- 1 The following is a condensed version of the TRUCKEE TAHOE AIRPORT DISTRICT BOARD OF DIRECTORS
- 2 regular meeting held Wednesday, June 22, 2016 in the Truckee Tahoe Airport District Community Room
- 3 A, located at the Truckee Airport, 10356 Truckee Airport Road, Truckee, California at 4:30 p.m.

4 **CALL MEETING TO ORDER:** 4:30 p.m.

5 PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

6	DIRECTORS PRESENT:	President Lisa Wallace	
7		Vice President Jim Morrison	
8		Director Mary Hetherington	
9		Director Tom Van Berkem	
10		Director John B. Jones, Jr.	

- 11STAFF PRESENT:Mr. Kevin Smith, General Manager12Mr. Hardy Bullock, Director of Aviation and Community Services13Mr. Phred Stoner, Director of Operations & Maintenance14Ms. Sally Lyon, Director of Finance and Administration15Mr. Mike Cooke, Manager of Aviation and Community Services16Mr. Brent Collinson, District Legal Counsel
- 17 Ms. Lauren Tapia, District Clerk

18 **SPECIAL ORDERS OF BUSINESS:**

19 Mr. Smith introduced Katie Greenwood as the new Pilot Outreach Coordinator.

Mr. Smith presented Thank You notes written by 5th grade classes to the airport for funding the Challenger
 Experience and read one of the notes.

22 PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

President Wallace announced that the timed item for the California Environmental Equality Act (CEQA)
would be discussed at 8:00 p.m. and that if the meeting ran long, a break would be taken at 7:30 p.m.

25 CONSENT ITEMS

26	1. May 25, 2016 Regular Meeting Minutes	TAB 1
27	2. Monthly Service Bills and Fees	TAB 2
28	3. Monthly Financial Report	TAB 3
29	4. Property, Cyber, Workers Compensation Insurance Policy Renewal Approval	TAB 4

30 Director Hetherington requested that Tab 1, the May 25, 2016 Regular Meeting Minutes be pulled.

31 MOTION #1 JUNE-22-2016: Director Jones motioned to accept all Consent Items with the exception of the 32 May 25, 2016 Minutes. Vice President Morrison seconded the motion. Director Van Berkem seconded the

33 motion. President Wallace, Vice President Morrison, Directors Van Berkem, Jones and Hetherington voted

in favor of the motion. The motion passed.

Director Hetherington referred to Line 100 of the May 25, 2016 minutes and suggested that the increase should show 25% and not 6%, as 25% was confirmed toward the end of the meeting. Director

- 37 Hetherington referenced Line 131 and suggested that it should state Director Hetherington does not agree
- 38 with allowing variances on the website.

39 MOTION #2 JUNE-22-2016: Director Van Berkem motioned to accept the May 25, 2016 Minutes as 40 amended. Director Hetherington seconded the motion. President Wallace, Vice President Morrison, 41 Directors Van Berkem, Jones and Hetherington voted in favor of the motion. The motion passed.

42 **PRESENTATIONS AND ROUTINE REPORTS**

43 **AIRSHOW COMMITTEE REPORT:**

- Mr. Smith reported that there was more military support this year than ever before. There would not be an event Friday night before the AirShow but that there would be a Friday rehearsal from 12:00 p.m. to 2:00 p.m. There is an application in to the Thunderbirds for 2018 and community opinion is desired. That particular show would be a noisy 30 minute set, they would be staged out of Reno. There was consensus
- 48 from the Board that the community would welcome the Thunderbirds.

49 **PUBLIC COMMENT:** None.

50 ACAT REPORT:

- 51 Mr. Smith would bring a full update to the July meeting.
- 52 **PUBLIC COMMENT:** None

53 MONTHLY OPERATIONS AND COMMENT REPORT (TAB 5):

President Wallace asked the Board if the May report could be included in the quarterly presentation inJuly and the Board agreed.

