

MINUTES of
AIRPORT BOARD MEETING
June 12, 2018
Alaska Room, 6:00 p.m.

I. **CALL TO ORDER:** Chair David Epstein called the meeting to order at 6:02 p.m.

II. **ROLL CALL:**

Members Present:

Dennis Bedford	Jerry Godkin*	Chris Peloso
David Epstein	Dennis Harris	Angela Rodell

*attended via phone

Member Absent:

Joe Heueisen

Staff/CBJ Present:

Patty Wahto, Airport Mgr.	Teresa Bowen, CBJ Law
John Coleman, Business Mgr.	Keith Walker, Fire Department
Catherine Fritz, Airport Architect	

Public Present:

Kent Craford, Alaska Seaplanes	Tom Williams, Ward Air
Mike Stedman, Alaska Seaplanes	Evelyn Rousso, McCool Carlson Green
Kelsey Childers, Harris Air	Shannon Morgan, Island Air Express
Ed Danywill, Republic Parking	Sharon VanValin, Island Air Express
Martin Klein, Republic Parking	Scott Currier, Island Air Express
Nate Vallier, Airline Doctors	Christopher Morrill, Delta Air Lines
Tony Yorba, Jensen Yorba Lott	Brian von Allworden, Wright Engineers
Jodi Garza, Alaska Seaplanes	Scott Harris, Harris Air
Kathy Smith, Alaska Airlines	

III. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** *Angela Rodell moved, Jerry Godkin seconded, adoption of the minutes of the May 8, 2018, Board meeting as presented. The motion passed by unanimous consent.*

IV. **APPROVAL OF AGENDA:** *Angela Rodell moved to approve the agenda as presented. The motion passed by unanimous consent.*

V. **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS:** None.

VI. **UNFINISHED BUSINESS:**

A. **Terminal Reconstruction Phase II Update** (Letters of Support – Attachment #1, Attachment #4): Airport Manager Patty Wahto said this has been looked at for the last few years. Meetings were held with McCool Carlson Green to go over some of the conceptual designs. At those meetings and at the Board meeting in May, some concerns

AIRPORT BOARD MEETING

June 12, 2018

Page 2

were voiced from tenants regarding the conceptual plan as it was laid out (affectionately known as “Option 1”). The idea was to have tenants build an area off the north end of the terminal while the Airport itself reconstructed part of the knuckle and some of the other functions in the terminal. There were comments about the Airport losing control of the north end of the terminal. The idea through the Board was to go back and have another public meeting, bring everyone in who was involved, plus make sure it was an open invite – people from Southeast, Canada and the public in general. That meeting was held today.

Airport Architect Catherine Fritz said a full day of meetings were held today. Option 1 calls for the Airport to limit the future development to the essential facilities within the main terminal and allow opportunities for Part 135 current operations and extended operations (cargo, etc.) to be done on private lease lots. Staff has reviewed this during the last couple of weeks. It was known that the project budget would not be met with this proposal. To address those budget issues, the Airport articulated the first option into two parts. Phase 1 would do a limited amount of work. Phase 2 would follow.

The total for Option 1 is about \$30-\$33 million. It would happen over time. The first \$15 to \$16 million would be used to maintain the 1948 area where the 135s operate now and allow for new construction off of the North end of the terminal. In the future when there was more money, the 1948 building would be torn down and kind of do something in the in-fill, which could be more private development or it could be an extension of the Airport terminal. Staff also took the Operations Committee recommendations and looked at a hybrid solution where 135 operators would not have to provide service ... there may be minimal service like they have in the terminal now and continue for passengers.

Option 2 would compact the footprint of the development. It cut off the concourse and utility development – everything north of the terminal itself – but it did provide room for the 135s to have counters to operate passenger facilities, about the same size as they currently have. Those options were reviewed today and reviewed in context with some site issues. There are possibilities for site development. The Airport is at a stage now that it needs to know the interests of the 135 operators to know if either Option 1 or Option 2 would meet their needs and interest and what portion they would be able to participate in. At this morning’s meeting, they brought forward a couple of proposals – both Alaska Seaplanes architect (Tony Yorba, Jensen Yorba Lott) and Harris and Ward Air who have been collaborating with an engineer out of Arizona who attended today and talked about a concept to fully build a separate Part 135 building. The latter would be a mix of public and private funds, but it is not totally fleshed out yet.

