

**MINUTES OF THE CITY OF WICHITA**  
**WICHITA AIRPORT ADVISORY BOARD**

**Monday, November 5, 2007**

Present: Robert Beattie, Charles Fletcher, Willis Heck, David Murfin, Kevin Myles, Tom Pryor, and Bill Ward

Absent: Tim Austin, Ron Estes, U.L. Gooch, Dwight Greenlee, Jay Russell and Jeffrey St. Clair

Airport Staff: Victor White, Sandy Coykendall, Kelly Fabrizius, John Oswald, Valerie Wise, Jean Zoglman

City Staff: Joe Allen Lang, First Assistant City Attorney

Others: Mike Carter, DMJM Aviation  
Chuck Reedstrom, Carter & Burgess  
Scott Sellmeyer, interested citizen

**Director's Report**

Hawker Beechcraft recently announced plans to sell their fixed base operator at Mid-Continent as well as the rest of their fixed base operator's nationwide. Hawker Beechcraft does not have a buyer in mind and is planning to solicit bids for the facilities. The intent is to explore the possible divestiture of the domestic fuel and fixed base operator line operations. However it is anticipated they will retain Hawker Beechcraft services for maintenance and customer support facilities. Chairman Fletcher asked how the sell would impact Wichita Airport Authority's leases with Hawker Beechcraft. Mr. White reported that it is not known yet, however since Hawker Beechcraft has the entirety of the leases, more than likely they will sub-lease out just the fixed base operator portion.

The Airport will have five items on the City Council agenda tomorrow. There is a Change Order for a project at Jabara, the renovation of the old national weather service building on Tyler Road, Airport Road is going to have a rehabilitation and the Airport Authority also has two leases with Cessna that will be amended.

Valerie Wise presented the Board a PowerPoint presentation that she gave last week to the South Central Kansas Legislatures. The Regional Economic Area Partnership ("REAP") brought the group together to provide them with an update on the status of various projects that REAP is involved in, the Affordable Airfares program being one of their top priorities. The presentation looked at how low fares have impacted air service at Mid-Continent Airport. Passenger traffic hit a low point on 9/11, however since then has recovered 66%. Overall in the top 25 markets there has been a 32% growth, however traffic to low fare destinations has grown by 67%. Destinations without a low fare component have only seen a 2% growth. AirTran has been a huge addition to the Wichita market. Based on the top 14 markets that AirTran serves there has

been more than \$27 million spent on airfares each year. If AirTran were to leave this market, Mid-Continent would lose at least 384,000 annual passengers, which would mean a loss of over \$5 million, based on concession revenue, parking, passenger facility charges and AIP funding. It would also make a huge economical impact on the Wichita business community. The addition of Frontier will also have a significant effect on Air Service in Wichita. Average fares are reduced 30-40%. An annual fare savings of at least \$27 million is expected, and passenger traffic is expected to increase by over 208,000 passengers. Air Service enhancement for this year includes Allegiant Air starting service to Orlando Sanford in May with two weekly flights. Express Jet Airlines d/b/a Delta Connection started non-stop service to LAX July 1<sup>st</sup> with one daily flight. United Express also started daily non-stop service to LAX on September 5<sup>th</sup>. Frontier Airlines began service to Denver on October 1<sup>st</sup> with three daily flights. Frontier gives Mid-Continent the low fare connections to the West. In July of this year Mid-Continent set a record for the most passengers flying in and out of Mid-Continent during any month in Mid-Continent's history. Today, passenger traffic is up 9%.

### **Terminal Area Redevelopment Program Update**

Mike Carter, DMJM Aviation, presented the Board a PowerPoint presentation providing an update of the current status of the project. A parking study charette was recently held to review design development issues with the Design Team to provide a clear understanding of what the specific elements that they need to work around at this point are. There was also a meeting to determine what is going to be done as far as renovation and demolition of the existing terminal. As reported before, the entire building is not going to be torn down, the East Concourse will be left in place with a certain amount of modification to accommodate various functions. Also this month, there will be another airline technical review meeting to meet individually with the airlines to familiarize the design team with exactly how they are currently operating in the existing facility and how they wish to operate in a new facility.

