of the community space, the investment analysis is more favorable. The decision to build the community space should be based on a different cost/benefit analysis that is tied to the analysis of the community benefit. Director Wallace asked about the level of confidence in the anticipated revenues forecasted by C&S. Mr. Smith responded that Staff helped craft those forecasts, and he believes they are achievable. Director Hetherington asked whether the revenue forecast for the hangar usage sufficiently considered the fact that many of the TU2 and TU3 sized planes could fit in hangar A09. She asked if the new hangar is only being contemplated for the storage of TU4 and TU5 sized aircraft, as the smaller planes would fit in A09, according to the "Aircraft Compatibility by Hangar" analysis provided by Staff. She asked if the District could provide data on the number of times multiple TU2 and TU3 sized planes were tied-down on the same days, as the only time there is need for the larger hangar is when there are multiple smaller planes or one of the larger planes that would not fit in A09. Mr. Bullock stated that is beyond the scope of the analysis provided; however, in Mr. Bullock's opinion, there will be days where there is demand from multiple smaller-sized aircraft that could not be accommodated by A09. Director Morrison feels the assumptions used for estimated usage are conservative.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Andrew Terry stated that a 22-year payback is an inordinately long time, but he noted that the "soft" benefit of the community use has to be factored in. Vice President Morrison asked what Mr. Terry feels is a reasonable payback period. Mr. Terry responded that when he worked in industry, he could only propose ideas with a payback period of less than two years, but he realizes that is not comparable to the District's situation.

Vice President Morrison stated the dream list includes the construction of five executive hangars at a cost of \$1.75 million and associates with that annual revenues of \$72,000, which would work out to a 24 year payback period. He stated that he feels that is a reasonable payback timeframe for a project of this type.

MULTI-USE HANGAR PROJECT REVIEW AND FUNDING APPROVAL FOR DESIGN AND BIDDING (CONT'D)

Mr. Bullock began his discussion of the potential operational increases related to the construction of the new hangar by discussing the operational forecasting done by Mead and Hunt in conjunction with the Master Plan. The forecast in the Master Plan assumes the multi-purpose hangar is constructed. He then stated that the purpose of his analysis was to answer the question of whether there would be additional operations driven by the fact that an aircraft can de-ice or safely land here and be overnighed, without the need to reposition to Reno. He used a 'liability' model to answer the question; the model seeks to determine the maximum number of operations that could be incurred based on the presence of the new hangar. He walked the Board through the exhibit to his report, which determines that the maximum impact that could be seen is an increase in operations of 7%. That assumes that there would be three aircraft in the hangar every night and that operations the Airport is currently *not* experiencing would occur *because* the hangar was built. The nature of his report is to place a maximum number of events that could happen, and that means he has assumed that sufficient aircraft will arrive to fill the hangar every night, although our current operational experience does not support those numbers. Mr. Smith pointed out that if that level of occupancy would be attained, the District would see revenues of over \$600,000 per year for overnight hangar rental. He reiterated that the analysis is useful as a boundary condition. The maximum exposure the District has for increased operations is 6.65% of 25,000 operations, or 1,666 operations.

President Jones read a passage from the Mead and Hunt report, which notes that the Lake Tahoe area is a destination market and visits are influenced by the perceived desirability of the visitors. The report states that activity is driven by area growth, not by the airport offering amenities. President Jones also noted that the Mead and Hunt report states that if the multi-use hangar is not constructed, additional operations may be seen, as there will be more repositioning flights.

PUBLIC COMMENT

President Jones read a letter dated April 23, 2014, from David Welsch, a resident of Northstar, which questioned the relationship between the Hangar #3 project and the Master Plan. The letter questioned whether the decision on the multi-use hangar should wait until the Master Plan has been approved. The letter also questioned if the replacement of other hangars suggested in the Master Plan has any bearing on the decision to build the multi-use hangar. The letter also suggested that the Net Present Value analysis include one or more scenarios that include a higher discount rate than was used to highlight the impact that factor has on the analysis.