More letters of interest are being received from the public. Staff is trying to hone in on what is it that is important for the Airport to build and what opportunities are being allowed for the private sector to build. These are still the essential questions. In terms of the timeline, the historic actions were outlined for the last few months. This project’s

AIRPORT BOARD MEETING

June 12, 2018

Page 3

design work is being funded by FAA (Federal Aviation Administration) AIP (Airport Improvement Program) funds, a portion of which is not fully eligible. Until staff gets a concept that can be fully agreed to, the final applications cannot be made for a grant as the Airport needs something to get a fee proposal from the architects and engineers. The grant clock is ticking. The final paperwork needs to be into the FAA within the next 30 to 45 days to be able to successfully look at a grant. It is already scheduled for the FY 18 year. The final applications have to be into the FAA by August for the Airport to be able to secure the grant. The design needs to be designated to allow the architects to give a fee proposal and get started on the work, at which time the grant can be secured once staff knows what the concept is.

Nate Vallier has been a resident in Juneau since 2009. He works with a number of Part 135s, none of which operate out of here. The first thing that caught his attention was the Board trying to divvy up the land and have the 135s build to suit. His concern was that this would take a huge investment. The airlines only make a 5% margin and an aircraft can cost \$1 million. It is nearly impossible, even for the most profitable airlines. How does the Board expect and anticipate these carriers to be able to come in and build to suit without turning the airport into a trailer park? If you look at other airports around the nation, they are buying modular, not building amazing structures. Trying to get funding for a limited aspect operation might be harder. His question for the Board was did they take that into consideration the finances of the smaller carriers? Now take the smaller carriers and they are being told that, hey if you want to come in, you may need to build your own building ... this is \$.5 million that they may not be able to get. He said to make sure the Airport is not cutting everybody out. Another question is why not talk about a remodel where a second bag claim is added, and add a new entry point to the sterile area. If the Airport is going to start digging up dirt and moving around mud, that is expensive. He knew there was not enough money, but why not propose that and give it to the City to see what their response is.

Chair Epstein said the Airport did take the small air carriers into account starting last month, when the Operations Committee got some very clear feedback. They left the Committee meeting last month where if the carrier wanted to do their own thing, fine. If others were not so much interested in that, the Airport would work with them. He said he thought that base was covered.

Scott Currier, speaking for Harris Air/Island Air Express, said they did request a meeting to try to identify design criteria and a little more information on what it would take to build their own facility. Having done that, they asked to all get together collectively, which was done earlier in the day. He thought it was very productive and he thanked the Airport Manager and the Board for arranging that meeting. Part of the questions that came to his mind was what are the design criteria? He had heard about the 2005 Master Plan. He dug into and tried to find some information. He said he did not have a lot more clarity, but it helped him understand the planning process from the beginning, which has

AIRPORT BOARD MEETING

June 12, 2018

Page 4

been a long laborious road. He understands a lot more today than he did at the last Board meeting.

To that end, he started working with an engineering firm that he works with down south. He tried to identify their space needs that the Manager has been asking for. As he was looking at this, they do not need a whole lot. They cannot plan too far in the future, nor can they afford to build very much, so they tried to keep it to a minimum. Once that started unfolding, it showed the concept of a big box, which is an open area and no limitations on how anything is laid out ... meaning walls and roof. They took that concept a little further and tried to identify what he believed is needed for the third carrier. It gave them the footprint and some ideas on concourse, bathrooms and all the other amenities. As it started taking hold, Brian von Allworden of Wright Engineers (the engineer he was referring to) took it to another level with some CAD details and built a floor plan and elevation, which he thought met some of the questions they had. It kind of blends in and looks like the structure is there, not as a remodel or as an addition, but would fit into what the original building looked like.