56 Mr. Cooke presented the April report. An increase in traffic was most likely due to Spring Break. There 57 was a small increase of two comments and one comment per household. A new commenter came from

58 Glenshire in regard to a jet departure on runway 11 which was deemed compliant.

59 Mr. Cooke reported that Thursdays were the heaviest comment days as opposed to typical Sundays. More 60 traffic should be starting on Thursdays.

61 Mr. Cooke reported that the majority of night operations were EMS traffic. The only comment associated 62 to night operations was regarding a departure and staff reached out to the operator based on the 63 neighborhood overflight. There were no fly quiet violations and all non-incentivized operations received 64 outreach.

- Director Hetherington asked if the six night operation aircraft were local or transient, and Mr. Cook replied that one was transient and the rest were home-based but that they did not violate their Fly-Quiet incentives.
- 68 Director Hetherington expressed concern about the policy instruction passed in May, as June had been
- extremely busy. A positive point was that there was a caveat in the policy regarding General Manager
- 70 discretion regarding repeat commenters.

71 **PUBLIC COMMENT:** None.

72 DISTRICT ENGINEERS REPORT (TAB 6):

Mr. Bill Quesnel, District Engineer, reported that a contract had been awarded to Skylark, for a 5,000
 gallon refueler to be delivered in July. Director Jones asked what would be done with the old model and
 Mr. Quesnel explained that a surplus sale would be held.

76 Mr. Quesnel reported that warehouse improvements would cost approximately \$85,000 and the 77 anticipated completion was end of June. Staff was working with an engineer to design a fire sprinkler 78 system that would minimize impacts to existing tenant storage operations with recognition of limitations 79 on the District water distribution system. The least intrusive option to tenants required three times what 80 a typical water system requires to run. President Wallace asked if there was a way to restrict what tenants 81 use as storage so that this "extreme" would not be necessary for fire protection water usage and Mr. 82 Smith explained that there had been a long standing legacy agreement with a specific tenant but new 83 tenants would experience new requirements. Director Jones stated that the District was not required to 84 implement this fire protection but was doing so proactively.

Director Van Berkem asked if the most expensive route must be taken, and Mr. Quesnel explained that a
 discussion would be held with tenants regarding how they store their items and specifically what they
 store.

88 Mr. Quesnel reported that Maker Space would be open on July 1st. President Wallace stated that at the

beginning of the process, the cost of improvements was estimated at \$80,000. Mr. Smith replied that the
 Maker Space funding plus the Capital Facility Plan allocation was being used.

90 Maker Space funding plus the Capital Facility Plan allocation was being used.

91 Mr. Quesnel reported that 2,400 square feet was being added to the Maintenance Building with a 92 functional mezzanine and that 60% of the design was complete. The budget and scope of work would be 93 discussed at the July budget workshop meeting. Delivering the metal building via truck drove the price up. 94 Bidding in the winter months when less expensive should be considered in the future. Director Jones asked 95 if there was a way to broaden the bidding and Mr. Quesnel explained that there had only been one quote 96 from one supplier, and an erector must be licensed and qualified to avoid a similar situation as Hangar 97 Row Lima a few years ago. Prevailing wage was another huge cost increase. Hangar maintenance would 98 include painting G, H and J rows with a budget of \$210,000, and roof coating of Hangar C rows with a 99 contract amount of \$153,000 would be completed by September. Staff was rechecking maintenance 100 prices and assumptions.

101 Mr. Quesnel reported that additional playground features geared towards a 6-12 year old age group 102 would be the focus with construction in the fall budgeted at \$55,000.

Mr. Quesnel reported that drawings and discussions for the proposed Helipad had changed significantly
 due to County and TRPA requirements. Among other details, an agreement from the conservancy to use
 the access road would now be required as the 40' property was never transferred to TCPUD. Director Van
 Berkem asked how much this would now cost, and Mr. Quesnel replied that \$40,000 had been spent in
 total so far.

