

The regular monthly meeting of the Gallatin Airport Authority was held June 11, 2015 at 2:00 p.m. in the Airport Conference Room. Board members present were Carl Lehrkind, Kendall Switzer, Kevin Kelleher, Ted Mathis and Karen Stelmak. Also present were Brian Sprenger, Airport Director, Scott Humphrey, Deputy Airport Director, Paul Schneider, Assistant Airport Director-Ops, Troy Watling, Assistant Director of Finance, Cherie Ferguson, Office Manager and Shannon Rocha, Recorder.

Kevin Kelleher, Board Chair, welcomed everyone to the regular meeting of the Gallatin Airport Authority Board and said members of the public are welcome to comment on a specific agenda item when it is being discussed. He said there were a couple of people signed up to do so. He asked that they raise their hand, be recognized, go to the podium, state their full name, and make their comments.

1. Open bids on deicing, commercial apron and east ramp expansion

Mr. Sprenger called for bids. The first bid was from Knife River of Belgrade. Their Montana Contractor Registration number is 10089. The bid bond of 10% was attached. The bid proposal was signed by Dave Schmidt, General Manager and Vice President. Knife River of Belgrade bid \$2,283,124.00 for Schedule I, \$1,036,281.50 for Schedule II, and \$1,598,803.00 for Schedule III, for a total of \$4,918,208.50.

The second bid was from Duneman Construction, Inc. of Bozeman. Their Montana Contractor Registration number is 151842. The bid bond of 10% was attached. The bid proposal was signed by Keith Duneman, President. Duneman Construction, Inc. of Bozeman bid \$1,521,169.00 for Schedule III, for a total of \$1,521,169.00.

The third bid was from Williams Civil Division, Inc. of Bozeman. Their Montana Contractor Registration number is 158949. The bid bond of 10% was attached. The bid proposal was signed by Bryan Petersen, Vice President. Williams Civil Division, Inc. of Bozeman bid \$1,629,809.00 for Schedule 1, \$948,623.00 for Schedule II, and \$1,566,926.50 for Schedule III, for a total of \$4,145,358.50.

Mr. Sprenger indicated that schedules I and or II can be awarded separately from III. Schedule II is for the west apron expansion with the additional entrance into the terminal area. That was determined to be preferable but also Schedule II was optional. However, because of AIP funding we would award this based upon Schedules I and or II and separately with Schedule III.

Mr. Mathis commented that the prices are higher than we anticipated. Staff and engineers will have to consider what we want to do and what we can afford.

MOTION: Mr. Mathis moved to take the bids under advisement and award the contract to the lowest qualified bidder provided the funding is available and the staff considers the project worth the cost. Mr. Switzer seconded the motion. All board members voted aye and the motion was passed.

2. Review and approve minutes of regular meeting held May 14, 2015

Mr. Kelleher asked if everyone received their copy of the minutes and if they had any questions, corrections or additions. There were none.

MOTION: Mr. Lehrkind moved approval of the minutes. Mr. Mathis seconded the motion and all board members voted aye. The motion carried.

3. Public comment period

Mr. Kelleher said anyone wanting to comment during a particular agenda item could do so by raising their hand, being recognized, going to the podium and introducing themselves before making their comments.

4. Consider "Emergency Response Exemption" request by Mr. James Allbright to sub-lease non-commercial hangar 66 to Bridger Aerospace in support of U.S. Forest Service Air Attack Fire Service needs including overnight accommodation for the 2015 Fire Season

Jim Allbright came to the podium along with David Crisp, Director of Operations at Bridger Aerospace. Mr. Allbright said Bridger Aerospace fights forest fires throughout the United States. Mr. Allbright is currently one of their pilots. When they receive a call alerting them to a fire, they have to be airborne within 15 minutes. He originally indicated a 5 minute airborne time due to the time involved in figuring the flight plan, readying the plane, and then being airborne. That is almost impossible in 15 minutes. Then they go to the fire. They are the communication platform for the Forest Service and the Department of the Interior. They have Forest Service personnel that will be on board the airplane as well. He will call back to his main office and report the size of the fire along with impending damage or evacuation requirements. They evaluate and designate the plan. It is important they get above the area immediately in order to advise. They stay above the fire for 3-4 hours at a time.

