

**COOS COUNTY AIRPORT DISTRICT**  
**REGULAR BOARD MEETING**  
Thursday, April 18, 2019.

Minutes of the regular monthly meeting of the Board of Commissioners of the Coos County Airport District held on Thursday, April 18, 2019 at 7:30 a.m., in the District Boardroom.

**CALL TO ORDER:** Vice-Chair Benetti called the meeting to order.

**COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:**

Joe Benetti, Vice-Chair;  
John Briggs, Commissioner;  
Mike Lehman, Commissioner;  
Helen Mineau, Commissioner (via conference call);

**ABSENT:** Jon Barton, Chair.

**COUNSEL PRESENT:** James Martin, District Legal Counsel.

**STAFF PRESENT:** Theresa Cook, Executive Director; Robert Brittsan, Executive Assistant; Bob Hood, Operations Manager; Rick Skinner, Project Manager; Crystal Lyon, Property Agent.

**MEDIA AND GUESTS PRESENT:** Gerry Boldt, CH 14; Mike Collins, County Citizen, Ed Ellingsen, Nasburg Huggins Insurance Agency; Michele Hampton, Banner Bank.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:** Led by Commissioner Briggs.

**Section I. Review of Minutes: March 21, 2019 Board Meeting:**

Upon a motion by Commissioner Lehman (Second Commissioner Briggs), the minutes of the March 21, 2019, regular Board meeting were approved.

**Section II. Review of Invoices:**

The Board reviewed new invoices through April 18, 2019 in the total amount of \$198,460.85. Upon a motion by Commissioner Briggs (Second Commissioner Lehman), the invoices through April 18, 2019 in the amount of \$198,460.85 were approved.

**Section III. Finance Report:**

The Account Manager addressed the Board to give the Finance Report by summarizing the Coos County Airport District fund resources and requirements throughout the month of March. The Account Manager informed the Board that the District is currently 75%

through the fiscal year. The Local Government Investment Pool (LGIP) account received \$14,421.00 in interest earnings since opening the account in September of 2018.

The General Fund cash balance carryover, excluding transfers, was approximately \$124,000.00 more than budgeted, predominantly due to approximately \$100,000.00 less in requirements than forecasted for the month of March. The Income, excluding transfers, is at 92% of the budget and the Operations are at 64% of the budget. There were a few factors to the income being at 92%: The District had unexpected legal settlements come in, along with insurance reimbursements that were not budgeted for, and the District had previously received the majority of the tax revenue. Commissioner Lehman questioned why the expenses in the General Fund was down \$100,000.00. The Executive Director offered that the District makes the expensive purchases toward the end of the fiscal year, so that the less costly items have the budget that's required. The Account Manager added that some entities were budgeted to be purchased through cash flow in the month of March, along with some capital outlay purchases that would likely be acquired later in the year; the materials and services were down approximately \$40,000.00, and personnel services were down roughly \$20,000.00. Commissioner Briggs questioned if this was an accumulation through the year so far. The Account Manager clarified that this was for the month of March only. Commissioner Lehman questioned if the operations personnel services being below what was expected was a trend due to the inability to keep positions filled. The Account Manager informed the Board this was due to a combination of factors that included another Operations Agent being budgeted for at the start of the year, but the District has now switched to temporary employment to cover the four (4) hour end shifts; there has also been a change in staff that was budgeted at a higher rate, as well as a full time Accountant through Cardinal Services that worked less than was budgeted for, and is no longer with the District. Vice-Chair Benetti inquired if all the positions still needed filling. The Executive Director offered that a lot of the temporary employment was being turned over, although the District was still looking to hire more.

Acct. 7167- Grounds and Roadways: This includes the fees related to the utilization of an inmate work crew that removed vegetation overgrowth on various District properties. Commissioner Lehman questioned the cost of the inmate crew. The Account Manager informed the Board that the inmate crew cost \$590.00 a day, with approximately ten (10) workers each day.