After today's meeting, there is more clarity on what they can do. There is some identification of what the cost of the building is ... for private money he thought it was just south of \$5 million. For Davis/Bacon or the collective bargaining agreements that may be in place to work at the airport, it was about 40% more than that or just under \$7 million. He thought the question was, is there a way that the budget can be juggled to come up with a project with a cost of \$5 to \$7 million, or is there a portion of bond sales that could work? There was also a discussion that they would get together with Seaplanes to discuss some cooperative effort. That is yet to be arranged, but they were willing to do that if that is a direction to help move this off of the dime. He handed out information they presented at the earlier meeting to the Board (Attachment #4). This information will provide some clarity.

Kent Craford, Alaska Seaplanes, welcomed Chris to the airport community. He addressed three things: The first was a misunderstanding that has wound its way through the process; second he wanted to speak to Option 1 and they have some renderings of what they believe Option 1 could look like; and third, he wanted to speak to Option 2 – the hybrid option. Harris/Island/Alaska Seaplanes are all federally certificated scheduled airlines. They hold a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity. Any airport or airport terminal facility that receives FAA funding is obligated to provide space for them.

The misunderstanding that has wound its way into the discussion is that somehow somebody could get aced out of the airport – that if the north terminal was torn down and allowed some carriers to build their own facilities, which would leave no space or room for anybody else. That is not true. They experienced this first-hand in Sitka recently. They were operating out of an FBO and wanted to go into the main terminal. They did not have space for them, and they had the FAA gently remind them of their obligations

AIRPORT BOARD MEETING

June 12, 2018

Page 5

and soon thereafter they moved one of the rental car companies and made space for Alaska Seaplanes. Space was made available for Delta where there wasn't really a readily available counter space. Nobody is going to get frozen out of Juneau International Airport.

Option 1 was the charge that the Board gave to the staff and the operators last November, that had the support of the then operators and that was what they took the ball and ran with because they want to get something done. They have been working on the concourse connected to private facilities. Tony Yorba with Jensen Yorba Lott took the lead on developing some concepts of what that could look like. What you've got is a main foyer area with all of the operators around its perimeter. Alaska Seaplanes (they envisioned) would be to the north with Harris and Island to the south. He thought it could be a wonderful facility connected to the main terminal with a concourse and it could all be done privately with some public investment.

Option 2 – When they first heard about the possibility of Option 2, he was a little apprehensive – the idea that the 135s would be brought into the terminal. He was pleasantly surprised by the discussion of what the staff and consultants put together. He thought it seemed potentially workable so long as the three-legged stool is met – one is space to accommodate they currently have with some reasonable room for growth; two is access to a freight loading/unloading area (which he knew the Airport wants as well); third was equity of visibility so that no one operator has an advantage over another. He felt Option 1 achieved those three legs. But those three legs would be needed for Option 2 if that was the direction to proceed. \$6.9 million came from a GO bond that was referred to the ballot by the Assembly; voters approved it – they decided to raise their own taxes to fund the airport terminal passenger facilities. If the Airport Board does decide to proceed with Option 2 and move in the hybrid fashion, they could support that and they could support some of that GO money being thrown into the pot. He said they have to remember the public here at the end of the day, not just the taxpayers who voted for that money, but the traveling public as well. A bunch of letters have been received from those folks, who aren't represented in the room – those are the people at the end of the day that they need to keep in mind. Alaska Seaplanes wants to make sure that a reasonable amount of that GO bond is dedicated to improving the passenger facilities in the 135 area, at least as good as it is now if not better.

He said he thought the operators could work together. He thought it was a very solvable issue. There have been contentious issues between the operators before and they have been worked out. He thought this can be done here as well.

Sharon VanValin said she felt that it was a big concern being squeezed out and not having a place to go – the problem was if a limited operation was being done and the main hub is not here, can an operator afford to come here if there was an additional expense of a very expensive building. That was the concern that it would add a great deal

AIRPORT BOARD MEETING

June 12, 2018

Page 6

of expense to an operation. She noted that every single letter said, “Great, wonderful, let’s have a better terminal,” etc., but she did not know if anyone would write a letter and say, “let’s not do this,” especially people in the outer villages who really aren’t the taxpayers. She suggested that maybe the Juneau people should be asked, but she thought they would say the same thing, except they would probably understand that the money would be coming from them rather than somewhere else. She said everyone wants it to be better.