He realizes that he is requesting the emergency response exemption for his hangar. This is because his hangar has a complete condo, office, and living space upstairs. These pilots need a lounge, a planning area, and a quick response. He likes this airport. He thinks it would be great to bring these airplanes, The Forest Service, and the Department of the

Interior here to the Bozeman Airport. They have the airplanes here now. Two are here being retro fitted with cameras. It is not a matter of residency but a matter of a place to stage them. This is not a permanent living situation. They could get a call today to be in Dallas Texas and they have to get there as soon as they can. He is requesting the emergency exemption for a staging area.

Mr. Switzer asked if there was a process the Federal Government goes through leading up to this so called 15 minute alert. How do they fit into that process? Are they on a 15 minute alert 365 days a year?

Mr. Crisp responded by saying technically they are not on call 365 days a year. They are here for the fire season which started June 1st and goes through October and can be extended depending on what the fire prediction is. Mr. Crisp said he was on standby at that moment. If he receives a call, he has 15 minutes to respond. He said he sent copies of their contract to Mr. Sprenger and there were 2 paragraphs which indicated that the Department of the Interior letter requires a 15 minute response. If not, they are out of compliance and their aircraft will not be used. Bridger Aerospace is based here in Belgrade. They purchased the airplanes from another company, a 135 operator in Iowa. They are moving the airplanes here to Bozeman. They want to keep the planes and people in one local area. Their 15 minute response is mandated by their contract and they would like to operate out of the Bozeman airport and not take it to one of the other airports.

Mr. Switzer asked Mr. Crisp if he was under contract right now with the 15 minute response. Mr. Crisp's response was yes, as of June 1st.

Mr. Lehrkind asked, before they took over the contract, who had the contract previously for this area and where were they based out of.

Mr. Crisp responded that there are two other outfits and he could not tell us where they are based. Being air attack, you can be based anywhere, but since Bridger Aerospace is based here in Belgrade, they would like to operate out of Bozeman.

Mr. Allbright commented that the contract and the company was bought from a company in Iowa and brought here to Bozeman.

Mr. Lehrkind asked if the airplanes previously flew out of Iowa. Mr. Crisp confirmed they did. Mr. Lehrkind mentioned that was a long flight before they got here to Montana.

Mr. Crisp said the Forest Service can move their airplanes around. If he gets a call, he goes to the fire area and remains in that area until he is released. That means that either the fire is out or they no longer require his services. Then they move on to the next fire.

Mr. Lehrkind asked for clarification that their contract requires them to be airborne in 15 minutes, even if they may fly for 3 or 4 hours. Mr. Crisp said that was correct.

Mr. Kelleher asked what type of aircraft they are staging here. Mr. Crisp responded they have three Aero Commander 500B planes. Mr. Kelleher asked if they considered flying out of West Yellowstone since the Forest Service Center is there. Mr. Crisp said he is not sure what the CEO of their company has considered. Considering that their CEO is based in Belgrade, they wanted the aircraft here. They have their own maintenance personnel. They are trying to get all the pilots here. They have one pilot based out of state and they are trying to get him here this month. They have 3 planes, 3 primary pilots, 2 standby pilots and 3 relief pilots. Their contract limits the number of days they can be on duty and flying.

Staging the planes here makes it easier instead of calling someone out of Washington or Missouri. They would have to get the pilot here on an airline, and then onto their plane.

Mr. Sprenger commented that the challenge is that this is a non-commercial hangar. If this was a commercial hangar, it would be an operation very similar to what Summit Air Ambulance does. Summit Air Ambulance has people on duty and on call overnight. In this case, the hangar is in a non-commercial area and it does not meet minimum commercial standards. In addition to previous issues with that, there are concerns and they have asked for comments from Trent Gardner, their legal counsel.