There was an increase of about \$2,000.00 in the telephone expenditures for the month of March. That was due to the cellular phone buy-out fees and a prorated bill from the switch to the new cellular carrier for the District to obtain a lower monthly rate. These effects will be seen in the coming months.

The PFC Fund receipts are at 69% of the budget with \$34,512.00 received year to-date. The BEC Fund Operational Income is at 74% of the budget and the Operations are at 55% of the budget. The DHS Fund Operational Income is at 75% of the budget and the

Operations are at 68% of the budget. The BLM Fund Operational Income is at 75% of the budget with the Operations at 71% of the budget.

Acct. 7195-Consulting Services: This includes the architectural planning fees related to the BLM facility Tenant Improvements Allowance, Seismic, and ABAAS Upgrades project, in the amount of \$7,438.00. These fees are to be included in the accrued reimbursable costs associated with the project. Vice-Chair Benetti questioned what the rent increase would be for the BLM tenants after the completion of the project. The Account Manager offered that the rent would be based on the loans and the percentage interest rates for all the upgrades; once the project nears completion, and the full extent of the loan was known, the District will better know what the rental rate would be.

Net Income for all funds was \$90,627.52.

#### **Section IV. Staff Reports/Discussion Items:**

Mr. Ellingsen from the Nasburg Huggins Insurance Agency approached the Board to discuss pollution insurance.

Mr. Ellingsen had expressed concern over the past few years regarding the shortcomings of the current level of pollution coverage for the District. Mr. Ellingsen stated that through research, gaps in the coverage have been discovered. Mr. Ellingsen informed the Board that the District is responsible for any pollution event that occurs on, or originates from the premises. Mr. Ellingsen specified that the intention of the proposal was not to have a decision made about purchasing insurance, but to open the discussion regarding the lack of coverage; and discuss if additional pollution liability coverage should be acquired. Mr. Ellingsen went into detail about the three (3) types of current coverage. The first was a twenty-five hundred thousand (\$250,000.00) dollar Special District pollution liability coverage. The Special District pollution liability coverage is to be considered excess coverage that is only useful outside the fences; if a District tenant had an incident that led to a pollution liability, the Special District liability coverage would respond to that incident. The second type of coverage was a twenty million (\$20,000,000.00) dollar Airport Operations Liability policy. This policy is for incidents caused by or resulting from crash, fire or explosion, or collision from a reported in-flight emergency causing abnormal aircraft operations. The third coverage type was a five million (\$5,000,000.00) dollar FBO Environmental liability insurance that the Coos Aviation is required to have, according to the lease. This policy is coverage for environmental pollution incidents. Vice-Chair Benetti questioned if other leases had this pollution insurance requirement. Mr. Ellingsen offered that generally leases do not mention this type of coverage. Commissioner Lehman opened a discussion on whether or not the leases should have this pollution insurance requirement; after some discussion, the Board came to the conclusion that the pollution insurance would be too costly for the tenants and hard to manage, and the requirement could potentially make it difficult to keep tenants. Vice-Chair Benetti questioned if this

