

**MINUTES**  
**ABERDEEN REGIONAL AIRPORT BOARD**  
**Regular Meeting**  
**November 4, 2010**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Mike Erickson, Rolf Johnson, Steve Kaiser

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Nate Zeeb

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Bob King, Gary Dahlerup, John Aman, Emily Arthur-Richardt, Arnie Johnson, Darrell Hillestad, Julie Johnson, Comm. Mike Wiese, Rod Tobin, Adam Altman, Rhea Ketterling

Chairman Erickson called the regular scheduled meeting of the Aberdeen Regional Airport Board to order at 11:32am on Thursday, November 4, 2010.

Johnson moved approval of the minutes from the October 7, 2010 meeting, seconded by Kaiser. Motion carried.

Old Business: (Storage Shed) King reported we are still working on the Storage shed. The concrete is coming in this afternoon. (Display Board) The Display board still has not arrived. The wiring has been completed. The kiosks are here, but the computer to go with it are not. King had asked Bauer, Station Manager but does not have any update. (2011 Vehicle) The bill date on this is November 15<sup>th</sup> and hopefully the first part of December we should have the new vehicle.

Kaiser moved approval of the bills for the month of October, seconded by Johnson. Motion carried.

Johnson moved approval of the October financial report, seconded by Kaiser. Motion carried.

King stated for the signs to get the lights under it, he has one quote which is \$1,585 to get lights under on both sides. What they will do is it would be hooked in with the existing signs. Kaiser asked will they be high enough up so it will not get snow packed. King stated they will be hanging it from the bottom of the signs. Chairman Erickson asked how many lights will be put in. King stated one on each side of the signs. Johnson asked if a RFP (Request for Proposal) is needed. King stated with this small amount we do not have to; what he will do is get a couple more bids to make sure it is competitive.

Kaiser stated we now know more as to why it cost more to fly out of Aberdeen. It is the way Delta's pricing structure is done. We are now going to ask Delta if they can change us since they changed Pierre. It is a little dicey doing this because Pierre has a competitor to Delta whereas we are a single station. Although the consultant that we hired to do the Airfare Study feels that we have a very good chance of getting selected to go to a pricing system. Right now looking at everything we are price apparently \$90 to \$140 above whatever one would pay out of Fargo. This is the general rule. There are other contravening things that get thrown in the mix, like enough aircraft for the demand in the given day and other restrictions like some of the lower fares dependent upon one spending Saturday and Sunday here. We have a better much handle on how airfares are determined in today's market. The gentleman who did the Study for us was a fare setter for one of the airlines for four years and understands the system and how it operates. Basically we looked at all kinds of fare. There are some that it is cheaper to fly out of Aberdeen than Sioux Falls which is to Dallas and Seattle. This is all laid out on the report. One of the anomalies that we found and the only explanation that we really come out is that Aberdeen prices went up a lot when Great Lakes pulled out. Johnson added it has not settled back down to our pre-Great Lakes time. The report compared us to Sioux Falls and Fargo which has ten times more traffic than we have. It is interesting to note that Rapid City now has more passengers going out lately than out of Sioux Falls. We knew going in from the Marketing survey that we did 5 or 6 years ago that 50% of people do not use the Aberdeen Airport at all. How many of them actually fly? There is a certain percentage that does not fly at all, but then there's also percentage of those who drove to Sioux Falls, to Fargo and to Minneapolis. These are the cities that were used to compare us to in the Airfare study. The hope now is Pierre wants to get theirs so they are only \$20 to \$30 more than Sioux Falls. If we can get in the same it would really assists us. Will Delta do this, we do not know. Johnson stated there are a lot of questions that we do not have answers to that would require additional research on. Kaiser distributed an advertising sheet to get the word out that Jet Service has started November 1<sup>st</sup>. Kaiser stated he had talked to Ochs at the Chamber to send this out to its members. Kaiser thinks by having the jet service on a permanent basis we can end up with 5% or 10% boost in our passenger traffic because there were these many people that told us on our survey that they would not fly on the Saab 340. Kaiser also wants to add a picture of the CRJ 200 on the advertising sheet. Tobin stated he sits on the Chamber Board and thinks this is a great idea, but he would simplify it more and adding the picture of the jet is also a great idea. Julie Johnson, Absolutely Aberdeen stated they are thankful to this Board and King for engaging in this research. An important research for a community that is trying to grow like ours to have in hand, so we can be sure what we are dealing with in terms of our air service markets. They are also incorporating the new City brand with the Fly Aberdeen strategy. Hopefully they will have something to share with the Board in short order as well. Chairman Erickson asked are we pursuing further in the study. Kaiser stated yes. The Air Task Force group will be meeting again and will do some work and thoughts.