Phase I is being designed for 2 million passengers with the capability of going to a Phase II for 2.4 million passengers. There will be ten hold rooms with passenger boarding bridges. That would be ten parking positions if used primarily by 737's, or fourteen parking positions if they were all regional jets. Ticketing, rental cars and baggage claim would all be on the main level, with departure lounges, security screening and concessions on the upper level. There would be approximately 230,000 square foot for major concessions both pre-security and post-security. The baggage handling system will have inline TSA security screening and there will also be new communications systems.

Mr. White mentioned that the addition of two more gates will be included in the bid alternate package at the time of the base bid, so if the prices are good two additional gates will be added. The other two gates will be bid as well, however those are more problematic because the existing concourse is too close to their location. This would mean theoretically there could be fourteen positions on opening day, subject to bid prices being good.

Mr. Carter showed the current schedule. The shuttle parking just went out to bid with construction anticipated to start within a month. Design development and contract documents will be continuing on for the next year. About this time next year bidding will begin on the main terminal building with construction starting in early 2009 and completed by 2011.

Mr. Murfin asked if the schematic design had been finalized. Mr. Carter stated that the schematic design phase is complete and the design team is proceeding with design development on the major elements of the terminal and apron, however there are some items that they are holding on until they are resolved.

Mr. Murfin asked if it had ever been considered to put the parking garage directly adjacent to the terminal with a blast wall. Mr. White reported that it would become a structural issue because of the basement and the fact that the existing terminal is currently in that location. To get as many parking spaces as needed and with the height restrictions from the FAA, there would not be enough room. Mr. Murfin also asked about the possibility of integrating a parking garage into the terminal building. Mr. White reported that TSA usually frowns on that, even if blast walls were included.

**Chairman Fletcher called the meeting to order at 3:31 p.m. upon arrival of a quorum.**

### **Approval of Minutes**

*Motion by Mr. Ward to approve the minutes of the October 8, 2007*

*Wichita Airport Advisory Board meeting. Motion carried unanimously.*

### **Parking Study**

Chuck Reedstrom of Carter & Burgess presented the Board a PowerPoint presentation giving a synopsis of the initial results of the parking study their firm has been preparing. Their firm has been on contract for about a month and in that time has prepared some preliminary numbers and plan to provide the final report by the end of the year. In the meantime they wanted to provide the Board an indication of what the study has found so far and to give some initial conclusions and recommendations. The study will provide rate comparisons, employee parking surveys, statistics of the existing parking system and also show how patrons are using the current system.

To see how patrons are using the current system parking tickets were analyzed from a week in July and a ratio of those tickets compared to enplanements was made to determine Mid-Continent Airport's long-term parking demand. The study also analyzed the rental car requirements both from a ready return perspective as well as for a customer center. So far the study shows that in terms of short-term or hourly parking, Wichita is actually fairly low compared to other geographically central airports. Colorado Springs is the only one with lower rates. For long-term rates there are only two airports that are lower than Wichita. Wichita is towards the top on the economy lot rate comparison, which Wichita refers to as the "shuttle lot" which is probably because it is not truly run as an economy lot, it is really more of an offshoot of long-term parking. As far as employee parking, various airports close in size were looked at and some provide a shuttle service, while others have parking directly adjacent to where the employees need to be. The interesting aspect is the cost per month that the airports are charging their employees. Basically the cost for employee parking recovers the operating cost for providing the shuttle service, which is fairly minimal, roughly a dollar per day in most cases.

When looking at the existing system, the short-term lot currently has 370 spaces, the long-term lot has 1,365 and the shuttle lot has 446, giving a total of almost 2,200 total spaces. Based upon industry rule of thumb, Mid-Continent is very heavy in short-term parking, and actually offers

too much short-term parking. The patrons are not using the short-term parking area as short-term, it is basically just an over-flow from the long-term parking. Since the differentiation in rates is minimal, people will park wherever they can find a space. The study analyzed the week of July 29<sup>th</sup> thru August 4<sup>th</sup> of 2007. It took into account when patrons came in, when they exited, how much they paid, how long they stayed. A profile was then created for the short-term or hourly parkers. Hourly parking is considered to be any patron that parks 3-4 hours per day in the facilities. In hourly parking the turnover ratio should be four to five cars per day. The idea is for cars to come, park and leave, and not stay overnight in those facilities. In Wichita's short-term parking, the average fee per ticket was just over \$3 per ticket. Average duration was about four hours and 90% of the tickets were for less than three hours. These numbers are fairly good, however, the overnight occupancy in the short-term lot averages 130 spaces and it has reached almost 300 spaces during this study period.