requirement was present in the Coast Guard lease. The Executive Director clarified that the Coast Guard does not lease that land. The Operations Manager brought to the Boards attention that there is a thirty thousand (30,000) gallon fuel tank located on Coast Guard property approximately sixty (60) yards from a storm drain on the Districts property; if a breach were to occur, the outcome could potentially be grim. Vice-Chair Benetti questioned whether it was the City's or the Districts responsibility for those storm drains. The Operations Manager stated that because of the location of the storm drains, it was believed that the District holds the responsibility. Vice-Chair Benetti questioned if the twenty million (\$20,000,000.00) dollar Airport Operations Liability policy covered all the Districts tenants, such as the T-Hangar tenants. Mr. Ellingsen stated that no policy covers everything, but it would cover the exposure of a T-Hangar tenant creating a pollution problem, in this specific example. In other situations, such as asbestos or lead exposure from older buildings—that exposure to the surrounding buildings and the removal of the pollutant from the soil and ground water would be covered up to twenty-five hundred thousand (\$250,000.00) dollars in the proposal made by Westchester. But this policy does not cover abatement, or the initial disruption of the pollutant; having the pollution liability coverage would be the responsibility of the abatement contractor. Mr. Ellingsen expanded on the liabilities that were not covered by the current pollution liability insurance. Mr. Ellingsen explained that the transferring and disposal of the polluted material would still be a liability to the District. Regardless of the materials no longer being in the Districts possession, the polluted materials would still be under the ownership of the District. Mr. Ellingsen explained that Westchester, out of several quotes received, offered something that no other company did: a pollution policy that includes non-owner disposal site and transportation coverage. Mr. Ellingsen stated that Westchester has asked for a fifty thousand (\$50,000.00) dollar self-insured retention, with a twenty thousand (\$20,000.00) dollar premium, on a five million (\$5,000,000.00) dollar limit; Mr. Ellingsen believes that the retention could possibly be brought down to twenty-five thousand (\$25,000.00) dollars for the same amount of coverage. Vice-Chair Benetti questioned what the twenty thousand (\$20,000.00) dollar fee went to. Mr. Ellingsen clarified that the twenty thousand (\$20,000.00) dollars referred to the premium and the twenty-five thousand (\$25,000.00) dollars would be the potential deductible; Mr. Ellingsen also stated that the twenty-five hundred thousand (\$250,000.00) dollar coverage provided by the Special Districts would not cover the Westchester deductible—the policies cannot be combined. The Executive Director inquired about the order in which the policies could be used. Mr. Ellingsen clarified that the Westchester's five million (\$5,000,000.00) dollar policy was to be used prior to the usage of the Special Districts twenty-five hundred thousand (\$250,000.00) dollars policy. Commissioner Briggs queried the possibility of an impending legal battle, due to the District being built upon an old military base with possible pre-existing pollution conditions. Mr. Ellingsen offered that no insurance company will cover an unknown, but there is a possibility to gain coverage for pre-existing pollution conditions by going through the process of discovery using environmental assessments. Commissioner Lehman stated that the environmental assessments would be a good step; and suggested that long term, the District conduct deep assessments to uncover the unknowns. Mr. Ellingsen

insisted that the current primary concern for the District was a major pollution event created by anyone operating on the Airfield; if a tenant were to dig up a sewage line, that sewage could quickly run into the bay. A seemingly small event could very quickly grow and affect many people. Vice-Chair Benetti stated not having all the information regarding the pollutants put the District in a difficult situation. Mr. Ellingsen suggested working in a committee to analyze and find the severity of the exposures. Vice-Chair Benetti suggested that Chair Barton and the Executive Director be part of that committee, though urged that it not be a lengthy process.

The Executive Director addressed the Board to give an update on the BLM seismic upgrade funding.

The Executive Director informed the Board that the architect was involved, and the design phase was in progress for the BLM Seismic, Tenant Improvements and ABAAS Upgrade project. The next step, once the design phase reaches completion, was to get a contractor involved. The District has reached out to inquire about funding scenarios for the BLM Seismic Upgrade, Tenant Improvements and ABAAS project, and determined that it would be in the District's best interest to refinance the BLM facility loan, which was approximately two million (\$2,000,000) dollars. The accrued BLM facility loan being combined with the one point eight million (\$1,800,000.00) dollar estimated BLM Seismic Upgrade, Tenant Improvements and ABAAS project, along with the seven hundred thousand (\$700,000.00) dollar Large Hangar loan to make the BLM Refinance loan total approximately four point five million (\$4,500,000.00) dollars. The principle portion of the Terminal loan was thought to be combined with the refinance loan as well, with the District owing approximately one million (\$1,000,000.00) in deferred interest and approximately eight hundred thousand (\$800,000.00) dollars on the principle of the loan; IFA has the interest and the principle combined and will not separate it for the District to pay down the principle. The Executive Director stated that was in the District's best interest to exclude the Terminal loan from this scenario at this time.