Maybe they can get specific advertising campaign organized that could help us over the next three, four, five months. One other thing we want to talk a lot about is to keep the jet coming; we have to fill it. Northern is really concern that they are going to loose the late afternoon flight when we go to two jets. The only way we can prevent this is to fill the 20 seats extra that we are now getting. Kaiser thinks the passengers are there. They are just going to different airports now; it's a matter of getting them here. If the price structure change, Kaiser thinks that we will see a big change on this and our usage will go up a lot. Chairman Erickson asked if the flights had been full lately. King stated he thinks we are doing quite well. He has not received the actual figure lately. We seem to be up a little over last year at this time. Johnson added not year to date.

Dakota Contracting, AIP Project #3-46-0001-29-2009 Hangar Taxilane Improvements:

Johnson moved approval of Change Order #4 increasing contract in the amount of \$3,510.04, seconded by Kaiser. King stated we bought the stencils that were used to paint 13/31 and 17/35 with the new surface painting requirement on the runways. We will use these stencils in the future when we have to do it ourselves. Motion approving CO #4 is carried.

Muntean, Helms and Associates stated the pay estimate is the final estimate when the Board approved it; it has to be contingent on lien waivers. Muntean added they will send a letter to the Airport stating everything is complete, the job is complete and can release the payment. Johnson moved approval of pay estimate #7(Final) in the amount of \$60,967.57, seconded by Kaiser. King stated this is the final payment so we can close out the project. They have done everything that is required. Muntean stated there are three items that we are waiting for before we can release payment. They are the lien waivers from all their sub-contractors, badges that had not been turned in (either turn them in or pay for them) and one item that was found this morning during the final walk through. There is one small hole on the concrete that they have to patch. Braun from Quest Aviation asked if they gravel the road that they tore up with all their trucks. King stated he does not believe they did this. Muntean asked which road. King stated the fuel road. We may have missed this on the punch list that was done this morning. Braun stated to King that they had talked about this. King acknowledged that they did. Braun stated with all the traffic they ground all the gravel and they are just dust. King stated he believed when he talked to Braun about this there were some stockpiles left and we were going to asked them to move it. Kaiser asked is the contractor aware of this? King stated not yet and we can still take care of it. Braun asked Muntean on the fuel road where it ties into the back taxiway, it's crumbling (the asphalt is giving away), what are we going to do there? Braun's concern is that when it gets soft, are they going to get through there? Muntean stated it still has the same gravel underneath that it did before. The asphalt was there to keep rocks from dragging across there. Muntean stated we can look at it. King added he is not sure what we can do on this. We just have to look at it. This portion of the road was designed for single axle fuel truck. Heavier trucks will be tearing it up as it is not designed for that. Johnson amended his motion that final payment is contingent upon approval from Helms and Associates, seconded by Kaiser. Motion carried.

