

MINUTES
ABERDEEN REGIONAL AIRPORT BOARD

Special Meeting

April 15, 2010

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

MEMBERS ABSENT: Chuck Bensen

OTHERS PRESENT: Dave Osborn, Bob King, John Aman, Sam Muntean, Rhea Ketterling

The special meeting started with a roll call at 11:30am. Osborn stated the two items that were left with the Board, item #1 is that Hangar 9 requests from the Board the ability to lease an additional 30'x100' for the new hangar. The reason for this request is their wishes to shift the new hangar closer to the passenger terminal and construct a car port for patrons to facilitate unloading during inclement weather. From our last meeting it was requested to give a week to do additional information with FAA, who Muntean had communication with. Osborn opened the meeting to Aman in case he has something more to offer. Aman, Hangar 9 stated he has nothing more to offer. Aman's understanding of the week's delay was just to check with FAA to ensure that it would not hinder or inhibit any AIP funds now and in the future. Osborn stated this is correct and also the fact according to the notes that we also wants the Engineer's recommendation. Aman agreed. Muntean, Helms and Associates stated he talked to FAA. FAA supports the Airport in trying to protect and utilize their apron as efficiently as possible for items that need to be located on the Airport: parking is not one of those things. FAA had asked and pointed out the other FBO's parking areas are located adjacent to apron and have drive a on access. Either way the Airport went, the FAA would support the Airport. They did not see any regulatory issues that would go, but they would certainly want the Airport to lean towards most efficient use of the apron. Helms and Associates recommendation after reviewing this is that the Airport is loosing a large chunk of the apron and is getting very limited in the amount of apron we are going to have. Helms and Associates hesitates to allow the car port because we are loosing 90' of apron space; once you get from the existing building over to the electric line, the 10' offset off the electric line and the 30' car port to the building. What Helms and Associates recommend is if Hangar 9 wants to do the 30' car port, Hangar 9 move the electric line so they can put the car port between the two buildings and get back down to roughly 30' or so as they had planned. This will still give them drive through access onto the apron and gives the Airport the most efficient use of the apron. The Airport is then not loosing a big chunk of space that all it is use for is for loading/unloading of cars or parking. Hangar 9's share of moving the electric line portion of 120' to 130' to get from the main in the back up to the apron edge, from the apron edge out would be part of the apron project and should be paid for under this project because the apron would be disturbing this line and we have to do this anyway. Muntean does not have a firm estimate from West Plains Engineering on this, but Hangar 9 is probably looking at between \$2,000 to \$3,000 for a 150' conduit cable and the work to install and connect it (estimate from an old bid prices and adding a little to the cost). Osborn stated a lot of the Board members does not know that Muntean, Biegler also from Helms and Associates, King and Osborn met with Aman last week and went over the fencing and tried to talk about this. Osborn knew at that time this was one of the suggestion; look at possibly moving the electrical line because it could be a dual project where we could meet at the apron, pick up the line for the field and get it out of there and it does make it simpler. Kaiser asked for clarification of where we are moving the electrical line from and to. Osborn stated it would be hard to do it directionally by phone. The best Osborn could describe this is that right next to the existing hangar within approximately 34' there is the electrical line that goes out to the field. This provides all the electricity to the field. The suggestion is taking that line that goes through moving it to the opposite side of the existing hangar. By doing this, it opens it up that they will not have the 10' requirement for set off that the City has. It will just be the 30' only and they will not have the electrical line. Johnson stated he sees a value in the fact that Hangar 9 if they paved that area and there was electrical problems down the road they will not have to repave. Osborn stated the contract did allow Hangar 9 to pave this area, but if there was any issues with the lighting that we will be involved. Johnson stated this is understood, but if this area is abandoned, then Hangar 9 will no longer have this risk. Kaiser asked if there are any other lines that go through where the utility lines are. King stated to the best of our knowledge, we just have the home run for the Airport going through here. Osborn stated we are talking electrical, but on the other side of the existing hangar there are other issues that are out there that had been discussed with Aman such as waterline. Zeeb asked Aman if Hangar 9 has any thoughts on relocating the lines. Aman stated he does not know what Dr. Bormes or Dr. Wischmeier thoughts are, but for Aman personally he would assume the risk of paving over it and having it there. If the Board wishes to move it and shorten up the distance between there, (if Aman is doing this) he does not feel it would be his responsibility to move the cable and vacate the utility right of way just to shorten up the lack of exposure on the ramp side. If it was Aman doing this personally, he would be willing to pay the rent per square footage. Right now not knowing what Dr. Bormes and Dr. Wischmeier's wishes are Aman would have to ask them for guidance. Kaiser stated Dr. Wischmeier apparently is asking for the 30' and the Board is giving them a way to do it. It seems that \$2,000 to \$3,000 is not much to have the way they want it build. Johnson asked Muntean if the Board make a motion and Hangar