Mrs. Hampton addressed the Board to present the proposal for the BLM Refinance Loan.

Mrs. Hampton informed the Board that Banner Bank had already approved the loan, and documentation could begin whenever the District was ready. The pre-approved amount for the loan was five million four hundred and forty thousand (\$5,440,000.00) dollars primarily for the accrued BLM loan, the BLM Seismic Upgrade, Tenant Improvements and ABAAS project, and the seven hundred thousand (\$700,000.00) dollar Large Hangar loan—with the option to add a portion of the Terminal loan. Mrs. Hampton stated that the only collateral being requested by Banner Bank was to be the leading role on the rental income from the BLM property; with no request for real-estate, which Mrs. Hampton expressed as a significant savings for the District, due to the appraisals and environmental assessments that would be necessary. The proposed interest rate was 2.85% fixed for fifteen (15) years. Mrs. Hampton informed the Board that the Large

Hangar loan of seven hundred thousand (\$700,000.00) dollars is to be paid off in the first five (5) years. Due to all the moving parts of the loan, there is to be a twelve (12) month drawdown on the one point eight million (\$1,800,000.00) dollars on the BLM Seismic Upgrade, Tenant Improvements and ABAAS project based on the application and the advanced request from the contractor. The principle and interest in the beginning will be based on the scenario submitted. Mrs. Hampton made a request for the District's General Fund to be moved to Banner Bank, with an analysis stating no additional cost for the activity of the account—but perhaps even a cost savings for the District. Mrs. Hampton reiterated that the BLM Refinance loan was ready for documentation whenever the District was ready. Vice-Chair Benetti inquired how much the bond counsel would cost. The District Legal Counsel offered that it would be estimated at ten thousand (\$10,000.00) dollar for the preparing of documents and an opinion letter; Mrs. Hampton stated that the Banner Bank has committed no more than thirty-five hundred (\$3,500.00) dollars for the bond counsel expenses. Mrs. Hampton stated that the documentation included a loan fee of twenty-five hundred (\$2,500.00) dollars. Commissioner Lehman questioned why the Terminal loan wasn't added to the BLM refinance loan. The Executive Director and Vice-Chair Benetti explained that this was due to the IFA not separating the interest and principle portions of the loan, nor would the IFA inform the District which portion of the loan payments went towards; the principle portion of the loan which was eight hundred thousand (\$800,000.00) dollars with 4.56% interest, or the interest portion of the loan which was one million (\$1,000,000.00) dollars with 0% interest—and the District would not want to refinance 0% interest on a one million (\$1,000,000.00) loan. Commissioner Lehman questioned the annual progress of the Terminal Loan. The Executive Director stated that one hundred and sixty-five thousand (\$165,000.00) dollars payments were going towards the loan annually. Vice-Chair Benetti asked if the refinance would create more cash flow for the District to escalate the payment on the Terminal Loan. The Executive Director offered that it would create more cash flow due to the Large Hangar being paid off with a lower interest rate within the first five (5) years of the BLM refinance loan, albeit not a large increase. The Executive Director mentioned that it was brought to the attention of the Board at the Budget Meeting that the District had the revenue to escalate the payments, and that the Board was asked to decide where the extra revenue would be assigned to: paying down the Terminal loan of one point eight million (\$1,800,000.00), or paying down the ten million (\$10,000,000.00) dollar for the DHS architectural services for the built-to-suit loan, which was at a 5% interest rate. The Executive Director clarified that the Terminal loan was not being combined with the BLM Refinance Loan, unless the interest portion of the loan could be separated. The Executive Director mentioned a discussion that would take place between the District and the IFA regarding the refinancing of both the Terminal loan and the DHS built-to-suit loan. Vice-Chair Benetti questioned if the interest rate had been locked in for the DHS built-to-suit loan. The Executive Director stated that the District had a locked-in interest rate, with a no prepayment until 2026; the penalty for the prepayment would be based on the interest rate. The discussion between the District and the IFA will pertain to the waiving of the prepayment fee; which will depend on the bond issue and the interest rate. The Executive