Altman, City Attorney stated we had some problems on getting the hay off the Airport this year. The lease is not sufficient in terms of what it requires of the removal of the hay bales. Altman's suggestion is to amend the lease and contact the operators to take the hay off. Before we do this, what is the correct time to put on the lease? The primary concern of getting the hay bales off is Airport safety. It is important to do it sooner rather than later. Altman stated he does not have the sense in terms of operation of the Airport of what this number should be. Altman asked the Board for guidance on what this number should be and he would contact the individual operators and negotiate the change and bring this back to the Board next month. Johnson thought that we talked about 2 to 4 weeks. King stated originally when we talked about this, we would like the bales removed within 2 weeks. We made exceptions this year because of the wet weather. Like Altman had said it's the safety concern. King added because of wildlife concerns also. We would like them removed within a couple of weeks. King has no problem with 2 to 4 weeks giving them a chance. We do need to have them removed in a timelier manner than what happened this year. Johnson stated last year this was not an issue. King stated a little bit that is why we implemented the 2 weeks. There are 96 bales currently on property. Johnson asked how long since the last cutting. King stated basically the end of June/July. Its only been cut once. Kaiser asked if there are any FAA mandates on this. King stated not for hay removal. King added giving the farmers credit, they did a good job on getting the bales away from the safety areas. This year they stacked them single row next to the fence. King's concern on this since there is such a delay; if it would start snowing we will have huge snowdrifts on our fence. Also the staff as they do their inspection see a lot of smaller animal activity; hiding in bales and such. Johnson stated so King's suggestion is 30 days from the 2 weeks. King stated 15 to 30 days. They really should get the bales off. Hillestad, local pilot asked if we could add weather permitting. Altman stated yes, as in any case it is standard in these kinds of contract. Chairman Erickson asked this would not jeopardize any contracts; as they may say this is not worth their time. King stated he honestly does not know. It would be up to them. Hillestad stated it's a lot better to have them cut it. If we make it too strict then they will not cut the hay, then we will have varmint's problem. When the grass gets tall, the pilots notices this on the runways as there will be more critters. Chairman Erickson stated we definitely do not want to be in the farming business. Altman asked what if they don't; is the penalty to be a financial penalty? We do not want to get into a hay moving business either. Without specifying what should happen, we would probably be authorized to move it ourselves, charge it back to the farmer who's cutting the hay, but a lot of times they do their own work. For us to a hire hay mover and it will end up costing the farmer, is not a great plan. If we have a structured financial penalty for not moving the bales versus moving it ourselves or is it enough safety concern to move it ourselves and charge it back. Hillestad asked has this been a problem in the past. King stated it's the first year this bad of a problem. It had to do with the weather and the weather did straighten out and they just did not get it moved. In the past we worked with them as to where to move it off, make sure it is out of the safety areas and a little timelier of getting it moved. Our wildlife recommendation is we get

them out early. Johnson stated he does not understand since July what the issues had been. We had a wet spring, but since the 1<sup>st</sup> of August, Johnson can't see what the problem had been. King stated he had send them a letter prior and requested that the bales be moved by the 1<sup>st</sup> of October. They are either busy or does not have it sold. Even when we notified them, it did not get done. Kaiser asked if we called them. King stated he called and sent a letter. Chairman Erickson stated it was harvest season and then farmers got busy. Altman stated we do not need to specify, but sometimes it is helpful. The first thing is if it is ever an immediate safety concern, we are going to take care of it right away and assess it later. We can put a fine, if they do not move it or just leave it blank. If it hasn't been a huge problem in the past maybe we do not need to specify it at this point. King stated they had a stack mover come and haul them out. This is the first year that they are out in the fence line. Johnson asked do the farmers feel that they are in compliance with the current contract. Altman stated no and they know this. Comm. Wiese suggested that after 60 days the bales are not moved, the City has the option to declare as City property and they forfeit all rights, but they still have the obligations to the contract. Kaiser stated the contract we have now does not have this. Altman stated we will amend them and they will have the right to walk and we have to re-bid the contract. Comm. Wiese asked how many of the contracts we have now is in this situation. King stated we have 6 contracts and 4 of them are inside the fence. Hillestad stated it is an inconvenient to the farmers to do this because of the security, are they getting a good deal. Altman stated the right to cut is cheap and it just depends on what the hay is going to bring. Hillestad stated we have to put this in consideration too. King stated we based it on the average for the amount of hay produced in Brown County and we keep it on the low end. Altman stated we want people to cut the hay as our goal is not to make money; we want the grass cut and removed. Altman stated he will bring the amendment next month and it does not sound that we want to place a substantial financial penalty. Altman is looking at giving 2 weeks pending weather and after 30 days it becomes property of the City. The Board can change this as they see fit.