108 Mr. Quesnel reported that obtaining funding from the FAA for almost all paving projects had been very 109 successful. Taxi lanes West G, G/H, A, F, U and J would be reconstructed. The south jet ramp would be 110 reconstructed and Taxi E and H would be removed. Aprons A1 and A2 would be widened. Director

- 111 Hetherington asked if the Contractor, Meyers, had been used before, and Mr. Quesnel replied that this
- 112 was the first job done for Truckee. Mr. Quesnel reported that the Paving Project Update Map had been
- 113 updated.

114 **PUBLIC COMMENT:** None

President Wallace asked how budgeting should be handled ahead of the Facilities Master Plan, and Mr.Smith replied that a preliminary update would be presented at the Budget Workshop.

117 STAFF AND DIRECTOR CONFERENCE ATTENDANCE REPORTS:

118 Mr. Cooke attended the AAAE GIS conference in Milwaukee. The District usually attends the conference 119 every other year and have presented in the past. A GIS program is used within the organization and 120 attending the conference allows for utilizing this more productively in the long term.

- 121 Mr. Bullock attended the NBAA Regional Forum in Van Nuys regarding public and private partnerships. A
- 122 meeting occurred with the FAA Regional Southwest Administrator, in charge of the Western Pacific
- 123 Region, and with manufacturers and charter operators who use the Airport.

124 **PUBLIC COMMENT:** None

125 **BOARD ACTION ITEMS**

126 HANGAR 3 CONCEPT AND BUDGET REPORT (TAB 7):

127 Mr. Smith stated that the Ad hoc committee should contribute to the presentation if desired. The process 128 began in fall, 2013 and Mead & Hunt was hired in April, 2014. Various options from pricing to operational 129 impact for a multi-use hangar were presented in the 319 page document. The Ad hoc committee 130 recommended that the Board table the project to be revisited at a later date if needed. Actions available 131 at this meeting were to either accept the recommendation and table to a future date, modify the 132 recommendation and approve funding to begin a bidding phase, or to move forward with design and bids 133 to be followed with a decision at that point. Mr. Smith asked the Ad hoc committee to contribute 134 comments.

- President Wallace also asked to hear from the Ad hoc committee followed by an opinion from Board members regarding how much discussion should occur. Director Morrison stated that many questions had been asked and hard answers given in the report, but after the amount of time spent on this, a strong recommendation still had not formed; because of this, Director Morrison believed the project should be tabled.
- Director Hetherington stated that the process was iterative in that by finding some answers, other questions were discovered. Director Hetherington believe the project should be shelved, but that there was a great deal of information that was discovered in the process and it can be used to answer other questions going forward. Director Hetherington stated that the process was iterative and a great deal of information had been discovered through the dedication of the committee. Director Hetherington believed the project should not be shelved, but that the information gathered be used to answer other questions going forward.
- 147 Director Van Berkem, Director Jones and President Wallace had no clarifying questions.

148 **PUBLIC COMMENT:** None.

149 Director Van Berkem supported the idea of tabling the project and stated that while subjects such as

- increased traffic at the airport and additional costs to the building regarding support equipment were still not clear, the report had been very well done.
- 152 Director Jones supported the recommendation of the Ad hoc Committee.
- 153 President Wallace expressed reservations about the building from the start of discussions but appreciated
- the hard work of the Ad hoc Committee and all staff and consultants to create the report. The cost of the
- 155 study was worth the result as the cost of moving forward with building would have been higher. President
- 156 Wallace supported the recommendation of the Ad hoc Committee.
- 157 Mr. Smith stated the study cost \$150,000 to complete, but the amount was minimal compared to the total
- 158 cost of constructing a building. The information obtained would be used to answer other questions and 159 was a valuable document
- 159 was a valuable document.
- 160 **MOTION #3 JUNE-22-2016:** Director Jones motioned to accept the recommendation of the Ad Hoc 161 Committee that the concept be tabled at this time. Director Van Berkem seconded the motion. President 162 Wallace, Vice President Morrison, Directors Van Berkem, Jones and Hetherington voted in favor of the
- 163 motion. The motion passed.