Director expressed that the District should try to lower the DHS loans interest rate from 5% to 3%, and let the Terminal loan be for now. Commissioner Lehman questioned combining all the large financial obligations into one loan. Mrs. Hampton offered that typically the cash flow revenue generators would want to be free standing. After researching the lease revenue from the DHS facility and determining that it is indeed a potentially great revenue generator, Mrs. Hampton and Vice-Chair Benetti agreed and suggested the District issue an RFP for the DHS built-to-suit loan. The Executive Director stated issuing the RFP was the next step for the District. Mrs. Hampton informed the Board that the DHS built-to-suit loan could possibly be combined with the BLM Refinance loan once sorted. Mrs. Hampton suggested including a three (3) month extension built into the documentation on the Tenant Improvement portion, so that there was no need to redo documentation if the BLM Seismic Upgrade, Tenant Improvements and ABAAS project took longer than anticipated. The Executive Director questioned how the Large Hanger portion of the loan had no interest, yet the construction portion did. Mrs. Hampton stated that there was no interest only aspect to the loan, the District would only pay interest on the amount that was taken up-front; the District was not taking the one point eight million (\$1,800,000.00) dollars upfront, so there would not be any interest on it. Mrs. Hampton mentioned that the loan would be re-amortized after the first five (5) years, due to the Large Hangar being paid off; which could potentially be a twelve thousand three hundred and fifty-one (\$12,351.00) dollar savings on the monthly payment—without the interest rate being adjusted. Vice-Chair Benetti asked what Banner Bank needed of the Board at this time. Mrs. Hampton stated that all that was needed at this time was for the Board to accept the Commitment Letter from the District. Vice-Chair Benetti asked, and the District Legal Counsel confirmed that the Commitment Letter has been reviewed, and announced that there was a no prepayment clause stated for the first ten (10) years. Mrs. Hampton offered that there was an approval for the prepayment with a 1% penalty charge; but this is no longer in effect after the first ten (10) years of the loan. Vice-Chair Benetti confirmed that it was the Districts intent to take the four point five million (\$4,500,000.00) dollars. Mrs. Hampton announced that a dollar amount was not needed to be agreed upon at this time, for there were still questions for the Account Manager and a bit of documentation needing to be filled out; Mrs. Hampton confirmed all that was needed was the approval from the Board.

The Operations Manager approached the Board to give the Operations Report.

The Operations Manager updated the Board on the Air Traffic Control Tower's (ATCT) generator repair. The District initially received two (2) bid proposals for the repair, one being approximately twenty-six hundred (\$2,600.00) dollars and the other being approximately ninety-six (\$9,600.00) dollars; the District originally awarded the project to the lowest bidder. The awarded company placed the bid sight unseen, regardless of being offered to inspect the generator—for that company was the generators original installer. After coming to the site, the repairmen realized that there was a far greater issue than anticipated, and withdrew the bid. The project went out for bid once more—this time the

bid was significantly higher; approximately fifteen thousand (\$15,000.00) dollars, with the other bidder staying at ninety-six thousand (\$9,600.00) dollars. The Operations Manager made the request for the Board to take the ninety-six thousand (\$9,600.00) dollar bid. Vice-Chair Benetti asked if there was no obligation for the company to honor the original bid price. The District Legal Counsel offered that there was possibly something written in the bid that allowed the company to withdraw.