Altman stated he met with Rod Tobin, attorney for Hangar 9 this morning regarding the letter the Airport received was not in fact authorized by Hangar 9. It is strictly a private matter. The fees may have been already paid and if not those fees will be paid by the end of the week. The statements contained in the letter were not authorized by Hangar 9 and they do not represent the beliefs of Hangar 9 as an FBO. Hillestad asked are we charging for tie down. King stated we do not have tie down fees, it is assessed as Long Term parking fees; after 7 days it should be assessed. Tobin stated after the 7<sup>th</sup> day then it reverts back to the 1<sup>st</sup> day; meaning if you are there for 5 days you do not get charge, but if you are there for 7 then you get charge for 7. Altman stated this policy looked like it had been in place for a while and authorized by this Board. Hillestad asked if the City's insurance covers us for this if we charge for parking. Being we are charging for parking Hillested stated that we are opening a liability suit. Johnson disagrees and does not even know why Hillestad would make this assumption. Altman stated we provide parking, but it is basically at your own risk just like out in the lot. If we hit your vehicle with one of our plows, we will pay for the damage. If a tornado comes or you did not do your tie down correctly, we would not. Hillestad stated a lot of airport does not charge for this reason as they figure there would be liability. Hillestad added he is just sharing what he found around the country when he flies. They will not charge him as it opens up liability law suit. Tobin stated he thinks Hillestad makes a point. If there is a defective anchor out there, and we are charging and something ties to it and the anchors pulls up when there is a storm. Altman stated frankly he does not think this is going to matter whether we charge or not. If that rebar is defective and we are providing the rebar both insurance companies will be involved. Tobin stated this go back to hunter's liability as far as the invitee versus if you give somebody permission to hunt your land you do not have a duty to make safe, but if you charge them then you do. Altman stated he will take a look at this. In terms of evaluating the policy, if the Board wants to revisit we sure can. Altman can find information as he's think it is pretty standard throughout the country. Aeronautic insurance is a special insurance and sure that it is very similar throughout. Dahlerup, local pilot asked does the Airport make money out of this. No, we do not. Dahlerup stated this is a lot of hassle for no money. Kaiser stated there is a reason for having this and he wants everybody to understand. King stated the reason is that especially when it comes time for snow removal when we have some tied downs, to get them moved and if the plane owner is not around to move it, we have to go around the plane. We had issues where as the windrows get out their ridge, it will cause drifting which is a big hassle for snow removal. Also, the GA ramp is provided for everybody to use. For one guy to park his plane all summer because he does not want to have a hangar or something like this. This is denying everybody else a chance to use this. We do not have a tie down fee, what we have is a long term parking fee when they take advantage of the airport in this sense. Aman, Hangar 9 suggested maybe the 3 FBO's, a member of the Board and Altman can sit down and look at all aspects of it. Obviously a lot of what is there right now is pending completion of the hangar space and they will be able to get them inside. For future, for building purposes or enabling of it, if it is going to be long term how to enforce it. Altman stated he thinks this is appropriate. The goals of keeping the apron clear for snow removal and for all GA use is not necessarily in conflict with reconstruction of a hangar or reconstruction of the taxiway that would require some specialized use of the apron in a temporary basis. There is nothing conflicting about this. Tobin stated it would be nice if there is a procedure to go to the Board and say they are going to be out of their hangar for awhile, can they apply for exemption from the fee for this time period. King stated other people had done this, as long as we know. When we did the taxilane project, all of the hangar owners were notified and made arrangement to move and we knew it was on a temporary basis. We affected the use of their hangar while the construction was going. We just need an open line of communication. Aman stated he was unaware that there was a long term parking policy enforce. Hillestad stated going back to King's comment of not wanting a hangar and ties down an airplane. It would be just like Hillestad owning a house in town and because he can't build a garage he can't park on the street. There is a system to move your vehicle when they clean snow and if we have a system here to move snow it should not be a big deal. Taxpayers are taxpayers. Dahlerup stated they will not get everybody out because of transient. Hillestad stated this is the comment that he did not agree with. King stated with the transient coming through normally they make arrangement with the FBO

because of the security reason of getting in and out of the Airport. They work with the FBO to have their airplane moved if there would be a reason. Dahlerup stated he comes in at 11:00 at night ties his plane down and that night it snows. Braun from Quest comes in that morning and says whose plane is this? Tobin suggested when it is convenient to the Board, Chairman Erickson appoints some kind of task force to look at what the rule is and get those who want to participate in the process to see if they can make this better or not. Chairman Erickson stated he thinks this started when we had the big plane that broke down. It leaked oil and also because of the mooney. The plane was down and was here all summer. We cleaned up oil on the ramp and we did not have a place to go with it. Hillestad stated this is understandable. General Aviation is dying breed and Hillestad stated he does not want to see a bunch of charges. If we can get the small guy back at the airport and let them do maintenance and pay taxes on maintenance and buy fuel and keep them going. It is an expensive hobby, but there are a lot of people who like to do this. Hillestad would soon not be in the business of killing it as it is dying fast the way it is right now. As a lover of aviation, Hillestad hates to see a lot of nuisance fees that just irritate people. Hillestad is not saying that we should not charge, but it is something we should take a look at and take seriously. Chairman Erickson stated we can certainly look at this and hopefully we will have a new Transportation Director on board and this will be something he can look at.