Mr. Mathis asked Mr. Sprenger if staff has a recommendation. Mr. Sprenger responded that their recommendation is to deny the request because it is a non-commercial hangar. From what we understand, it is a growing commercial operation. With maintenance, additional pilots, and additional aircraft, this is an ideal situation to pursue obtaining a commercial hangar that meets the minimum standards. This is based on Mr. Gardner's guidance regarding the commercial and non-commercial hangar usage. We have been told this may be an imminent emergency request from a federal agency but that request has not been received. We are sympathetic to the mission, we understand the mission, and are concerned about the fire potential throughout the west this year. But to address this quickly, without addressing future concerns, this opens up a slippery slope for non-commercial hangars. We could have multiple requests for exemptions. There could be a lot of different ideas about what would be considered a need for emergency response. We could receive requests that we don't even understand the nature of at this point.

Minimum standards are set for a reason. So our recommendation is to deny the request at this time.

Ms. Stelmak is in support of US Forest Service fire fighting capabilities but we have to look at the facts. The hangar does not meet the minimum qualifications at this airport. If we change that at this point, we are setting a dangerous precedent for further requests that we are just not prepared to deal with.

Mr. Switzer asked to understand the difference between a commercial and non-commercial hangar. Mr. Sprenger said the commercial hangar has to meet several minimum standards including parking spaces, office space and two ADA compliant restrooms. It is required of any commercial operation at the airport to operate out of a commercial hangar.

Mr. Allbright commented that they don't want parking because they don't want the public to visit the hangar. His hangar has five restrooms, a pilot's lounge, and office space.

Mr. Switzer asked whose standards these are. Mr. Sprenger replied they are the Gallatin Airport Authority's standards.

Mr. Sprenger said the hangar does not meet the standards. Parking and access are requirements.

Ms. Stelmak said that access was the main issue; it is in the fenced area and does not have access to the public.

Mr. Allbright commented he doesn't want the public to have access to it.

Mr. Sprenger said to keep in mind that the standards require an additional investment by the commercial entity. To open the door for a non-commercial hangar to increase its value by approving its request diminishes the value of the commercial hangars.

We understand the entity does not need all those standards. One of Mr. Gardner's comments was that if we were to address this appropriately, we need to establish a due process to do so, but to approve it on an exemption basis is not recommended.

Mr. Gardner commented that it is not recommended to start making individual exceptions for specific instances. In this instance, the hangar has a non-commercial lease which specifically prohibits residential use. So you would not just be making an exception for the commercial use but for the residential use as well. While it is a very good cause and it may be something the airport wants to consider, from a legal standpoint it is very dangerous to start making specific exceptions. This is especially the case on such a short time frame and without considering how it affects all the other leases. It is much better addressed through rules and regulations and making a standardized process so it applies to everyone. Because when you are not applying the same standards to everybody, you are opening yourselves up to severe consequences.

Mr. Switzer thanked Mr. Gardner and said that as a public service entity, we owe it to members of the Gallatin Valley and the State of Montana to be fair and balanced. So we should set up a process, and he believes we have one, that everyone can participate in and have the opportunity to meet the standard. Then the public feels comfortable knowing that we are providing the standard for them and being responsive. Mr. Switzer feels that is important.

Mr. Kelleher said he served a lot of time on a zoning district in Gallatin County. The more contentious items were commercial entities operating out of private neighborhoods. As Mr. Gardner indicated, that is a real slippery slope. His feelings are if it is commercial, it

needs to be in a commercial area on the airport. If it is non-commercial, it should be in the non-commercial area. If we start trading off reasons for that, we open ourselves up to a basis of allowance that he is not comfortable with.

Mr. Mathis wanted to clarify something that Mr. Allbright mentioned. A part of our reason for being here is to accommodate commercial aviation. We would all like to work with Mr. Crisp and Mr. Allbright to make their operation a success. We have always required 10 parking spots. The parking would be for employees, forest service folks, mechanics, and deliveries. There are a lot of reasons why we require that they have parking outside of the fence. There is no way they can accommodate that at their current hangar. He would encourage them to work with the FBOs or someone else who meets commercial standards. That is his opinion.

MOTION: Ms. Stelmak moved to deny the request by Mr. James Allbright to sub-lease non-commercial hangar 66 to Bridger Aerospace in support of U.S. Forest Service Air Attack Fire Service needs including overnight accommodations for the 2015 Fire Season. Mr. Lehrkind seconded the motion. All board members voted aye and the request was denied.