For long-term parking, the average fee per ticket is \$27, the duration is just under four days and 15% stay for one week or longer. Overnight occupancy has reached up to 1,300 spaces, which is 95% of total capacity for the long-term lot. Once again the industry rule of thumb is that when utilization reaches 85-90% the lot is basically out of space and it is time to start thinking about expanding the facilities. Regarding the shuttle lot parking, the average fee per ticket is \$33. The long-term parking was \$27, which reflects people are actually staying for a longer period of time in the shuttle lot. It could be that if people are going to be gone for a longer timeframe and may have more luggage, they like having the opportunity to take the luggage and be dropped off at the terminal. The overnight occupancy average for this lot has reached 400 spaces, which is 90% of capacity.

Regarding rental cars, during the parking charette held in mid-October a lot of the surveys that were conducted earlier this year were reviewed, showing the basic market share for allocation purposes. Currently the rental car companies have approximately 200 parking spaces, however they would like to have 340. The industry rule of thumb, assuming approximately 120,000 transactions, shows that in roughly ten years Mid-Continent will need 400 spaces for rental cars ready return. The customer service areas were also discussed. What exists today is approximately 180 linear feet and if this facility were to open they would need roughly 200 linear feet of counter space. When the back office requirements and other requirements are added, a facility of approximately 14,000 square feet is needed. The study also looks at if the airport should provide a quick turn around area for the rental cars, and if so, where that area should be located. Given the level of operation for the rental car companies, they would need 16-24 fueling positions, roughly 10 car wash bays, and additional parking requirements for operation, storage and overflow. Carter & Burgess has developed a couple of options to consider. Option 1 is to provide the operations and ready return on the lower level of the garage, which is roughly 400 spaces, then construct a customer service center at the front of the garage on the terminal side and the current maintenance and quick turn around areas would remain where they are today. Two things dictate the footprint of the garage. The first is the quantity of hourly parking needed in the year 2016, which is estimated at 400 parking spaces. The other factor is the estimated number of parking spaces that is needed for ready return of the rental cars, which is also estimated at about 400 parking spaces for the year 2016. This footprint is roughly 400 parking spaces per level, and in order to meet the total demand for daily parking we are suggesting that rental cars be on the first level, hourly parking on the second level, and then two

levels (levels three and four) to be daily premium. The customer service center would be just on the terminal side of the garage. It would be a great asset for patrons to come in, grab their bags and go straight across to the customer service center. The study suggests the possibility of removing the customer counters for rental cars from the terminal and put them in this location. Option 2 would provide a quick turn around area large enough to support this kind of a rental car facility. It would take up all of the long-term surface lot in the back area. Looking at it from a financial feasibility standpoint, this takes up approximately 1,200 parking spaces that are currently allocated to long-term parking. If \$9 per day per space could be generated, it would be almost \$10,000 per day in lost revenue for parking. The other issue with this particular option is that it removes those 1,200 parking spaces and would not provide the capacity needed in the year 2016, which would be 3,200 total parking spaces. Right now, this option does not look like it is financially feasible.

Mr. Murfin suggested putting the parking garage above the existing terminal, Mr. White said it could be more expensive and the basement is needed for airport maintenance and building support functions. HNTB's original plan was that would be the rental car space. However, the layout was bad for rental cars because the distance from the back row of spaces was too far from the ticket counters.

Chairman Fletcher asked if the garage would need to be four levels. Mr. Reedstrom stated that based upon the demand forecast, that much parking will be needed. Whether it is a much larger footprint that is only two levels or to get it in this footprint it would have to be a four level garage. Chairman Fletcher asked how the height of the garage compared to the height of the terminal building. It would be higher, however one of the design ideas is to go sub-level so only three levels would be above ground. Mr. White mentioned there is a maximum height that it can be to comply with FAA restrictions from the Control Tower. Mr. White also said that it has been a concern that people do not want to block the view of the new terminal, but to keep in mind that from the Kellogg exit heading towards the terminal, the garage will not block the view. Chairman Fletcher said that there is also the concern about people flying into Wichita, walking out the front door of the terminal and just seeing a huge parking garage. Mr. Reedstrom stated that if a service center was in the front it could be aesthetically designed and built where it did not look like just a square parking garage.