Johnson asked if formal application has to be gone through at all. Aman, Hangar 9 stated no. The fuel side of this request is a follow up to the status change that was approved back in May's meeting. What Hangar 9 is asking for is site selection to be approved so Altman can amend the lease to coincide this for rent as well as besides the building. Aman does have Thompson, Fire Marshall's report. At the time Aman and Thompson talked, Aman was not fully aware of the self-serve containers and these will be placed according to the NFPA and so on. Basically what Hangar 9 is asking for right now from the Board is permission to designate the spot as indicated. The 7460 for construction is pending the Board's approval and knowing that nothing can be done until the 7460 is approved. They would like to get this going before the ground freezes hard and knowing full well that they cannot dispense any product until such time as the certification is current. Aman is trying to schedule a recertification class at this time. Johnson stated the 7460, the frost and being we are in the 1<sup>st</sup> of November, he does not think this is realistic for this year. King stated with the application as stated here, it would be hard for the Board to approve it. We already approved that they can have a fuel farm. First of they have 4' high berm, they have to have 7460 completed. There is also State and City which takes 30 days. Request #2 states that the fuel transports will be parked on the SE side of the new facility. King stated this was addressed in Thompson's letter which Aman has to get a footprint where it is going to be, so Thompson can approve it on how far from the building, how far from everything else and what kind of containment pad they will have. This is the same with the remote fuel tanks. There is no problem with this; we need to know where they are going to be place. Also with the construction of the apron, we also need to know where this would be and all the rules are followed on this. King knows that Aman wants to start before the ground freezes, but realistically it will take 30 day with DENR alone plus the FAA 7460. Kaiser asked if the 7460 has been submitted. Aman stated the 7460 has been started, but cannot do a final submittal until this Board approves the location. King stated he and Aman had talked of where they will put it and Aman is accurate on the map that was submitted to the Board, but Thompson also wants to know exactly how far they will be from the other fuel farm and the amount of storage. What we need is a lot more information out of Aman to move forward on this. Tobin, Hangar 9's attorney stated he understands what King is trying to say, but a lot of it is driven by code and regulation. If there are rules out there about distance, Hangar 9 will follow and comply. Often time these things are approved on the basis as long as you meet the distance and set back requirements they will approve it. Tobin does not think Hangar 9 is in any way asking for variance from what the Fire Marshall or what the code requires. They are just asking the Board to say, yes they can be in this general vicinity, make sure you keep a number of feet from the current tank farm, make sure you keep your on site fueling barrel so many feet from your hangar, and make sure you park your truck where the Fire Marshall says you can park your truck and approve this subject to complying with these conditions. This would allow them to move forward. They can't move forward with the 7460 until the Board approves it. Aman added part of the problem is that he cannot submit the detailed drawing site plan to Thompson without the Board's approval. King thought that this Board already approved that Hangar 9 can have a fuel farm as long as everything is followed. Aman stated part of what needs to come from this Board is that the area is approved, so Aman can submit the site plan to FAA, DENR and everything else. King agreed that Aman has to have all this information. The way King read the request was rather unclear because he knows that they will want the specific footprint of where everything is going to be. Tobin stated so this Board can approve this subject to the requirements of the Fire Marshall or whatever it is. Aman added once he has the Board's approval he has the longitude and latitude and all the coordinates for the building. Aman can then pinpoint where the site would be. Given the Board's approval for the tank farms, then he can do the coordinates for this based on the required setbacks both from Quest fuel farm and from where any future development be and or any state highways. Tobin stated he respectfully request the Board to approve and make it subject to Fire Marshall's requirements. Kaiser moved approval of Hangar 9's requests subject to all City, State and Federal requirements, seconded by Johnson. Altman stated the next question he is anticipating is can Aman get in the ground with the proposed location prior to approval. Can they get the concrete going? Aman stated it would not be concrete. It would be earth and berm and any construction on the Airport has to have an approved 7460 prior to. Aman added this is part of the requirement of Planning and Zoning to issue a building permit as well. Altman stated typically Aman would do footing and foundation if the 7460 was anticipated that is why Altman is trying to help Aman to get in the ground earlier if it is something Aman thinks can happen and it does not violates the 7460. Aman stated once they get approval and he has all the geographical coordinates and he can pinpoint it on the map and get it verified by Jennifer Clements at the State DOT. Aman can forward this approval back with the 7460 to Patty Dressler in FAA Bismarck. It may be possible to get this approved within 30 days or less, he does not know. Generally they say

30 and up to 90 days for 7460. King stated typically off airports it's 45 days, on airport is 90 days and more. Motion approving Hangar 9's requests subject to all City, State and Federal requirements is carried.

