The meeting was called to order at 12:03 pm by Chairman Aaron Bear

- **Members Present:** Aaron Bear, Mark Miller, Jeff Towner
- **Members Absent:** Dr. David Beverly, Wayne Thiel
- **Ex-Officio Members Present:** Monte Hasl, Airport Superintendent; Jeff Barnes, Deputy Public Works Director- Transportation; Douglas Waterman, City Attorney

Chairman Bear asked the Commission to stay on topic and to limit discussions to one conversation at a time.

**1-Airport Business**

**Item 1-1 Action Item:** AIP-31 – Construct Hangar Taxi lanes and Taxiways; Recommend to City Council they Authorize the Mayor to sign the FAA Grant Offer for AIP-31 - Tom Lemenager, J-U-B Engineers, presented the request to the Commission. The FAA has requested the signed Grant Offer be returned to them July 16th. The Grant Offer will go to City Council on July 15th for approval / signatures. The Notice of Award will go before City Council on July 1.

MOVED by Miller and seconded by Towner;

*The Airport Commission hereby recommends to City Council they authorize the Mayor to sign the FAA Grant Offer, AIP-31-0043-031-2019, for the Construction of Hangar Taxi lanes and Taxiways.*

Chairman Bear asked all in favor to say AYE with all Commissioners present voting **AYE.**

**MOTION CARRIED**

**Item 1-2 Action Item:** Review Warhawk Air Museum proposed expansion response letter – The Airport Superintendent updated the Commission. Clair Bowman, Senior City Planner, the Airport Superintendent and Douglas Waterman, City Attorney are refining the letter. They intend to have the letter ready for Commission review at the July Meeting. The letter identifies the initial steps to move forward with the expansion. The letter will also review the FAA grant assurances the Airport must adhere to while conveying the value of the Museum to the Airport. The Superintendent would like the Mayor’s review prior to sending the letter to the Warhawk Air Museum.

DPWD Barnes noted the letter is an important response to the Warhawk. At this time the letter is not quite ready for Commission approval.

**Item 1-3 Action Item:** Request from Mad River, LLC to approve the building plans for lots 2030, 2032, 2034, and 2036 – Julie Schelhorn, Mad River, LLC, addressed the Commission. Ms. Schelhorn presented a draft set of architectural plans to the Commission. The building will have three doors to the east and one to the south. At this time if they submit for building permits after July 2, they will be assessed with the new impact fees. Their Civil Engineer has expressed concerns with the upcoming Taxi lanes project. Once the taxi lanes are completed Mad River could have to make costly changes to their civil and drainage plans.

Mad River is requesting the Commission stamp and sign the architectural plans enabling them to submit for building permits. The Civil and Drainage plans would be updated and submitted once the Taxi lane project is complete.
Commissioner Towner asked if Mad River’s Civil Engineers could work with J-U-B to complete the Civil and Drainage plans at this time, Ms. Schelhorn indicated her Engineer is concerned there could be differences between designed and completed work causing costly changes or corrections on their plans.

Commissioner Miller clarified; Mad River is asking for a letter to go to the City Building Department indicating the Commission is the hold up.

Ms. Schelhorn indicated a letter would be helpful. She will provide the necessary architectural sets to the Airport for Commissioners to stamp and sign.

Douglas Waterman, City Attorney, indicated it is ok for the Commission to send the request to the City Building Department. It is unknown if the Building Department will go along with the request. The request could make the statement the hold up is due to the Commission. However, in general admitting or causing “harm” to someone is not preferred. The Commission could also express the desire for the Building Department to assess the Mad River project with the old impact fees.

DPWD Barnes noted the Commission would be providing a recommendation to the Building Department. The Building Department will ultimately decide if the deferral is ok.

Ms. Schelhorn indicated she plans on submitting the architectural plans for permits. During the permit plan review they will obtain updated civil and drainage plans for review by Airport Engineers and submission to the Building Department.

MOVED by Miller and seconded by Towner;
The Airport Commission hereby grants tentative approval of the plans. The Commission is in favor of allowing Mad River to move forward with the plans as they are until the taxilanes are completed. At that time Mad River will submit updated civil and drainage plans.

Chairman Bear asked all in favor to say aye with all Commissioners present voting AYE.  
MOTION CARRIED

Item 1-4 Action Item: Discuss remaining storage hangar lots. a) Continue request from Andrew Simmons to construct a private storage hangar b) Review storage hangar lot applications – Chairman Bear noted that Mr. Simmons was not in attendance, nor was a representative for Mr. Simmons.

Chairman Bear reviewed the applications that have been received: Andrew Simmons, Mad River, John Newland, Felix Beauchesne, and Robert Denton. David Thomas is in attendance but has not submitted at this time.