Mr. Heck asked about the long-term and if there was a way to grow with this facility. Mr. Reedstrom said, once again that would be a design feature where you could grow horizontally, rather than vertically. The demand forecast shows how many spaces would be needed. First level, whether that's subgrade, half subgrade or at grade would need 400 spaces, hourly needs 400 spaces, and daily premium needs 800 spaces, for a total garage size of 1,600 parking spaces.

The assumption that was used for the financial model was that this garage will be a stand-alone project and will not effect the existing terminal development. Some adjustments were made in the demand model based upon elasticity of demand based upon pricing. A rental car customer facility charge ("CFC") of \$3 per transaction day was assumed. Also we are looking at the implementation of some new parking rates. The hourly parking rate could be \$2 per hour up to a total or maximum of \$24. This would also help to change the behavior of the patrons who use the hourly parking. If they want to park longer than that they will move either to the daily

premium or daily surface lot. The daily premium represents the cost of parking in the garage, closer proximity to the terminal, level 3 would be covered, level 4 probably would not be covered and would start at \$3 per hour and go up to a maximum of \$9 per hour. The study also suggests the possibility of raising rates for daily premium \$2 per day maximum and the rates for the existing surface lot and shuttle lot would remain the same.

This is based on the estimated parking demand for the year 2011 when the new terminal building opens. The initial study results show the need for approximately 2,800 spaces and 5 years later in 2016, 3,200 spaces will be needed. A garage is not designed to be at capacity as soon as it opens, it is designed based upon future demand. Based upon these assumptions and determining what the revenue forecast would be based upon all of the different elements, the total annual revenue would be just over \$8.1 million. Less an estimated \$1 million for operations and maintenance costs and the committed parking revenues that are primarily committed to the terminal project, the net revenue would be \$2.7 million dollars. When looking at what it would cost to build the garage, the current estimate is \$19,000 per space. At 1,600 spaces this garage would run right at \$30 million. The debt service is 6½% allocated over 30 years, so if the debt service were taken out of the net revenues, the remaining amount would be \$400,000. What that shows is based upon the financial assumptions, this garage would pay for itself.

Mr. Reedstrom stated that in conclusion, there is a current parking demand since several of the facilities are out of space. The footprint is actually dictated by the 400 space hourly demand, rental cars would have a separate entrance and exit and hourly parking would have separate entrances and exits as well. The study suggests changing parking rates to encourage appropriate parking, it assumes a CFC of a minimum of \$3 per transaction day, and also assumes that a pedestrian tunnel or an overhead walkway is not needed. The potential also exists that a new exit plaza could be built with some adjustments in either the CFC or parking rates. For instance, if the CFC was increased by just \$.50 per transaction day it would bring \$300,000 of extra revenue per year, which would pay for a very nice exit parking plaza. Both the patrons parking needs as well as the rental car needs would be met with this option.

Mr. Ward asked what occupancy percentage the figures were based on. Mr. Reedstrom stated that when a garage is opened it is typically in the 70-75% range.

Mr. Pryor stated that it appears to be a good idea if Mid-Continent keeps the low-fare carriers and the high volume of traffic continues, however if for some reason Mid-Continent loses the low-fare carriers, and volume drops off, the airport is stuck with a building that cannot pay for itself. Mr. Reedstrom said that is correct, but there is no way to predict something like that. Their firm did a lot of work in Dallas Love Field right before 9/11 building a 4,000 space garage which the airport did not end up needing in 2002, however they are now back up to a level where they are at 85% capacity. Mr. White said that there is a roller coaster of good and bad years. Mr. Reedstrom said that their firm intentionally does choose a peak week to study when putting together the forecasts, because a garage should not be designed for the absolute highest level. Chairman Fletcher stated that the other issue that we are faced with is if something is not done now, this airport is already out of space as it stands.

Jean Zoglman stated that another issue that cannot be ignored is off-airport competition. If the airport does something like this and shows that it can be feasible, someone else could do it off the edge of the airport and then the airport would be losing money. It is important to be aware that when airport parking is overflowing like it currently is, it gives others the incentive to compete with us. Mr. White reported that off-airport competition is a serious risk since a lot of airports around the country have off-airport private parking lots right next door that provide competition and the potential exists at Mid-Continent sooner rather than later.