Kent Craford answered that Sharon had accurately characterized the concern that they have to make a big investment to access the Juneau Airport. He said that the Airport would be under an obligation to provide space at the Airport’s cost, just like they did for Delta downstairs. The Airport would be obligated to provide them some space, whether it was one or a dozen. That is one tool that operators have to ensure they can go anywhere, file a schedule to go between any two points they want – they have equal access to federally funded airports.

Kathy Smith, Alaska Airlines, she said she attended the meetings today. She thought there was a group of highly engaged airlines and she thought it was a good problem to have to solve. She noted that Patty and her staff do a great job of getting federal funds, especially discretionary grants in addition to the entitlements. She first heard today that maybe a revenue bond could be approved; she said this was done in Sitka. Alaska Airlines and Delta Air Lines have approved a PFC (Passenger Facility Charge) to be collected; even though they won’t operate in the space, they approved the PFC to be collected to fund that. They thought that initially the PFC was supposed to be a pay-as-you-go bond to pay for the project. However, if the Airport took the PFCs that are collected and use them to back a revenue bond (or the eligible portions of the terminal) she figured out how much money it would generate with no impact to the rate base. The PFCs that are collected pays the mortgage or debt service on this bond. It was done for Sitka and she has the model. She said that based on the enplanements at Juneau, it would be over \$17 million, which is based on 25 years of 5%. The term, enplanements, etc. could be changed and it will calculate. This is a different way of thinking of how to stretch the PFC dollar without impacting the carriers.

Secondly, the 2018 omnibus and appropriation included a \$1 billion special appropriation for small airports. The timeline for the omnibus begins in 2018 and runs through 2020. As Alaska Airlines, they are very interested because the State of Alaska was the highest on this list for receiving these monies and they have a zero match. She encouraged the 135s to think about going forward with this plan. If they thought of the public part being a little more, if the airport can get something from that omnibus bill, it can get another appropriation that might bridge the gap.

Thirdly, on the access, everything everyone said is true. She said operators will get access. She thought it was possible to do both – have space for carriers that want it and

AIRPORT BOARD MEETING

June 12, 2018

Page 7

allow others to build if they want. She thought the funding might be easier than thought. She said the airport staff the Board has is excellent, probably one of the best in the country. If you have a shovel-ready project, a legitimate project that allows competition that meets the requirement for that type of funding, the application is filled out and done well, and it gets the grant. A plan has to be ready.

Airport Architect Catherine Fritz made a clarification. She attended an FAA conference last week where this was discussed. It is AIP funding and would follow the same criteria as AIP. There will be a national prioritization on what is ready to build. It is not that it is not reachable, but the Airport has to be ready to go. Kathy Smith said the good news is that it is only for non-primary and small-hub airports. None of the big airports have access to this money and they're pretty mad about it, too.

Mrs. Wahto said it is the backing of up to \$17 million based on the enplanements that come forward annually and the PFC revenues that come in. So this would be over 25 years, and so the \$17 million would be the maximum that could back the revenue bond. Ms. Smith said that is without causing the rates to go up. Alaska Airlines and Delta collect \$4.50 from every passenger out of Juneau. It is remitted to the Airport because it has an approved PFC application. That generates \$1 million, which pays the bond debt so the airlines don't have the bond debt in the terminal rental rate. This is only for the eligible portions. There may need to be another revenue bond that Tom proposed which seems to not cause a really high terminal rental rate, because it would be comparably small in comparison with the non-eligible. Staff has to determine what is eligible. It is for public areas and things like that. Mr. Currier said if the PFCs get used for a portion of the eligible and may free up money that is earmarked for the 135 area or is any of it eligible for the 135 building. Mrs. Wahto said this is the whole complexity of funding any project, but particularly a terminal. When there are pockets of areas (which is all spelled out through the FAA A/Cs), the public circulation areas are eligible, the rest rooms (a portion of those) based on the pro rata share of the whole area that is being redone, less any tenant space that is under a lease (which is non-eligible). It is a very complex spreadsheet, which cannot be done until the Airport gets a good conceptual design down, know where the project is headed, and then numbers can be run to see if the Airport is in the ballpark of what is eligible and what is the gap. Some will be AIP, PFCs and the rest will be the bond money, which is local money so it does not have the restrictions on it. Until the Airport can find out what the needs are, it cannot figure that formula out. That is why the Airport is trying to finalize the conceptual design so staff knows where to go – how many square feet needs to be in the terminal for ticket counters, back office space, etc. Mr. Currier said it is complicated. But it is encouraging.