164 **EXECUTIVE HANGARS (TAB 8)**:

- 165 President Wallace explained that there were a range of actions that could be taken at this meeting,
- 166 including asking staff to bring more information. Mr. Smith confirmed that the Board had until September
- 167 28, 2016 to deliver a decision.
- 168 Mr. Smith reviewed the Executive Hangar fact sheet. The Hangar 3 report had been very helpful towards 169 the Executive Hangar concept. Staff recommendation was that if Executive Hangars were to be built, a
- 170 lease rate and terms should be set, and staff could then poll the Hangar wait list to determine if this would

be accepted. Items added to the May report were additional language on Pro Formas, market lease rate

- 172 data and tables comparing other destination airports.
- 173 Directors Van Berkem and Jones had no clarifying questions.
- Director Hetherington had not examined the May report as closely as the March report, but had questions regarding the Pro Forma projections and various rates on pages 8 and 21. Mr. Smith replied that the market rate would be the 10%, 20% and 30% Pro Formas. The market study said that we are over what the market charges currently. Our Executive Hangars were more expensive than what was charged at
- 178 other similar airports.
- 179 Director Hetherington stated that comparing Truckee to Big Bear or Red Bluff was not realistic. Mr. Smith
- 180 indicated that Big Bear is a comparable airport and that many resort destinations are included. He agreed
- 181 that Red Bluff and a few others may not be in the same category as KTRK, but that the Board would need
- 182 to decide what the market is.
- 183 Director Hetherington asked for clarification regarding page 7, T-Hangar doors and page 10, Executive 184 Hangar doors; that tenants may sometimes want to park a car in a hangar in addition to a plane. Mr. Smith

- explained that it is typical for a pilot to drive to the airport, pull the plane out and leave the car in thehangar.
- 187 Director Hetherington asked how long bond financing would go out, Mr. Smith said likely 20 years, but it
- 188 could be paid off earlier. Director Hetherington asked how long a bond would take to obtain, and Mr.
- 189 Smith if the Board decided to move forward he would get a timeline, which would take about 90 days.
- 190 Director Hetherington asked about lost piston aircraft over time and if an engineer should review the T-
- 191 Hangar rows to determine if they could be modified. Mr. Smith referred the question to Mr. Stoner who
- 192 explained that while a structural engineer had not been consulted, modifying would be a significant
- 193 structural challenge and a tear down; starting new, would be recommended.
- Director Hetherington asked for more detail regarding the Monte Carlo scenario within the report. Mr.Smith replied that more information could be gathered.
- 196 Director Hetherington asked about front end lease rates and re-negotiation. Mr. Smith replied that it was
- 197 desirable to have tenants sign a contingency. Director Hetherington stated that the setup of the tables in
- 198 the report was confusing and an apples to apples comparisons was desired.
- 199 Director Hetherington asked if the presented report was final, and Mr. Smith replied that the report was
- actually the latest version. Director Van Berkem stated that some numbers were vague and actual numbers would be helpful.
- 202 Director Hetherington stated that it should be understood that regarding the statement on page nine,
- 203 third paragraph, it was a fact that people do not fly to KTRK due to no hangars and deicing. Director Jones
- stated that this was a comment and not a question. President Wallace asked if there were more clarifying
- 205 questions, there were none.
- President Wallace asked about appendices and receiving a bond timeline also, but understood thesewould be researched further by staff.
- 208 **PUBLIC COMMENT:** None.
- 209 President Wallace asked Mr. Smith if any comments had been received prior to the meeting and Mr. Smith
- 210 replied that interest but no issues had been expressed. Director Hetherington asked if the survey was
- new, and Mr. Smith explained that the survey was part of the original study.
- 212 Director Jones stated support for the project. There was a ten year waiting list and the Master Plan 213 confirmed the project. The demand was real and there was an interesting financial alternative in that 214 pilots using the hangars would pay for them, taking the discussion around taxpayer money away. The 215 charged rate should be limited to 20% over market as an amount over 20% may appear to be gouging and 216 raise questions from the FAA. It would be hard to ask the public to pay for something KTRK has been 217 unwilling to provide, and this is actually why there was such a long wait list. There would probably be 218 additional questions needing to be addressed by other Board members before making a decision, and 219 Director Jones wanted to see the questions defined at this meeting so that the project could move forward, to avoid re-addressing of previous discussions. 220
- 221 Director Van Berkem was in favor of building the hangars but with some caveat, and did not believe the 222 first six hangars would likely increase traffic. Director Van Berkem agreed with Director Jones regarding