Mr. White stated that a parking garage would be an independent structure from the terminal building and whether or not the garage is built should not effect the design of the terminal project with the exception of the rental car ticket counters and offices that currently are designed to be inside the baggage claim area. If the garage is built the rental car ticket counters and offices would be across the street in the customer service center attached to the garage so theoretically the baggage claim end of the building could be scaled down which would save some of the cost that would have been for rental cars.

Mr. Ward asked if a tunnel is not going to be put in, will there be an overhead walkway. Mr. Reedstrom said that is not their recommendation. A lot of the Airports today have covered crosswalks at grade across the roadway. Mr. White reported that the issue of a tunnel or bridge has been considered for a number of months, however the cost is high and after talking to several other airports it is becoming clear that tunnels are not popular and are not used very much at other airports that have them. Mr. White also mentioned that there is no code or ordinance that states the facility has to have a storm shelter, however in order to provide shelter for the hundreds of people in the terminal building the architects are considering putting in a hardened core of the building that would run the length of the building. Mr. Myles asked if the reinforced structure would be similar to what was done in Denver. Mr. White reported that in Denver's terminal, their restrooms have been reinforced on the second floor, providing them with a second floor shelter. Mr. White reported he was also at DFW last week and their new terminal has hardened tornado shelters on the second floor as well. Chairman Fletcher asked if any of the Board members were committed to the idea of having a tunnel. Mr. Murfin said not necessarily the idea of a tunnel, but does see the need for a skyway. Mr. Reedstrom said that airports that offer both surface walkways and elevated pedestrian walkways notice that a vast majority of patrons prefer to walk straight across the driveway. Mr. White reported that if the terminal was going to be two-level like originally intended it might be a priority, however everything now will be on the same level. Mr. Reedstrom suggested that in the final report he will provide a comparison of other airports that have tunnels, surface walkways or elevated walkways to get an idea of what other airports do and to provide an approximate percentage of people who use each.

Mr. Reedstrom suggested that he could present the final recommendations from the study at the December meeting in order for the Board to be prepared to act then. Mr. White reported that his sense is that City Council is looking for advice from the Airport Advisory Board. Mr. White said that he told the City Council that whatever the decision is it needs to be able to be justified. There is an expectation from the public that there is going to be a parking garage associated with this terminal. Chairman Fletcher said that he thinks everyone believes that we need a parking garage, however the question has always been, how is it going to be paid for, and this plan seems to answer that question.

Mr. Murfin asked what percentage of passengers park versus are dropped off. Jean Zoglman reported that the airport has that information from a past customer survey and can provide that to him. Mr. Murfin said that he commends whoever slowed down the process enough to consider going ahead with the parking garage. Mr. White said that he appreciates that comment because staff sometimes feel like we are racing through a lot of decisions to meet some arbitrary deadline, however it is important to do this right.

John Oswald mentioned that Mr. Reedstrom and staff should be prepared to discuss at the December meeting that even though the parking garage could pay for itself, it is important to also consider the impact of the garage not being built now.

#### Rental Car Customer Facility Charge

Jean Zoglman presented the Board a PowerPoint presentation providing information regarding the proposed Rental Car Customer Facility Charge ("CFC"). Chairman Fletcher asked if the rental car companies would be upset if we told them it is going to be \$3.50. Mrs. Zoglman stated that it has been discussed with the rental car companies and they are comfortable with anywhere from \$3 to \$5. At \$3 they are actually encouraging us vigorously to go ahead and do this before the project is totally defined. Because the project is not specifically defined, staff is recommending starting at \$3, however the rate can be adjusted at any time with thirty to sixty days notice. The rate of \$3 also matches the parking garage financials.

A CFC is levied on rental car customers, and is collected for the airport by the rental car companies and remitted monthly. It is very similar to the Passenger Facility Charge ("PFC") with two important distinctions. One is the PFC is regulated by Federal statutes, where this is not. It would be an agreement between the Airport Authority and the rental car companies. A Resolution would also need to be passed by the Airport Authority. The other factor is that for a PFC the airlines retain part of the fee for their handling, and with a CFC the rental cars do not retain anything. CFC revenues are dedicated to improvements that are going to be used by the rental car companies. Those can be capital improvements, roadways, or even operation expenses that are incurred. Staff has met with the rental car companies twice on different issues and each time they have vigorously encouraged us to start implementing the CFC now so we can begin collecting money and pre-fund some of the projects in order to reduce the amount of debt service that would have to be incurred.