5. Consider extension of Copper Horse "On the Fly" architectural elements to the other Concourse Food and Beverage Concession area

Mr. Sprenger said that a memo from Mr. Hopeman was sent out. Mr. Hopeman was present to answer questions and make a few comments.

Bert Hopeman, President of Sharbert Enterprises Inc., came to the podium and spoke. He said they are off and running on the construction at the restaurant. Martel Construction has drilled holes in the deck and framing and is drilling holes in the roof for air conditioning units. This has turned out to be a bigger project than originally expected.

Before the board meeting he asked board members over to the table to see samples of colors and finishes.

Mr. Sprenger had told Mr. Hopeman that everything looked okay but he had a question regarding the color called "leather" as the proposed coloring for the countertop. Ms. Stelmak had asked if they could get a maroon color. Mr. Hopeman went to the countertop supplier and they didn't have anything in maroon. Mike Wilkinson with Martel Construction went on the internet and he thinks they might be able to get something in that maroon color range. But they have to make a decision on this or it will hold up the opening of the restaurant. He wanted something that would give it more pizzazz to blend in with the red cherry wood. The rest of the colors are the same or comparable to the current colors. He asked the board what they thought of the "leather" color. The board responded they didn't think much of it. They said it was too loud and just a little too much. Mr. Hopeman asked the board if they felt comfortable letting Mr. Sprenger make the decision based on colors that Mike Wilkinson from Martel Construction can find in an acceptable color range. Mr. Switzer commented that as long as it meets the bracket, he thinks that is fine. Ms. Stelmak agreed she would like to see more of a subtle shade used. Everyone agreed they don't want to hold up construction but do want a more subtle shade.

Ms. Stelmak complimented Mr. Hopeman on the rest of the color scheme.

Mr. Mathis said he went down and looked at counters in the bistro area. He noticed that the fronts of those counters, where the wood is, are really showing wear. He asked if it would make sense to wrap something over the front of those where they are deteriorating.

Mr. Hopeman said the counters they are ordering have a lip they will wrap over to cover those areas. They had wanted to use copper but it didn't prove to be practical.

The other question Mr. Hopeman said he raised in the memo was money. Last September they went into the numbers of how to feed everyone at the airport, especially during the summer. They came up with the idea of a new restaurant to supplement the current restaurant. They came up with an estimate of \$290,000 based on a standard kitchen. When they responded to the Request For Proposal (RFP) in January, they re-designed the kitchen into a mix of a fast food and a standard kitchen. This kitchen will produce a huge amount of food when needed. That increased the cost of the restaurant considerably. Just the equipment purchases increased the cost by \$25,000. They have a lot more pieces of equipment that require additional hook ups to gas, electric, and plumbing. In addition to that, the architect came up with a canopy, which they did not originally envision. They have run into several little things that they never contemplated. The airport put in \$300,000 as their portion of the cost of the restaurant. It now looks like it will run \$491,000. Sharbert Enterprises will gladly pick up the remaining \$191,000. They are also adding an electronic ordering system, which is an additional \$38,000. They are working on some POS improvements at the old restaurant, which adds another \$50,000. Then they have improvements that extend down the concourse that are not directly related to the new restaurant. These improvements include the canopy over the grab and go area to pull people's attention to that entrance. They are also proposing putting a ceiling under the two existing canopies at the existing restaurant and gift shop. Many of those changes were not contemplated during the original estimating in September. Those proposed changes come

out to \$47,000. That also includes extending the accent flooring. Once you put the ceiling up, you have to add lighting and extend the sprinkler system, which adds to the cost. They will also remove the existing signs, which are not really visible, and add new ones under the canopy. He thinks it will add to the whole retail area of the airport and carry through the architectural theme in that area. He is therefore respectfully requesting that the airport fund the \$47,191 to accomplish the concourse improvements that are not in front of the existing restaurant.

Mr. Mathis asked Mr. Sprenger if they have seen drawings of the changes. Mr. Sprenger responded that yes they had and he described the drawings.

Mr. Switzer asked if this fits within their budget. Mr. Sprenger responded that they can accommodate this request in the budget.