B. Front Curb Education/Enforcement. Mrs. Wahto said staff was told to go forward and look at public education and consistent enforcement. When the Assembly approved the \$100 fine, those were the items that filtered down that the Airport needed to do. This is a follow-up to what the Airport has done and see if further direction or discussion

AIRPORT BOARD MEETING

June 12, 2018

Page 8

needs to be done. Public service announcements have gone out. As someone may have noted, there is more JPD (Juneau Police Department) enforcement at random times. The inconsistency was based on what happens at night, weekends, 6 in the morning. Marc gathered some information. The Airport reached out to JPD regarding their Community Service Officers, which is a low probability because they don't have the officers. Then contracting out the services. Republic Parking has ambassadors at other airports. It is not necessarily the teeth of enforcement, but they are out there helping get people off of the curb. The costs for Republic Parking have been outlined. If at some point in the future after staff monitors where this goes, does the Board want to pursue any of the options and how would it be adjusted in the budget. Mrs. Wahto noted that Martin Klein, Republic Parking, was in attendance at the meeting and may answer questions if the Board had any.

Board Member Dennis Harris said he was very pleased that the last three times he dropped off passengers or picked them up that the congestion problem seems to have been mitigated (at least early and late in the day). He was pleased by the ingenuity of the police officer that left his car parked by the far north side with the lights flashing. He thought that got people's attention because no one was standing at the curb when he arrived to pick up somebody off of Flight 69 at 9:30 in the evening. Two weeks before, it had been a total traffic jam. He talked to the officer briefly and he said he was trying that. He also said the officer was trying to get away from the gate as soon as he could and get down at the curb to try to help out with enforcement.

Mr. Harris asked about the ambassador program. If the Airport was to do such a thing, the cost was noted at \$85,000 for 12 hours a day/7 days a week. He wondered if the personnel in doing that could be flexibly and/or randomly scheduled and continue with random enforcement. Martin Klein, Northern Regional Manager for Republic Parking System, said he deals with airports in Alaska. He said he has some familiarity with the ambassador program. When they wrote the proposal with Marc, there was no specific schedule of time. It was agreed that they could do a general ballpark. He thought it would be an improvement to sit down with Marc and discuss when the coverage is needed. They realize it will need to be somewhat flexible seasonally. This was a general number. They are certainly flexible. In talking with their other operations, it is not effective to send someone out there once the congestion has started. It is better to get ahead of it and stay ahead of it. They would want to consider that in scheduling.

VII. NEW BUSINESS:

A. **Board Member Appointments.** Chair Epstein congratulated Angela Rodell for her reappointment and to Mr. Albert Clough for being appointed as a Member of the Board, and to Mr. Chris Peloso, who is the newest Board Member in attendance. Mr. Peloso will be filling out the term for Martin Myers. Mr. Peloso said he was glad to be on the Board.