hangars being paid for with a bond. A price should be set related to a twenty year payback. The hangars
would be appropriate to an airport. Mr. Smith reviewed the cost recovery scenario.

Vice President Morrison honored all of the efforts to assemble information and believed there was a distinct need for the Hangars compared to any other current needs of the District. The hangars aligned with the mission. Tenants should not be gouged with the maximum charge, however, because the Board had prevented supply against the demand for years.

- Director Jones stated that no property tax would be used and the District would receive a return on an asset they did not have to pay for.
- Vice President Morrison believed the hangars would not increase traffic because tenants on the wait list
 were already here, and believed the project had been on hold long enough and should be moved forward
 at this meeting.
- 234 Director Hetherington acknowledged that there was a demand; however, there had been a 200 tenant T-
- hangar wait list before the economy dipped in the late 2000s and this should be a consideration. Revenue
- should be made from the hangars. The market consists of wealthy people with expensive aircraft and up
- to 30% Pro Forma would be reasonable. The Master Plan shows 24 more Executive Hangars, but but the
- previous Master Plan had 4 runways and over 200 additional T hangars. Just because something is in the

239 <u>Master Plan, it does not dictate what must happen.previous plans included details that never materialized,</u>

- 240 so the Master Plan does not dictate what must happen. Vice President Morrison stated that he and
- 241 Director Hetherington had worked on the Master Plan process for many years, approved by the Board.
- 242 Director Hetherington wanted to see a real cost number to assess and believed the Board was aware that 243 there are aircraft that chose not to come to KTRK because no hangars were available for them. Director
- Van Berkem believed that the comments of Director Hetherington would be accurate in relation to
- building 24 new hangars, but there was no data that concluded the six hangars would increase traffic.
- 246 Director Hetherington stated support again for charging plus 20%, an alternate revenue source as good
- 247 business, similar to the belief of Director Jones. Director Van Berkem replied that KTRK would be making
- 248 money on the tenant investment regardless and the question was how much profit should be made.
- Director Jones asked why there was an emphasis on profit specifically on the six Executive Hangars and not all of the other tenants. If profit was the goal, fees should be charged for parking and use of the meeting room.
- 252 President Wallace agreed with much of what had been said with the exception of charging more for all. 253 Building six hangars would not likely increase operations; when initial discussions were held, President 254 Wallace would have voted no to additional hangars but had changed the opinion particularly with bonding 255 as a financing mechanism. More information was needed to support a yes vote around such areas as the 256 bonding timeline, which was the only form President Wallace would support. As cost overruns had been 257 experienced on past projects, one more solid look at Pro Forma costs including maintenance was needed. 258 A long, important and complex conversation regarding a business and revenue model for the airport was 259 needed. President Wallace liked the cost recovery scenario.
- Vice President Morrison believed the market plus 20% would be too high and did not support this, but
 supported the other items. The Board enjoys a strong relationship with staff and Vice President Morrison
 was not sure the Board needed to ask staff to bring further answers to questions before giving direction.
 Design and a preliminary budget should be the next step.