Mr. Denton indicated he would be interested in building multiple spaces, box or t-hangar style hangars. He would prefer T- hangars and is open to partnering with other individuals to complete a row. Mr. Denton indicated if he were to build T-hangars he would rent the spaces. If he were to build box style hangars, he would sell the hangars.
The City Attorney advised the Commission; no action has been taken on any of the available lots. The Commission is free to discuss action for any available lot.

Tom Lemenger, J-U-B Engineers, indicated the grade difference for the hangar row between C-5 and C-6 will not allow for entrance on both sides. One entrance will have more than a 2-3% grade. The Commission asked if the interior floors could have different floor levels to address the dual entrance issue. Toby Eplar, J-U-B Engineers, indicated yes, adjusting the interior floor levels could address the dual entrance / grade issue.

Mr. Beauchesne indicated he is interested in building a row of box style hangars. For example, 3 – 60’x60’ hangars. His preference is to build a full row of hangars to be leased or sold.

Mr. Newland indicated he is open to building a single hangar or an entire row if needed. He intends to occupy the hangar he builds.

Commissioner Miller stated, the Airport is up against the available spaces for storage hangars and the number of parties expressing interest in building. He also noted individuals could partner together to build a row and split the costs for items like firewalls.

Mr. Denton advised the Commission, when he built his hangar, eight individuals formed an LLC to build and fund two 50’x200’ hangar rows. The individuals funded the 8 hangar spots for the two building structures. The LLC built the hangar structure. Each individual was then left to complete interior improvements on their own. Once the building structure was completed the LLC was disbanded.

Ms. Schelhorn indicated they are interested in building the same hangars they have constructed to the west of the available hangar space. They would build to sell. She does feel splitting up a building row between multiple individuals could be difficult to construct and stay consistent.

The Commission indicated they want to maximize the available space. The Commission does not want to leave gaps in the available space. The Commission also suggested that interested parties work together to come up with a proposal for the seven spaces that maximizes the space and makes everyone happy.

The City Attorney indicated it is a good idea to wait to make a decision. Also, the Commission should not put together an LLC, this is something that should be done by the private parties. The Commission should define the proposal criteria and evaluation metric for proposals, this will assist people in understanding what the Commission is looking for in an updated proposal.

Mr. Thomas indicated he did not apply as he was unsure what the Commission is looking for. He is waiting to submit until he understands what the Commission is looking for.

The Commission discussed where do you draw the line to cut off applications. Chairman Bear suggested giving priority to those who have submitted.

The City Attorney noted one issue is; An individual was advised the prior path was an RFP would be issued, individuals did not put their name on a list knowing an RFP (Request for Proposal) would be issued. The Attorney also asked about the list of people who had asked to be contacted for the RFP. Lynsey
Johnson, Airport Administrative Coordinator, reported all who asked to be notified for the RFP were called last week. Three individuals have not responded to the phone call. The Commission asked what order the current applications were received. Ms. Johnson reported applications were received in the following order: Andrew Simmons, Robert Denton, Mad River, John Newland, and Felix Beauchesne.

Mr. Denton indicated if he is only able to construct a single box hangar it may not be in his best interest. He sees the need for hangars and is interested in building t-hangars to help meet the needs at the Airport. Mr. Denton also noted even if he does not build he is happy to remain in the discussion and assist individuals if they wish to work together to construct a hangar.

The City Attorney cautioned the Commission against putting together individuals into a group to complete a row of hangars. Nor should the Commission determine locations of who should go where at today’s meeting. He likes the idea of the Commission defining the priorities for the available space and the items the Commission is considering for the available space. This gives proposers an idea of what the Commission is looking for. It also allows proposers to talk amongst themselves and if they choose to partner that is ok. The Commission could then discuss the updated proposals based upon the metric the Commission has created.

The Commission discussed limiting construction to users and not someone looking to sell and make a profit. The City Attorney indicated he would need to do some research on this. He is unsure this is a reasonable factor to base a decision on. The person building to sell would be selling to someone who needs the space. Nor would it speak to the quality of the hangar itself.

The Commission discussed criteria they would like to see in proposals. The following items were identified: Maximization of available space; Serve the greatest number of aircraft as possible; The desire to have a contiguous building and contiguous exterior aesthetic; Open to box hangar and/or T-hangar proposals.

The Commission discussed the maximization difference between box hangars and T-hangars. Four box hangars could potentially house only four aircraft, whereas T-hangars in the same space could house eight. However, box hangars could accommodate additional aircraft if the owner has multiple aircraft or renters. The hangar users potentially would have to shift aircraft around to get in and out.