B. **New Airport Road Name.** Mrs. Wahto said this is not done very often. The Airport was asked to come up with a name for the new road that runs past the Snow Removal

AIRPORT BOARD MEETING

June 12, 2018

Page 9

Equipment Building and down towards the float pond. The City has to assign a name rather than just 'over by' some place. The Airport gets to name these new streets as long as it does not duplicate other names in the city. This still has to be vetted through the City once a name is decided. She checked a few historical names to ensure they were not trademarked. Mr. Harris said he has been talking to members of the Kendler family, since a large portion of the airport sits on what was once the Kendler Dairy. Scott Spickler, who is married to one of the Kendler granddaughters, was unable to be at the meeting. He said the family agrees that Kendler Way would be a nice name for that road that starts at Gate E and going to the SREB. *Dennis Harris moved that the road be named Kendler Way, 1) providing that there is no other street named Kendler Way and 2) that City Hall approved it. The motion passed by unanimous consent.*

C. Airport Manager's Report:

1. On May 22, 2018, CCFR Firefighter/EMT Jason Tarver received the ARFF A.M.F. Certification (Aircraft Rescue Firefighter Airport Master Firefighter). There is only one other firefighter in the state of Alaska that has this privilege behind him. Mr. Tarver is full-time ARFF. She congratulated him.
2. Emergency Vehicle Access Road (EVAR) Updates. At the May 18, 2018, Operations Committee meeting, Superintendent Scott Rinkenberger provided an update on signage, emergency vehicle use, pedestrian use (and how to control pedestrian use during an emergency) and late night nefarious activities in the EVAR parking lot.
 - a. Staff is working at placing more (random) and succinct signage along the EVAR to alert pedestrians; rather than one long-winded sign at the start of the EVAR.
 - b. It was also thought that more Aircraft Rescue & Fire Fighting drills should be done on the EVAR so that public sees the activity and becomes accustomed to the activity. Additionally, public education and public service announcements continue to be the easiest way to remind people.
 - c. The Airport is having AEL&P install lights on existing poles in the EVAR parking lot to deter the unwanted activity occurring there at night. The Committee agreed this was a 'no brainer' for the cost of \$1,200 for the install and a flat \$40/month for the street light electrical.
 - d. The Airport will install a closable gate at the first entry of the pedestrian bridge that could be closed during an emergency or scheduled maintenance on the EVAR.
 - e. A suggestion to put up blinking lights along the EVAR to alert pedestrians was also mentioned, but this may be cost prohibitive without electrical to the area.

No further action was forwarded back to the Airport Board for consideration.

3. Airport Board Candidate Interviews. As Chair Epstein noted, Angela Rodell, Al Clough and Chris Peloso were appointed to the Board.

AIRPORT BOARD MEETING

June 12, 2018

Page 10

4. Airport Engineer Report (Attachment #2): Mrs. Wahto said the Airport Sustainability Master Plan should come back to the Board and the Assembly for its final approval. The Airport is currently waiting for the FAA to give its final blessing. She hopes that it will be brought back to the Board at the July meeting. The only comment received on the plan was from the Assembly Committee of the Whole and was on the financial CIP plan. Otherwise, no comments were received.

Staff is finishing up the liquidated damages portion to change some dates for the RSA (Runway Safety Area) Expansion IIc (the apron work to pave between TEMSCO and Wings Airways hangars), and then it will be ready to go out. This is being changed from a one-year capital improvement project to a two-year. It is still one grant; it is just the timing of it to get it out. RSA IIb is the pavement work on top of the geothermal next to the SREB. This was a small piece but there was work in there that would normally be closed out, but staff has to allow for the grass to grow. This only added a couple of months onto the contract. As soon as the end of July comes up and the sprouts are showing, that one can be closed out.

Meetings have been held for the Taxiway Alpha Rehab and the Taxiway Echo Realignment. This will be a big project. A lot of the tenants have been involved in this and looking at the plans. In Mrs. Wahto's opinion, the taxiway, the phasing of it and how it will be used during the rehab is more complex than a runway rehab just because it cuts you off and how people are moved, it will cause a lot of congestion. It is one of those pains that will have to occur. The realignment is required because of the runway incursion mitigation and the geometry of the airport. The pavement is bad and it needs to get done. It will be a two-year project, starting next year. The first year will be preliminary work, getting Taxiway Hotel lengthened for a 737 to be able to taxi out on it and some other preliminary work. The actual construction and rehab of the pavement will occur in 2020.