264 Director Jones stated belief that the point of view looking at the project was from financing and risk

265 management. The appropriate number to use was the rate of return with no funding from the Airport for266 the project.

267 Director Jones suggested a Motion to move forward and agree to build six new hangars subject to specific 268 information still needed from staff such as a bonding timeline, costs, off-ramps, types of contracts, the 269 cost of the hangar, soft costs and financing costs on a 20 year revenue bond in order to finalize a decision 270 with a 2.5% return included in the Pro Forma. Director Van Berkem stated that the Motion was very 271 complicated, and suggested the Motion be only for staff to return with a detailed cost analysis including 272 bonding, maintenance, credit card charges, etc.; and that determining the percentage earned would be a 273 business decision. Mr. Smith referred the Board to page 25 of the study which outlines cost with IRR and 274 includes maintenance, admin., financing, etc. The Board reviewed page 25. Director Jones amended the 275 suggested motion to 1% return and Director Van Berkem amended the suggested motion to design and 276 bidding only, not to include construction.

- 277 Mr. Smith stated that it would possibly be up to two months before a contractor could complete a 50%278 60% design with all of the details involved, and that a \$160,000 budget could be approved.
- Director Hetherington asked that the questions mentioned be answered at the July meeting, and Mr.Smith replied that this would be done no matter the Motion verbiage.
- 281 **MOTION #4 JUNE-22-2016:** Director Jones motioned to authorize staff to move forward with design and 282 hard bidding for six metal Executive Hangars with a \$160,000 budget. Director Van Berkem seconded the 283 motion. President Wallace, Vice President Morrison, Directors Van Berkem, Jones and Hetherington voted 284 in favor of the motion. The motion passed.

285APPROVAL OF CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL EQUALITY ACT (CEQA) INITIAL STUDY/MITIGATED286NEGATIVE DECLARATION (MND) FOR THE TRUCKEE TAHOE AIRPORT DISTRICT MASTER PLAN PROJECT287(TAB 9):

- 288 Mr. Smith explained that the initial study and mitigation plan were under consideration at this meeting,289 and introduced Mr. David Dietz, Project Manager with Mead & Hunt.
- 290 Mr. Dietz explained the components of the MND which did not include future non-aviation issues. The 291 purpose was to define mitigations and to inform the public. The MND is programmatic document and a 292 30,000 foot view of the Master Planning level which broadly defined mitigations for subsequent projects. 203 Specific projects may require additional CEOA review.
- 293 Specific projects may require additional CEQA review.
- Director Van Berkem asked what kind of archaeologic items might be found in the area between the two runways, and Mr. Dietz replied that this would be arrowheads, pottery, fire pits, etc. There could be cultural issues around the collection and disposal of the items.
- 297 Director Hetherington asked if greenhouse gas had been addressed for aircraft or only for buildings, and
- 298 Mr. Dietz replied that the biggest source of greenhouse gas is from aeronautical activities over the Airport
- which the District has no authority over. The issue is addressed as far as possible on the District level.
- 300 There are construction techniques that limit greenhouse gas emissions.
- Director Hetherington stated 7 a.m. to 10 p.m. for construction on the northwest hangar site seemed late.
 Mr. Dietz replied that the time mirrored town regulations. Director Hetherington stated that drainage
 requirements were addressed for Placer and Nevada counties, but that the town of Truckee was not

- mentioned. Mr. Dietz replied that this could be put in a Motion to add. Director Hetherington requested
 that construction hours be limited to 7 p.m.
- 306 **PUBLIC COMMENT:** None.

Director Jones stated that limiting work hours on this specific project, and on a project by project basis,
 was desirable to putting limits on the abilities in the Master Plan. Director Hetherington re-read the noise
 restriction hours, and Director Jones rescinded the comment.