The City Attorney advised; The Commission should create a list identifying the criteria they have agreed upon. When a proposer comes back to the Commission, they know what the expectation of the Commission is. The Commission should provide people a reasonable and fair method allowing the opportunity to make a proposal. Creating a fair and reasonable method to make a decision on the proposals, provides support for the Commission once a decision is made. The Commission should not show preference or prejudice to any applicant. The application should be fair to all applicants wanting to build a hangar, the criteria should not be arbitrary.

The Commission discussed having all of the interested parties work together and then come back to the next Commission Meeting with updated proposals.

The Commission also discussed where to draw the line on submitting an application. What if someone were to come in between now and the next Commission meeting with an application. Where do you set
the cut off at? If more people are interested, do we go back to the RFP process? The City Attorney advised the Commission should set a deadline, not today but a future date, for proposals to be considered at the next meeting.

The Commission also discussed the option of releasing these lots via RFP. An RFP would define the framework or criteria required for proposals as well as set the metric for evaluation of the proposals. Typically, an RFP is tangible with an item like price. In this case the RFP would be scored on the benefit to the Airport.

DPWD Barnes noted an RFP could be a simple single page document that outlines the criteria for proposals and the scoring criteria. The concern is, if all of the proposals score similarly how do you make a selection.

Commissioner Miller is concerned the scoring on an RFP could come down to personal judgement. He does not want to go back to credit and background checks. He felt reviewing credit and background was arbitrary and neither the Commission or staff is qualified to make a decision based on a credit or background report. Where do you set the credit score criteria or back ground criteria?

The City Attorney noted any way the Commission goes, a metric will be applied to a selection. A benefit to the RFP process is that the metric is clearly defined as well as the rating rubric. Having a clearly defined metric and rubric removes the arbitrary section of a proposal.

DPWD Barnes asked J-U-B for their input on the metric. Toby Eplar, J-U-B Engineers, sees three items as part of the criteria. 1- Number of hangars constructed. 2- If the hangars will be for private use only or leased. 3- The aesthetics of the building - i.e. the outside look, elevation, trim, finishing effects, etc.

Commissioner Miller is also concerned an RFP could limit the individuals who want to build a single hangar. DPWD Barnes feels you could include individuals who partner to complete a building in the metric. Commission is also concerned starting the RFP process at this point could drag this process out another year or longer.

The Commission noted there are seven spaces available with five or six who want to build. The problem is that four people would like to build more than a single hangar space.

DPWD Barnes advised the Commission, they need to make a decision on how to proceed. It would be simple if only one person wanted to build. Right now, we have five or six people interested in building. The DPWD is leaning towards an RFP due to the number of available spaces vs. the number of interested parties. With or without an RFP, a written procedure is needed. An RFP would allow time to prepare the metric and then review the proposals. Otherwise the Commission needs to be prepared to make the decision at the next Commission meeting.

The Airport Superintendent would like the applicants to work together and come back to the Commission with an updated proposal to move forward.
NAMPA AIRPORT COMMISSION
JUNE 25, 2019

The Commission identified an issue with limiting applications to those on the current RFP interest list at this time, if you release lots based on when someone went on the list we do not know what the individual would have proposed or if a reservation would have been granted when they went on the list.

The Commission asked for clarification of conversation with individuals who were interested in building storage hangars in the last year went. The Administrative Coordinator reported, based on the Commission decision to RFP the remaining storage hangar spaces, individuals were advised of the RFP for those spots or commercial size lots were available. The Commission also asked if there were people on a list to build prior to the RFP decision. The Admin Coordinator indicated when Phoenix Aviation had the reservation, Mad River had indicated if the reservation fell apart, they would be interested.

Julie Schelhorn, Mad River, LLC, reported she felt the RFP was created because of the additional infrastructure that was required; the installation of the sewer main and the taxilane pavements. Now that there is FAA funding for the taxilanes and the City is funding the sewer main, the circumstances have changed.

The Commission indicated they would like to specify criteria for the proposals as discussed in the meeting. They encourage those on the RFP interest list to work together and come back to the Commission with an updated proposals or plans. The Commission prefers to limit the proposals to those on the RFP interest list at this time.

The City Attorney asked Airport Staff to prepare a list of the criteria as discussed in today’s meeting and to include a list of individuals contact information from the RFP interest list. Staff is to send this information to those on the RFP interest list. Proposal updates will be due the Friday before the next Commission meeting.

MOVED by Miller and seconded by Towner to adjourn the meeting.

Chairman Bear asked all in favor to say aye with all Commissioners present voting AYE.

MOTION CARRIED

Chairman Bear adjourned the meeting at 1:22 PM

Passed this 8th day of July 2019

[Signature]
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