The Operations Manager brought to the attention of the Board that there was a large portion of road on East Airport Way, in front of the FedEx building and fire station, that needed attention; the road has started showing its age through pot holes and cracks. The Operations Manager stated that the District budgeted approximately twenty thousand (\$20,000.00) dollars for this type of repair throughout the Airfield. There were two (2) bids and one (1) inability to bid. The District awarded the bidder that was approximately ninety-seven hundred (\$9,700.00) dollars. The Executive Director announced that the pump station building, positioned adjacent to the road, was planned to be relocated by the City, and suggested that the two projects be scheduled simultaneously to eliminate any damage that might occur to the new pavement during the relocation. Commissioner Lehman asked the level of usage that the road gets. The Operation Manager informed the Board that the road is a high traffic area.

The Operations Manager stated approximately one (1) year ago, an Administrator for the Southwestern Oregon Community College (SOCC) had approached the Operations Manager with information regarding the Fire Science program available at the college. The Operations Manager was introduced to the new Instructor for the course, and offered his assistance however possible. Approximately two (2) months ago, the Instructor approached the Operations Manager inquiring about a lesson for the Fire Science students to experience other aspects of firefighting careers: City Fire, Structural Fire, Medical Fire, and now Aircraft Rescue and Fire Fighting (ARFF). The college students interacted in a two (2) hour lesson pertaining to the fire and dive aspects of the job, with equipment experience, and a question and answer session at the end. The Operations Manager suspects that this will be an annual event between the District and SOCC.

The Executive Director addressed the Board to give the Executive Directors Report.

The Executive Director notified the Board on the Air Service Update. The Executive Director stated that a meeting took place between the District and Alaska Airlines to inquire about receiving a letter of support for the Small Community Air Service Development (SCASD) grant, to gain service from Alaska Airlines through Portland Airport. The Executive Director acknowledged that there would be a fifty-fifty chance of obtaining the letter of support from Alaska. This is because the fuel tax increase would hurt the Airline financially since smaller planes are flown to regional airports, which means less passenger income while fuel cost would increase; furthermore, the revenue from the tax increase would go to supporting the smaller airports, therefore it would seem as if

Alaska were providing two benefits services for the District. The Executive Director attended the meeting for the Oregon State Legislation and gave a presentation in favor of the fuel tax, while Alaska Airlines made a presentation against the fuel tax. Vice-Chair Benetti and the Executive Director explained that the fuel tax would specifically go to rural airports to assist with air service, as well as aiding in other air field projects—such as marketing, capital improvement projects, etc. The Executive Director confirmed that the District should receive the Airlines letter in May. The Executive Director informed the Board that the District applied for the Rural Oregon Airport Relief (ROAR) grant in the amount of five hundred thousand (\$500,000.00) dollars. The Executive Director attended the Oregon Department of Aviation meeting to experience the review process of other airports submissions for airport subsidies, or airline subsidies. Although it was stated that a City's population of fifty thousand (50,000) was to be considered a rural area—which opens the grant to Cities such as Medford, Salem, and Klamath who have previously been awarded the ROAR grant—the Executive Director was confident that the District would be awarded the ROAR grant.

Although the Board had resolved the issue in an earlier discussion of the meeting, the Executive Director reiterated that the DHS ten million (\$10,000,000.00) dollar loan was being considered for refinance; to acquire a better interest rate and perhaps have the pre-payment penalty waived. The Pre-payment penalty was based on the interest rate, which was currently at 5%; with the prepayment penalty in place until 2026. The Executive Director stated that the total for the pre-payment penalty was an approximately two hundred and fifty thousand (\$250,000.00) dollar increase that has been budgeted for, and would benefit the District long term.

The Executive Director informed the Board that the BLM Seismic Update Project had a design workshop that took place earlier in the week, to finalize the design for the Tenant Improvements. It was stated that HGE would be taking the recommended Tenant Improvements from the workshop and provide a 65% packet to BLM; then turn around with a 95% design plan. The District Legal Counsel stated that this was a one-day workshop to agree upon the schematic for the design; although the tenants had a much larger vision for the changes—such as moving the main entrance—the tenants appeared fairly happy about the agreed upon improvements at the conclusion of the workshop.