Staff is proposing a program that has a flat fee per transaction day. There are two different ways to implement a CFC. It can be charged per transaction day or per rental contract. The transaction day is more common, and that is why we are going that way. In this market the average rental car contract is about four days. Some of the items that this can cover are security, access control, wireless communications, lighting, planning design, construction and financing costs and operations and maintenance costs. This is based upon what the rental car companies in the airport can agree are appropriate things to be funded. If they decide to extend this to other projects such as the parking lot exit plaza, it can be done.

CFC's are fairly common nationwide. Hertz sent us a list of 82 airports that they have a CFC agreement with. If there are 429 commercial service airports, then one-fourth of them where Hertz is at have implemented a CFC. Joe Lang has reviewed the issue and the CFC would not be



considered a tax. It would be a user fee for the people that it benefits. However, if the City were to add on an additional charge then that probably would be considered a tax. Mr. Lang said that if you go beyond a user fee concept then there is a whole different process for approving it that is subject to referendum.

Jacobs Consultancy provided a list of the necessary steps to implement a CFC. The first things is to perform a legal review. Joe Lang did a very thorough review as to whether there are any state or local laws or ordinances that are effected by this and came up with the result that it would not be considered a tax, it would be a user fee that could be implemented by resolution. Mr. Lang did recommend that there is nothing in the Airport Authority's current agreements with the rental cars right now that prohibits implementing a CFC, however it might be beneficial to have a clause stating the rental car companies concur with the implementation of a CFC. The next step is to define the project, which is going to be a very conceptual definition as the actual design and cost estimating takes place. The next step would be to develop a financial and business strategy, which at this point would be fairly basic. \$3 will pay for the amount of items being considered so that is what can be done. If it is decided not to build a garage, there is about \$6 million worth of costs in the terminal building that could be funded with a CFC. However, that would be capital costs only, and not operations and maintenance costs. The next step is to consult with the rental car companies. Staff has already met with them twice and will continue to meet with them as needed. The final step is to go to the Wichita Airport Authority for approval and the effective date would be just as soon as staff can make it happen. Overall, it is not a very complex process as compared to the process for establishing a PFC.

Mrs. Zoglman said that if the Board is comfortable with the concept, staff suggests putting it on the City Council agenda in early December for Airport Authority approval. Mrs. Zoglman further stated that at the rate of \$3, assuming 120,000 transactions a year for four days, it is estimated that \$1,440,000 could be collected per year. This is a comfortable level based on the historical trends at this airport. Also, future adjustments can be done at any time by either increasing or decreasing the amount.

Joe Lang stated that when looking at CFC's across the country, rental car companies are very litigious, and most of the litigation on CFC's is when an airport has imposed one without the rental car's acquiescence or because the rental cars are contesting where the funds are being put. Since this airport has the rental cars support up front, it is a great advantage and it may be beneficial to have a spokesmen for the companies appear before the Airport Authority. Mr. White reported that there are seven rental car companies on the airport today and all seven are in favor of it.

*Motion by Mr. Heck to recommend approval for implementing a Customer Facility Charge in the current amount of \$3.50 with the option to increase the amount on opening day to cover the operating cost of the facility.*

Mr. Murfin said that as he recalled there was an upheaval when the City proposed the possibility of issuing a vehicle occupancy tax of \$1. Mr. Lang said the reason why this is different is because the rental car companies support the CFC and they were very much opposed to that tax. Mr. Murfin reported that at the time, one of the main reasons they were opposed was because it

would make them not as competitive. Mr. Murfin further said that he understands that in this case the rental car companies support the CFC, which he assumes is because they see the benefit of having a good facility. Mr. White stated that another point is the customers who pay this are not local residents of this community, rather are people from elsewhere in the country who are visiting Wichita and are used to paying this wherever they go.

*Motion carried unanimously.*

### **Executive Session**

*Motion by Chairman Fletcher to recess into Executive Session to consider confidential data relating to the financial affairs or trade secrets of a business, and that the Board return from Executive Session no earlier than 20 minutes and reconvene in the Board Room. Motion carried unanimously.*

The Board Adjourned for Executive Session at 4:45 p.m.

The Board reconvened at 5:32 p.m., Chairman Fletcher announced that no action is necessary from the Executive Session.

### **Other Business**

The next WAAB meeting will be Monday, December 3, 2007 at 2:30 p.m.

Meeting adjourned at 5:33 p.m.

---

Kelly Fabrizius, Clerk