There was another surprise visit from the FDA regarding the biffy dump area that was in the tank farm. They knew that this was not being used, but they wanted to confirm that it was still not being used. The Airport is in compliance. They had other things to check as well, but this was one of their stops.

5. Airport Architect Report (Attachment #3): Airport Architect Catherine Fritz reported construction has started on the wash bay. The equipment has been ordered and it is on its way. The wash bay will be attached to the SREB by the end of the summer. The Gate 2 Boarding Bridge is going well. Concrete is in the ground. They will be finishing up some of the extended hard stand in the next few days. It will get cured and then the impacts/access to Gate 2 will be lessened. They have been able to park aircraft there and disembark from it, get through the construction site, remain overnight and then

AIRPORT BOARD MEETING

June 12, 2018

Page 11

get people back on the aircraft in the morning to get it out. The contractor has been very good with trying to keep that gate as usable as possible through the construction period. The drawings for the ramp lighting replacement have been received. This project has been super challenging to meet some of the federal requirements to get it out to bid, but staff is very close. This is a special AIP grant related to energy efficiency. Hopefully that will be on the street soon.

VIII. **CORRESPONDENCE**: Mrs. Wahto reported that any correspondences received have been in the packet and have to do with the north end terminal.

IX. **COMMITTEE REPORTS**:

A. **Finance Committee**: Committee Chair Angela Rodell reported the Finance Committee has not met, but there may be reasons to meet soon.

B. **Operations Committee**: Committee Chair David Epstein reported a meeting was held on May 18. Another meeting has not been scheduled.

X. **ASSEMBLY LIAISON COMMENTS**: None.

XI. **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS**: None.

XII. **BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS**: Dennis Harris noticed that there was a foot race on the EVAR over the weekend. Everybody kept referring to it as the Airport Dike Trail. He asked the Manager to send a letter to Parks and Rec asking them to tell their staff that it needs to be referred to as the Emergency Vehicle Access Road or the EVAR. Staff needs to keep working on them to do that. He thought this was really important to remind people that it is not the dike trail, it is the Emergency Vehicle Access Road until people finally start calling it that.

Regarding the North Terminal, Mr. Harris said that regardless of whether it is a single entity privatization thing or multiple companies or the Airport owns the facility, one of the things he is concerned about is that there is a consistent design motif for the airport. Whatever is built or allowed to be built should look very similar to this wing of the airport in terms of finish, color, design motif and everything else. It should look like one continuous building, even if behind the shell it is not. He thinks it makes a difference when people first approach the airport how things look. He confessed that he was an architecture school dropout. For people coming into Juneau, this is the first thing they see. For people leaving Juneau, it is the last thing they see when they leave. He thought that there needs to be an aesthetically pleasing experience for everyone both ways. When people travel, they are tired when they get here. They are under stress when they leave, and he thought the Airport needs to have a building that makes people comfortable.

Mr. Harris presumed that federal funding required Davis Bacon prevailing wages. Mrs. Wahto agreed that it does. He asked if a public/private partnership is being done and

AIRPORT BOARD MEETING

June 12, 2018

Page 12

especially part of it is financed with bonds that are being paid for by federal funds, does that also apply to that part of the building. Mrs. Wahto said if it is part of the partnership, yes. Chair Epstein said that he spoke on Mr. Harris' behalf regarding the uniformity issue in the earlier meeting.

XIII. **ANNOUNCEMENTS:** None.

XIV. **TIME AND PLACE OF NEXT MEETING:** The next regular Airport Board meeting will be held on July 10, 2018, at 6:00 p.m. in the Alaska Room.

XV. **EXECUTIVE SESSION:** *Angela Rodell moved that the Board enter into executive session to discuss a matter, specifically the performance evaluation of the Airport Manager, the immediate knowledge of this matter could have a detrimental effect on the Airport Manager and or the evaluation. The motion was approved by unanimous consent. Executive session began at 7:13 p.m. The Board came out of executive session at 8:27 p.m.*

XVI. **ADJOURN:** *Angela Rodell moved to adjourn. The meeting adjourned by unanimous consent at 8:28 p.m.*