The Executive Director informed the Board that the Airfield Electrical Projects original close date of April 26<sup>th</sup> had been extended to at least May 3<sup>rd</sup>, due to a request to rewrite the American Institute of Architects (AIA) contracts from the point of view of the District. The Executive Director made the point that the grant funding would still be in place for approximately June, and the contract would be awarded a month or so after.

The Property Agent approached the Board with a request from the DHS-Child Welfare and Self Sufficiency. DHS has requested that the District provide an additional twenty-seven (27) parking spaces in a secured parking lot adjacent to the building. The District

performed a count of the DHS employee cars parked in the unimproved area to the northwest side of the leasehold, shortly after the request was submitted; on that day there were thirty-three (33) cars parked in the gravel. The District has asked DHS to analyze the long-term parking needs to ensure near term development will provide for future requirements. The Property Agent presented to the Board an estimated cost breakdown in the total amount of two hundred thirty-one thousand one hundred and fifty (\$231,150.00) dollars for the construction of a thirty (30) space secured parking lot. Four (4) examples of potential parking-lot locations were given. The first site for potential construction was located behind the DHS facility, which could hold approximately thirty (30) parking spaces. The second possible location was to the northeast side of the building, and was estimated to hold sixty-five (65) parking spaces. The third potential site was to the northwest of the building, and could hold approximately thirty (30) parking spaces. The fourth potential location was across the street from the DHS facility, and could possibly hold sixty (60) parking spaces. The Property Agent informed the Board that the next step was for the District to hire an architect to evaluate the potential sites and associated cost estimates for final construction determination by both parties. Vice-Chair Benetti questioned if the retaining wall behind the building was strong enough to hold the weight of both the parking lot and the cars. The Executive Director stated that an architect would need to be involved to assess the potential locations. Vice-Chair Benetti questioned if DHS was to pay for the construction of the lot. The Executive Director stated that DHS would pay for the construction, and hypothetically lease the land under the improvements—for the District has already provided more parking spaces than initially requested by DHS. The Executive Director asked the Board for the approval to hire an architect to assess the potential sites, up to five thousand (\$5,000.00) dollars.

#### **Section V. Action Items Requests:**

Commissioner Lehman (Second Commissioner Briggs) moved to approve the multi-facility mandatory five (5) year sprinkler inspection in the amount of \$5,803.61. Motion passed.

Commissioner Lehman (Second Commissioner Briggs) moved to approve Knife River to pave approximately four thousand three hundred and twenty (4,320) square feet of East Airport Way, in the amount of \$10,100.00. Motion passed.

Commissioner Lehman (Second Commissioner Briggs) moved to authorize the Executive Director to proceed with the Banner Bank financing as outlined in the commitment letter. Motion passed.

Commissioner Lehman (Second Commissioner Briggs) move to approve the emergency generator repair, in the amount of \$9,685.00. Motion passed.

Commissioner Lehman (Second Vice-Chair Benetti) moved to approve the conditional funding for the DHS parking expansions siting. Commissioner Lehman expressed this should be for the first and third locations presented only, for the other locations had potential for development. Motion passed.

Vice-Chair Benetti (Second Commissioner Briggs) moved to approve the sharing of the cost for the development of floorplans for the Apartments at 1406 West Airport Way. Commissioner Lehman expressed a conflict of interest and abstained from the vote. Motion passed.

Commissioner Lehman (Second Commissioner Briggs) moved to approve ArInc Inc. Lease extension at the rate of \$1,000.00 per year for three (3) years. Motion passed.

#### **Section VI. Commissioner Comments:**

The next regular Board Meeting is to take place on Thursday, May 16, 2019.

#### **Section VII. Public Comments:**

Mike Collins, County Citizen, stated that while looking for a solution to the Aslin roof repair that was discussed in a previous Board Meeting, Mr. Collins found a company that had a metal beam that would span five (5) feet, that could reduce the cost of the truss repair. The Board expressed gratitude for Mr. Collins' research.

**Adjourned to Executive Session at 8:52 a.m.**