9 act upon it this allows them to bring their building how much closer together to one another. Muntean stated they could go all the way from the canopy from one building to the other. There will be no separation requirement other than what is required from zoning and code which Muntean believes that as long as they have a fire rated walls between the buildings could be conjoin. Muntean thinks and understand that for operational purposes they want to drive between the two buildings. Obviously to get on to the apron to be able to load/unload aircraft, cargo and so forth which make sense. Muntean assumes they still want to be 20' to 30' apart possibly a little further so the canopy doesn't run into the other building. Johnson stated he understands that there will be another gate. There is a gate now on what Johnson calls the north side of the existing building. Aman stated there will be a gate which will be Hangar 9's responsibility. Obviously public access cannot go through gate #6 which this issue had been addressed. As far as conjoining the two buildings, Aman as a builder/contractor would not do this because of the two different kinds of foundations and how the buildings would react in freeze, thaw cycle. You would just have a continuous leak. Johnson stated he would not recommend this either, but if you have the opportunity you can make it close. Aman stated you can get within reason. King and Aman had talked about this as in order to facilitate getting one of the Airport trucks through with the blade, wing or a broom Aman knows that they have to have a minimum of 20' gate. This means that we are talking about a 40' spread between building and building to facilitate the gate movement without either blocking the hangar door on one or the public access door on the FBO. Regardless of how it is done, Aman stated they have to have at least a 40' span and probably a little bit more between the two buildings. Johnson stated he was just thinking for efficiency purposes and employees going back and forth, shortening the distance might have some value. Aman stated this is just his observation. Johnson moved to deny the additional 30'x100' land space for the new hangar, seconded by Zeeb. Motion carried with Kaiser abstaining. Chairman Erickson stated Aman had said he needs a 20' gate and 40' spread, how does the car port fit in this picture. Osborn stated a lot of it will depend upon the doors on either side which way the gate would go. Aman stated from the corner of the building to center of the ramp side door is about 11.5' to the edge of the door. Osborn stated with the 30' car port and 11' this gives Aman 41', so will it ever affect the door. Aman stated his concern is getting the car port right up against the current maintenance facility too, if it gets shifting and heaving. Osborn stated this is understandable. It's just how this car port will be put there whether it'll poles besides the building or attached to the building. Aman stated one side will be attached to the FBO that is going to be constructed and the other is going to have two columns. Osborn stated so if the gate is offset from this and this is a 20' area and there is a 30' area in between another 11' to the door, if the gate is fully open, it will not interrupt the door from being used. Aman stated no it will not interrupt the door, but what height then are we looking at; construction wise so that one of the snow removal vehicles could pass beneath it. Aman is guessing 14' to 16'. Osborn stated 14' would be the minimum. Aman stated he was looking at ground clearance being somewhere 9' to 10' range. Osborn stated it probably would be best for Aman to talk to Hangar 9 how this would work if there would be an amendment to be brought back to the Board as obviously it would involve them some money whether it be the electrical or the height of the car port. Aman agreed that this would be their best interest.

Item #2 Hangar 9 also request the first option on 200'x80' located directly to the South East of the new hangar for future expansion. Johnson stated this was address by Altman as he does not know if they ever granted any option on Airport property. Osborn stated this was the statement from Altman from the last meeting "Altman stated he had never seen any of this on Airport property so he should at least do some research about whether it is legal, let alone advisable". Osborn contacted Altman this morning and he is out of the office today. Aman stated he has no problem with item #2 being tabled until May's meeting. The 200'x80' first right of refusal would not change regardless where the building goes up. They would like to have first option at that rather than becoming disjointed. If the Board's wishes that the only way this can be done, they do the rental agreement, the Board then can instruct Altman to do the additional rental agreement at May's meeting. Because we do not have anything from Altman at this time and he did advise us that he wants to check on this, Osborn concur with Aman to hold this until May's meeting at least to get something back from Altman. Zeeb moved to table item #2 until May's meeting, seconded by Johnson. Motion carried with Kaiser abstaining.

We received Geotechnical testing proposal's for the Apron expansion from Core Engineering and Consulting, \$2,992, American Technical Services \$3,430, American Engineering Testing \$3,485, Soil Technologies \$4,496, Tetra Tech \$4,730, and Midwest Testing Laboratory \$5,100. Geotek Engineering, Northern Technologies and Braun Intertec did not submit proposals for this project. Muntean stated this is for the soil boring for the Apron expansion to get a report on what kind of soil exists there. In addition, we are also getting a boring or two in several other areas of the Airport where we had soil movement and pavement movement. Some additional things had come up since then, we may put possibly water level monitoring in one of the boring, to monitor water level throughout the season to see if we got large fluctuations in water level. This is one of the things they had talked about to help identify some of the problem area. This work is eligible for AIP funding as far as the Apron project. They have worked with Core Engineering in the past and they are capable of doing the work and can start fairly soon. Muntean stated their recommendation is to accept the proposal from Core Engineering and Consulting, Inc as it is complete and reasonable. Kaiser moved approval to accept Core Engineering and Consulting, Inc proposal of \$2,992, seconded by Zeeb. Motion carried.

Johnson moved to adjourn the special meeting, seconded by Kaiser. The meeting adjourned at 12:04pm.