Mr. Sprenger showed the board the drawings of the proposed changes. Mr. Lehrkind asked if they need the awning at this time. He thinks that people should be able to see the restaurant the way it is now. Mr. Sprenger said we continue to have people miss the restaurant completely. They will now see the new one but the others still blend in. It looks good but it is not easily seen. Ms. Stelmak has heard several people asking where the restaurant is when she is at the gate. She likes that the flooring will be changed from carpet to tile because there is a cost savings in doing that. She thinks the lighting and ceiling will attract the eye and therefore increase revenue. For those reasons she thinks it is a good investment. Mr. Kelleher said he agreed.

Ms. Stelmak said one of the reasons why the costs are increased is due to the area's vibrant economy. The trades are in high demand. The airport benefits from that with

increased airplane traffic and at the same time experiences a cost increase for the work that needs to be done.

Mr. Lehrkind expressed some hesitation for the new changes. He said he thinks with the already approved changes, like the outside ordering, he doesn't think that visibility will be a problem. Mr. Sprenger responded that it provides a consistency in look. The airport doesn't have flashing concessions. We control the signage for airline and rental car companies. We try to provide a consistent format throughout the terminal. This continues that framed signage limitation.

Mr. Mathis said he didn't see signage for the restaurant. Mr. Hopeman described the look of the signage; it will be a dark perforated wood and will be the same on the gift side.

Mr. Kelleher said he likes the awning and the investment. He thinks there will be a return on it for years down the line. He hears a lot from the airport's clientele about how nice this terminal is. He feels a long term investment is a worthy cause.

MOTION: Mr. Switzer moved to approve the extension of the Copper Horse "On the Fly" architectural elements to the other Concourse Food and Beverage Concession area to include an additional contribution of \$47,191 and Ms. Stelmak seconded the motion. All board members voted aye and the request was approved. The motion carried unopposed.

Mr. Mathis mentioned to Mr. Hopeman that he and his wife flew out recently and had breakfast upstairs. Their food and service was excellent. Mr. Hopeman said that was good and that he gets a lot of compliments. He got a compliment that day. Someone from

their downtown store said they flew in and ate at the airport. Some fly in and eat at the airport because they want a quick meal before they head out.

6. Report of Airport Cost Savings – Paul Schneider

We continue to see good savings on the things we are purchasing as well as some of the projects we have been working on. Mr. Schneider started with Grainger, a company we order a lot of maintenance and safety items through. From December 2014 to May 2015, we have saved \$1,309, which is about 19%. That will continue to be an on-going savings.

All of the office supplies are primarily ordered through Staples. From January to June of 2015, we have saved \$431 or 34%. Those savings will also continue.

MSC is similar to Grainger. From June 2014 to April of 2015 we have saved \$511 or 23%, which will also be an on-going savings.

Fastenal is providing the best pricing on water softener salts. From June 2014- May 2015 we have saved \$1,271 saved or 36%, which will also be an on-going savings.

A lot of savings is seen on the HVAC filters. From June 2014-May 2015 we have saved \$7,300.

One thing to consider on all of the aforementioned companies is that they don't charge for shipping. Fastenal calculates what our shipping costs would have been. We have saved \$1,161 in shipping costs from Fastenal alone.

We saved \$14,311 through state pricing on the one ton truck that we purchased. Additional equipment was installed on the truck, the plow, sander, and the flatbed. We saved \$2,996 on that equipment.

We fabricated our own belt loader for Jetway Gate 8. That was for the a la carte bags. United installed their own on Gates 2, 6, and 7. We contacted the company that made those. Their price was right around \$14,000 each. We built them for \$8,100 including parts and labor, so we saved about \$5,500 there.

Copper was purchased for the upcoming project of tying the generators into the east end. We ordered the copper in February since they were tracking the cost of copper closely. Rhett Boerger, Building Maintenance Supervisor, checked June 4th and we are still \$12,800 ahead on purchasing that.

An annual order with the House of Clean saves about 10%. So that is a \$3,100 savings annually.