King stated he received a call from Human Resources and they are looking for someone to go to the 12<sup>th</sup> Annual Safety and Loss Conference in Pierre November 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup>. Kaiser asked if this is coming out of their budget. King stated no this will come out of the Airport budget. Johnson asked how easy is it for King to take 2 or 3 days off with Osborn being gone. King stated it works and he has a cell phone. Johnson stated he is just curious as we probably have about 90 days until they fill Osborn's position. Chairman Erickson asked if someone else from the City going. King stated he believes two from the Human Resource are going and they were looking for a 4<sup>th</sup> one. The conference does not start until noon on the 17<sup>th</sup>, so they will leave Wednesday morning. Kaiser asked what they are offering that is applicable to King and the Airport. King stated he was looking at was the Sidewalk Inspection Programs, Trips and Falls – How they can be prevented, and Putting in a Positive Spin on Safety. There will be other speakers, but these are the ones that King is interested in for the fact that when we he bring the staff up to date for just cleaning snow off our sidewalk, the importance of it. Johnson asked what would be the cost. King stated it would be less than \$200; one night stay, two meals and the registration. Kaiser asked does Lander, City Manager wants King to go. King stated actually Al Ruhlman, HR Director and Laura Millett, Risk Manager asked him. Johnson moved approval of King's travel request to Pierre, seconded by Kaiser. Motion carried. Chairman Erickson stated they would like a report when King comes back.

King stated on the annual review of the private hangar rates and FBO rates, this is one of the requirements that we look at every year to meet FAA standards that we are not under charging or over charging. We are within what everybody else does. This is being brought up to make the Board aware that we have reviewed the rates and seems to be good. Johnson asked these are annually. King stated yes. Kaiser stated the annual inflation rate has been actually below or about zero, so we are not making any changes. King stated this is correct. Chairman Erickson stated we just have it that we could review it every year.

Johnson asked with Osborn's absence, what kind of procedures was Osborn going through on an annual basis on the Federal grants, as far as where we are at, what we have to do, is their anything that we have been left with that we need to understand that Osborn did. It would take us a number of years to get back in the graces of the FAA to be back in the business of improving our facilities if we lost our grant for a year. Johnson did not know if this is something that Helms and Associates reviews and stays current with. Was this on Osborn's calendar or Muntean, Helms and Associates? Muntean stated he would just go through a generic process because Aberdeen is a non-primary commercial service airport. They are treated a little bit differently in South Dakota in that they are on their own to put together their Capital Improvement Plan and their Validation Justification for their projects. These have to be turned into the FAA by January 1<sup>st</sup>. Other General Aviation airports have to turn theirs into the State Office of Aeronautics by December 15<sup>th</sup>. The State then compiles all these together and they turn this into FAA by January 1<sup>st</sup>, but because Aberdeen is larger we do not have to go through the State. We work with the FAA. King and Muntean have been updating this and had met with Lander also. When King and Muntean were up in Bismarck last week, they had a chance to meet with FAA to give them some kind of an update of where we are at and what we are working on. One of the big question is the Environmental Assessment (EA). We can't move forward with any of the wetlands filling or runway shifting or anything until the EA is complete. The draft had been in with the FAA since this past spring. It's been in their office, in their hands for about six months now, waiting for them to review. In August, FAA told us that they were going to have somebody from their Regional Office who was going to take it over so it would get reviewed quicker and we would make progress. He was going to be in Bismarck so we could meet with him and we did and found out that he really had not have any time to look at it either. He just gave us general comments and some things he had noticed that he liked changed. Other than this he will try to look at the EA by the middle of January. Based on this we have revised the Capital Improvement Plan. King distributed the preliminary Capital Improvement Plan. As for the grant writing once they approve the project, then they start writing the grant. Chairman Erickson asked if King had a chance to talk to Osborn if there are any things that he left hanging that need to be pursued that the Board did not know about. King stated nothing major that has come up, just a couple of minor things. Osborn had everything in control and taken care of. Aman asked if we have on the list for repair of the GA Entrance that leads to Gate #6. King stated this is not AIP eligible. Aman asked is this something the needs to be address with the City. King stated with the City. Muntean stated this is not eligible for Federal funding. They did resurvey this and drew up the existing topo and gave this to the City and beyond this Muntean does not know. Muntean added before Osborn left he had addressed this with the City.

The meeting adjourned at 12:47pm.