Mr. Andrew Terry questioned the 30% saturation that was used in the analysis. He posited that there are three potential reasons for using the hangar: security, protection from the environment and de-icing. He stated that the need for protection from the environment and de-icing needs are more urgent at certain times of the year and suggested that the analysis could change the saturation rate to reflect that fact. Mr. Terry also commented that the overall annual comment increase could be more than the five shown in the report, because of the aircraft type using the hangar. He mentioned the fact that the largest plane the hangar is being programmed to accommodate exceeds the stated load-bearing capacity of the runway. He is not sure this is a good idea, as it will accelerate the breakdown of the District's pavement. Discussion ensued regarding maximum take-off weights and whether the District would be increasing visits by aircraft that test the runways capabilities.

Ms. Deborah Croyle stated that she was concerned to hear the current discussion and feels it has become untethered from the Master Plan discussion. She noted that the analysis revealed a possibility of hundreds of additional operations, which would likely be concentrated on certain days of the week or times of year and would cause a perceptible impact on noise. There are many hangars proposed in the Master Plan, and she suggested that by looking at the hangar projects in isolation, the Board is taking an incremental approach which could allow a substantial increase to operations, noise and annoyance to occur. She would like to see the discussion brought back to the scope of the Master Plan. She would like to see the hangar issues addressed more systematically and holistically because that is what the ultimate impact will be. Mr. Smith noted that the forecast chapter of the Master Plan considers the impact of the construction of all hangars proposed in the Master Plan.

BREAK: At 7:59 p.m. the Board recessed for a short break. At 8:10 p.m. President Jones reconvened the meeting.

Director Wallace stated that she appreciates the work to clarify financial data and return on investment analysis, to estimate the effect on operations and determine boundary conditions, and to discuss potential community demand. She expressed her gratitude to the public for their comments and noted that though there was general outreach on the concept of a multi-use hangar, there was not specific outreach related to this hangar project.

MOTION #4-APR-23-14: Director Wallace made a motion to authorize \$275,000 for design of the multi-use hangar. Staff would be authorized to take the project to 90% design and at that point the Board would readdress the issue to determine if the project proceeds. At that point the Board would face another decision whether to complete the final 10% of design and the bid package. Vice President Morrison seconded the motion. He stated that a great way to get the community's input on the project is to complete the design and take it out for public comment with detail on the actual costs and potential uses.

Director Hetherington questioned what the \$275,000 would cover. Director Wallace stated that it would cover programming and would involve a Request for Proposal (RFP) for an architect to design the building. Director Hetherington asked if there were any “off-ramps” where the project would be reevaluated and could be cancelled. Mr. Smith stated that the process would involve an ad-hoc committee, monthly updates to the Board, the solicitation of community input, and at any point in the process, the Board could choose to change, stop or alter the progress. Director Van Berkem stated that he supports the motion, but would like to see the RFP written in such a way that if preliminary findings from the community warrant it, the contract with the architect could be cancelled. Vice President Morrison would not assume that the architect could answer the design/programming questions. The architect would be a resource to help the ad-hoc committee answer some of those questions. Director Van Berkem would like concurrent outreach in the community to collect the information. Director Hetherington stated that the Board has to be thoughtful about incremental actions that could undermine the planning efforts the District has taken. She can support the motion, but would need to have an off-ramp available. She also would like to bring the issues of pavement strength, conditions of use and prioritization of Staff time and energy to the process. She recognizes that if Staff energy is being concentrated on this project, something is not being done; safety is her focus, and she would like to be assured that safety will not be sacrificed.

The motion on the floor died. The motion was restated as follows:

MOTION #5-APR-23-2014: Director Wallace made a motion to authorize \$275,000 for 90% design of a multi-use hangar. The contract with the architect should be phased to allow stoppage or cancellation if called for. The \$275,000 does not include funding of an outreach effort. Vice President Morrison seconded the motion. President Jones, Vice President Morrison, Directors Hetherington, Van Berkem and Wallace voted in favor of the motion. The motion passed.

The Board directed staff to complete a robust outreach effort for the multi-use hangar. Mr. Smith noted that there are funds in the budget for a public relations consultant that could be utilized. Director Hetherington asked that the funds expended for the outreach effort be accumulated separately.