We have reconditioned 6 uninterruptible power supply (UPS) batteries. We bought a reconditioning unit for \$150 a little over a year ago. Reconditioning them instead of purchasing new ones has saved us \$1,880.

The east end cooling project that we completed in April included a repurposing of the chiller pumps to take pressure off the pumps at the west end. This has resulted in an energy savings of \$62/day or \$9,300 annually. We spent \$5,600 in materials. There was a lot of labor involved. We did some research and if that project had been contracted out, it would have cost \$25,000-\$28,000. It has also improved the cooling at the west end. The office staff says the temperature has been great compared to last summer. The system is working very well.

We have continued to install motion sensors for lighting throughout the terminal. Seven of the concourse gates now have motion sensors. There was a concern that they

would not be sensitive enough if one person entered. Gate 8 has been up for a year and there haven't been any problems. The savings there is hard to quantify.

This all adds up to an overall savings of \$56,000. That does not include shipping charges and energy savings.

We are looking at a couple projects currently. Mr. Boerger has a design for charging stations. We are looking to start on those around the first week in July. We have estimated a cost of \$1,000 each and are considering making 2 units.

We are also looking into LED lighting. We are testing one in Jet Bridge 8. There is a big different in brightness and an energy savings when you change to LED lighting.

Mr. Schneider said he wanted to recognize the maintenance staff. They do a great job and we are lucky to have them.

Mr. Kelleher commented that Mr. Boerger and the rest of the maintenance staff are really on top of this. He asked that Mr. Schneider please pass on the board's appreciation for the cost savings as well as keeping everything looking good and functioning well.

7. Fiscal year in review report – Brian Sprenger

We are almost done with the fiscal year. This report is being done a little in advance. It is usually completed in memo form. This year we decided to add it as an agenda item to go over some of the accomplishments over the past year.

Total passengers increased 10% from May 2014 to April 2015. There were an additional 91,000 passengers for a total of 992,000 passengers.

Tower operations increased for that same period by 3.6% to 79,308.

Our operating income increased by 12.2%.

Our operating expenses were up by 7.3%, which resulted in our net income increasing by 17.4%.

We had a no-finding annual financial audit.

We are continuing to be Montana's busiest passenger airport. We account for almost 27% of all the passengers flying into or out of Montana.

Our certification inspection was completed last month. We had 3 minor deficiencies.

We completed the tri-annual emergency drill. We had 200 participants.

Our TSA audit showed no findings.

Over the past year we transitioned to private screening through the Screening Partnership Program. So far that seems to be going well.

We completed the construction of the airport roadway system last year. We are still working on the interchange part and once that is completed, we will get the full functionality of the system. The expected date of the interchange opening is June 30th 2015.

We were able to purchase 10 acres of land north of the airport. That purchase essentially completed our required land purchases that we have had on our Airport Layout Plan (ALP) for some time.

We have continued the environment assessment for the parallel runway. We are hoping that is accepted by the FAA by the end of July 2015. We received some comments back from the FAA on our submission. The comments are generally minor but have to be addressed line by line.

We awarded a seven-year food, beverage, and gift concession. We have ascertained insurance brokerage service for five years. We awarded a hay pasture and ground lease.

Mr. Sprenger said that was just a quick recap of some of the accomplishments over the last year.

8. Report on passenger boardings and flight operations – Scott Humphrey

Mr. Humphrey reported that May tower operations were down 12.1%. Some of that can be attributed to a very wet May. Rolling twelve-month aircraft operations were 78,450. Corporate landings were down 8.9% 113 versus 124. Total revenue enplanements for May were up 5.9%. Rolling twelve-month enplanements were 498,248. We are 3,400 passengers in and out shy of 1 million. Deplaned passengers are up 5.7% from 34,321 versus 32,461. Airline landings were down 6.6%, 408 versus 437. Our load factor is up significantly, 87.9% versus 83.1%. Frontier's load factor was 75.3% and they have adjusted their schedule beginning in early May. Fuel dispensed for April was up 9.9%. We are currently even with June of 2014 with the same amount of seats. Last June was 73.4%, so we should be up 2-3% better than last year.