- President Wallace stated that the two items remaining on the table were to change the allowed noise hours in the monitoring plan to 7 a.m. to 7 p.m. and to address storm water management issues for the
- 312 Town of Truckee. Mr. Collinson suggested that a Motion be made to modify the Plan first.

313 **MOTION #5 JUNE-22-2016:** Director Hetherington motioned to approve the Mitigation Monitoring Plan 314 with the two modifications discussed. Director Jones seconded the motion. President Wallace, Vice 315 President Morrison, Directors Van Berkem, Jones and Hetherington voted in favor of the motion. The 316 motion passed.

- 317 MOTION #6 JUNE-22-2016: Director Jones motioned to adopt Resolution 2016-06 and to waive the 318 reading. Director Van Berkem seconded the motion. President Wallace, Vice President Morrison, Directors
- 319 Van Berkem, Jones and Hetherington voted in favor of the motion. The motion passed.

320 **GREENHOUSE GAS CONSULTANT SELECTION (TAB 10)**:

- Mr. Smith reported that an Ad Hoc Committee was formed in May and met last week to select the Greenhouse Gas Emissions Inventory Consultant. The committee recommendation was that the Board move forward with First Environment, pending a final interview and opportunity to refine the scope. An authorization to proceed with scope and fee negotiations and the subsequent signing of contracts was requested, and if First Environment did not satisfactorily complete the final interview, a second consultant would be selected.
- 327 **PUBLIC COMMENT:** None.

MOTION #7 JUNE-22-2016: Director Van Berkem motioned to authorize moving forward with scope and
 fee negotiations with First Environment pending a final interview. Director Jones seconded the motion.

- 330 President Wallace, Vice President Morrison, Directors Van Berkem, Jones and Hetherington voted in favor
- of the motion. The motion passed.

332 **BOARD GUIDANCE AND INFORMATION ITEMS**

333 INTRODUCTION OF RATES, FEES AND CHARGES AND DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS POLICIES – BEGIN 334 PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD (TAB 11):

335 Mr. Bullock presented a timeline and reviewed the project. A revision incorporating public comments

would be brought to the Board in July and for adoption in August. A final draft would be available before

the July meeting and Mr. Bullock would be available to discuss if needed. Staff requested that the Board open public comment on Rates, Fees and Charges and Development Standards, with an amendment to

been public comment on Rates, rees and Charges and Development Standards, with an amenument to

- the public comment length from 29 days to 30 days. The staff report outlined the form and function of
- 340 each of the four documents.

- 341 Director Jones repeated a request from the meeting last month that a comparison to changes between
- the current and proposed policies be shown such as in a red-lined document. Mr. Bullock stated that a
- red-lined copy including the source of comments around any dramatic changes and a clean final copy
- 344 would be available at the July 27, 2016 meeting. The Board would have time to read the document 345 thoroughly, discuss with and submit comments to Mr. Bullock for incorporation into the final document.
- President Wallace explained that public comment was not being taken at this meeting, but rather a period of public comment was being opened from tonight until July 21, 2016.
- 348 Director Hetherington asked if there was an attachment of a Master Fee Schedule (MFS) to the Policy. Mr.
- 349 Bullock replied that there would be a MFS routed internally within the organization. Mr. Smith stated that
- 350 implementing a MFS should be done strategically as to not complicate a point of sale system currently
- 351 being modified. President Wallace asked for the draft to be posted to the public when ready and Mr.
- 352 Smith agreed.
- 353 President Wallace opened the public comment period with a consensus.

354 **FY2017 BUDGET WORKSHOP – WHATS TO COME:**

- 355 Mr. Smith reminded the Board of the Budget Workshop on July 11, 2016 from 9 a.m. to 12 p.m. The format
- will be similar to last year and a preliminary budget should be distributed by July 1, 2016. There will be
- 357 seven to twelve budget issues to define and depending on the outcome, a decision on the date of the next
- 358 budget review workshop prior to September when the budget be adopted would be determined.
- 359 Ms. Lyon stated that there would be consolidated budget comparison numbers and this would be more 360 comprehensive than what was presented last year.
- 361 **PUBLIC COMMENT:** None.