MOTION #6-APR-23-2014: Director Wallace made a motion to form an ad-hoc committee for 90% design of the multi-use hangar, with Vice President Morrison and Director Hetherington serving on the committee. Director Hetherington stated that she would be on the initial ad-hoc committee, but she reserved the right to step down when her schedule requires her to. President Jones, Directors Van Berkem and Wallace voted in favor of the motion. Vice President Morrison and Director Hetherington abstained. The motion passed.

Director Van Berkem left the meeting at 8:31 p.m.

MASTER PLAN – DRAFT AIRPORT LAYOUT PLAN (ALP) REVIEW

Mr. Smith stated that the two required elements of the Master Plan that the FAA is most interested in are the ALP and the Aviation Forecast chapter. An item must be on the ALP to receive funding; however, not everything included on the ALP has to happen. The ALP is a living document and can change. The ALP the District is currently operating on is from 2007. Mr. Smith reviewed items that had been on the 2000 Master Plan’s ALP that did not come to pass and the content of the various pages of the new ALP. The most significant change being shown is the extension of RWY 02-20 and the repositioning of taxiway G. Regarding Chapter 5 – Implementation Plan, which was distributed to the Board, Mr. Smith reported that District Engineers Bill Quesnel and Reinhart Brandley are reviewing the cost projections, and he requested that the Board review the draft of Chapter 5 and get comments to him in the next week. The ad-hoc committee will be meeting May 1st to review all comments received. A bound version of the draft of the Master Plan will be given to the Board by May 9, 2014. Mead and Hunt will be presenting the draft of the full Master Plan at the May 28th meeting, and then the public comment period can commence. President Jones asked if the multi-use hangar outreach could be tied in with the Master Plan outreach. Mr. Smith responded that it could because the multi-use hangar is included in the Master Plan, but he noted that the ad-hoc committee would be making that decision. Director Hetherington asked her

fellow Board members to take time to review the draft of the Master Plan and not rely on the fact the ad-hoc committee had been involved in the process. Director Wallace thanked Vice President Morrison and Director Hetherington for serving on the ad-hoc committee. Mr. Smith stated that the current timeline is to review the comments from the public outreach period at the July 23, 2014 meeting. The plan could then be accepted by the Board at the August meeting. Then CEQA could commence and sometime early next year the Master Plan could be completed.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None

GENERAL MANAGER'S REPORT

Mr. Smith noted available training opportunities and updated the Board on the existing ad-hoc committees. He stated that Clear Capital has submitted a Development Fund Application to the Town of Truckee related to their interest in a land lease of District property. The fact that the land they are proposing to lease is not in the Town of Truckee could cause an issue with the funding of their request. Mr. Smith also noted that the runway numbering has been updated in the Airport Facilities Directory, terminal procedures and charts. He thanked Mr. Barrett for his efforts in getting the update complete. Mr. Smith covered the potential Spring/Summer Newsletter articles. President Jones suggested that the multi-use hangar be included. Vice President Morrison asked that comments on changes to the park be solicited, and Director Wallace asked that the Safety Management System be discussed. Mr. Bullock requested comments on the new website. He discussed the changes to the digital version of the Board book that are taking place and asked that anyone who has problems contact him. Mr. Smith stated that a date needs to be set for the September Budget Workshop; he will send out a Doodle. He also suggested that the date of the October 2014 Board meeting be moved from October 22nd to the 29th so that it does not conflict with the NBAA conference. He also will suggest that the November/December combined meeting be held on December 2nd or 3rd. He will send that information to the Board. The Project Tracking List will be reformatted in June. Director Hetherington asked that comments received by the phone call outreach that was completed by Staff and the neighborhood walk project be presented at the May meeting as a tab item.

BOARD MEMBER ANNOUNCEMENTS: None

PUBLIC COMMENT: None

President Jones noted that the next scheduled meetings are May 28th and June 25th at 5:30 p.m.

ADJOURN

MOTION #7 APR-23-14: Director Hetherington moved to adjourn. Director Wallace seconded the motion. President Jones, Vice President Morrison, and Directors Hetherington and Wallace voted in favor of the motion. The motion passed.

At 8:56 p.m. the April 23, 2014 regular meeting of the Truckee Tahoe Airport Board of Directors adjourned.

John B. Jones, Jr., President of the Board

Kevin Smith, Secretary of the Board