Regarding air service updates, we are seeing larger aircraft being plugged into the schedule. Delta will be bringing in a 737-900 to replace the Airbus on the evening and morning Salt Lake departures. The seat difference is 180 on the 737-900 vs. 149 or 126 seats on the 320 and 319.

9. Airport Director's Report – Brian Sprenger

When we did the seat projections for the fall, we did not have really good definition. We are now projecting September to be down about 2.5% in seats. But October is up 6.9% in seats and November is up 13.2%. December, a peak month, will have 8.4% additional

seats. Fall will see some swings and we expect to continue to see some changes and adjustments.

One of the write-ups from our airport certification inspection involves Taxiway Oscar. The FAA at one point allowed Taxiway Oscar but because of possible confusion with zero, it is no longer supported. Mr. Sprenger showed the location of Taxiway Oscar on the map. Now is probably the best time for us to address it for two reasons. We have to address taxiway designations serving the new parallel runway. We are also in the process of potentially changing out taxiway signs to LED because we would need additional regulators to leave it the way it is.

Scott Bell, Airport Engineer, addressed the board and said that if taxiways continue, we are running out of the alphabet designations. We should start going to A1, A2, A3, A4, etc. Mr. Sprenger passed out a diagram of the recommended designation changes. The FAA recommends starting from the east end and working our way to the west. We would like to start the east end as Alpha 1. Echo would then become Alpha 2. Delta would be changed to Alpha 3. Charlie would become Bravo.

The intersection no longer meets FAA standards. The FAA prefers right angles. They also do not want exits from an apron going out directly to a runway. Charlie would be re-routed.

The Oscar – O designation confuses pilots because it looks like a zero, so we are recommending Oscar become Delta.

Mr. Sprenger said essentially Alpha and Bravo would be the air carrier taxiways. The main parallel taxiways would ultimately be Alpha, Bravo, and Charlie, with Alpha and Bravo being the dual taxiway for the main runway and Charlie for the new parallel runway.

The City of Belgrade has asked about putting a 15' x 10' sign at the corner of the current exit coming into Belgrade. It will be closed for a period of time to do some improvements. Once the interchange is opened, all roads will be opened. He just wanted to pass it on to the board before they make a formal request.

Mr. Mathis asked if they had discussed what they would be willing to pay the airport for the signage. Mr. Sprenger responded they originally agreed to put in landscaping in that corner area. They are still in negotiations.

Mr. Switzer asked when the signs go up on the main entrance. Mr. Sprenger responded the highway signage will go up just before the interchange opens. We have not yet determined the airport signage as we are awaiting the final outcome of the interchange.

There is some mixed information on the luggage carts. April was up 54% because we are now allowing credit cards. May was up 24%. The downside is that credit card fees are not conducive for small monetary transactions. However, we are still making more, even including the transaction fees.

Last month we talked about land development and hotels. We pushed off discussing that at this meeting. We have been looking at a Eugene RFP for a hotel there. We had some discussions with Ms. Stelmak because she has vast experience in this area. In the process, we found out there is a hotel real estate and research company that has a representative

based in Bozeman. Next month we will be meeting with him. We have heard nothing new on the land swap. We are still waiting on the appraisal.

Mr. Bell updated the board on the status of the Environmental Assessment (EA). We sent the EA off from the Helena ADO to their other lines of business. We received comments last Friday. We plan to address those this week and then meet with the FAA in Helena. We have some items to address going forward but nothing that we foresee being a problem.

The interchange ribbon cutting is scheduled for June 26th at 2pm. We have asked Mr. Mathis to speak on our behalf due to his experience on the project. The ribbon location is expected to be at the roundabout. He will get back to the board with more details.

We just made an offer to Denise McCarthy as our replacement for Meggie Moeller.

Mr. Kelleher asked if there was an update on customs for the summer. Mr. Sprenger said there are no indications of any changes at this time.

10. Consider bills and approve for payment

The tenth agenda item was to consider the bills and approve for payment. The board members and Mr. Sprenger reviewed and discussed the bills.

MOTION: Mr. Lehrkind moved to pay the bills and Mr. Switzer seconded the motion. All board members voted aye and the motion carried unopposed.

11. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 3:31 p.m.


Kevin Kelleher, Chair