362 **GENERAL MANAGERS REPORT (TAB 12)**:

363 UPCOMING TRAINING OPPORTUNITIES

The Arts in the Airport conference is upcoming. The two-day Boyd Conference will be held at the Resort at Squaw Creek September 30, 2016 after the Reno Air Races. Boyd International is the preeminent

aviation forecasting company that airlines observe. The website is <u>www.aviationforecastsummit.com</u>.

367 AD HOC COMMITTEES STATUS UPDATE AND BOARD ASSIGNMENTS

368 Master Plan:

- 369 The Master Plan Committee held its final meeting.
- 370 Warehouse Office Building (WOB):
- 371 There will be a timeline and budget update at the July meeting.
- 372 Hangar 3:
- 373 This committee has completed its project.

374 Non-Aeronautical Land Use Plan:

The committee will begin shortly.

376 **Classification and Compensation Study:**

377 Interviews have finished and the salary study is ongoing.

378 DOG PARK:

379 Mr. Smith indicated that he has been approached by community groups looking for land to construct a 380 dog park and he wanted the Board to know he is having conversations on the concept but that nothing 381 has been committed or agreed to. President Wallace requested that staff proactively contact entities in 382 the region that are planning Dog Parks to assure we are not duplicating facilities. President Wallace was 383 not in favor of becoming involved in a Dog Park if the airport has to be involved in planning, operating and 384 maintaining the facility. The Army Corp Master Plan has three Dog Parks in their Master Plan. Director 385 Hetherington asked if there was signage regarding cleaning up dog waste here at the airport park, and 386 Mr. Smith replied yes, as well as bags available.

387 ECONOMIC IMPACT STUDY CONSULTANT SELECTION UPDATE:

388 Mr. Smith reported that three proposals had been submitted and asked the Board if an Ad hoc Committee 389 should be formed. Director Hetherington and Director Van Berkem stated desire to be a part of this Ad 390 hoc Committee. There was consensus to have Directors Van Berkem and Hetherington to sit on the Ad 391 Hoc Committee.

392 TAHOE TRUCKEE COMMUNITY FOUNDATIONS REGIONAL HOUSING STUDY – UPDATE:

Mr. Smith reported that the Draft study would be available for review shortly. The Tahoe Truckee Community Foundation (TTCF) would like to rally support from the private and public sector. Mr. Smith has been invited to meetings in order to receive more information. The goal of TTCF is to have general managers and elected officials attend a regional housing summit to learn more about how to address our community housing needs. More to come in the future.

398 UPCOMING MEETINTGS:

399 Mr. Smith reported that the Budget Workshop would be held on July 11, 2016, and regular Board meetings400 on July 27, 2016 and August 24, 2016.

401 ROLLING AGENDA REVIEW:

402 Mr. Smith had no update.

403 **PUBLIC COMMENT:**

Ms. Tatiana Bennett, Truckee Resident, stated that the Dog Park map had been presented at the Truckee
 Parks and Recreation Board meeting. There is very little parking available in neighborhoods and while the

406 neighborhood is currently affected by airport activity, it would now be affected by increased traffic. Mr.

407 Smith mentioned that any sites in neighborhoods have been eliminated.

- 408 Mr. Bullock reported that the ACAT Controller is on-site for 90 days related to the survey for a seasonal 409 tower. President Wallace requested a brief staff update at the next Board meeting.
- 410 MOTION #8 JUNE-22-2016: Director Jones motioned to adjourn. Vice President Morrison seconded the
- 411 motion. President Wallace, Vice President Morrison, Directors Van Berkem, Jones and Hetherington voted
- 412 in favor of the motion. The motion passed.
- 413 The meeting adjourned at 7:55 p.m.