

MINUTES OF THE CITY OF WICHITA
WICHITA AIRPORT ADVISORY BOARD

Monday, January 14, 2008

Present: Ron Estes, Charles Fletcher, U.L. Gooch, Dwight Greenlee, Willis Heck, John Hennessy, Tom Pryor, Jay Russell and Bill Ward

Absent: Robert Beattie, David Murfin, Kevin Myles and Jeff St. Clair

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

City Staff: Joe Allen Lang, First Assistant City Attorney

Others: Mike Carter, DMJM Aviation
Chuck Reedstrom, Carter & Burgess

Chairman Fletcher called the meeting to order.

Approval of Minutes

*Motion by Chairman Fletcher to approve the minutes of the December 3, 2007
Wichita Airport Advisory Board meeting. Motion carried unanimously.*

Director's Report

John Hennessy, Jr. was introduced as the newest Board Member. Mr. White let the Board know that January 15th at 6:00 p.m. the Mayor is presenting the annual State of the City address at City Hall.

Mr. White reported that 2007 was a spectacular year for airline business. In 2007, Mid-Continent had 1.6 million passengers, which is the highest number of airline passengers in the history of the airport. Valerie Wise passed out the December report showing the December traffic as well as the year-end totals. 2007 showed an increase of 9.3% over 2006, which means Mid-Continent had about 12,000 more passengers per month in 2007 as compared to 2006. There have also been 15 consecutive months of increased passenger traffic. Mr. White mentioned that while this is great news, it also puts a strain on the airport both in the terminal building and in the parking facilities. The construction currently underway for the north shuttle park and ride lot will hopefully be finished by Spring Break if the weather cooperates.

Staff has been involved in negotiations with the Teamsters Union who represent airport police officers and firefighters and it appears a satisfactory conclusion has been reached. The union membership will now vote on the offer made to them. It is a two-year contract that will synchronize it with the police and fire contracts.

Mr. White reported that Chairman Fletcher and himself are going to Washington D.C. in March to attend the American Association of Airport Executives and the Airports Council International Joint Spring Conference. At this conference the key leadership of the House and Senate as well as top executives from the FAA, DOT, TSA and other key agencies the airport does business on a regular basis with will be providing updates on the status of legislation and regulatory issues. Mr. White and Chairman Fletcher will also meet with both Senators and both Congressmen and/or their staffs to advise them of funding requests for the terminal project. It is important to earmark portions of this project in federal legislation, specifically the DOT's appropriations bill, which is the typical mechanism airports use to have their projects identified. The funds would be used for TSA explosives detection screening equipment and discretionary funding for the ramp portion of the project. The City's Legislative Director, Dale Goter, is also working on this and the City Manager's office is making sure that the project gets put on the City's official federal legislative priority list. Chairman Fletcher suggested that if the Congressmen or Senators are going to be anywhere in the District, possibly meetings could be set up here in Wichita as well.

Mr. Estes asked about the City Council agenda item for HMS Host. Mr. White reported that Host recently constructed a new sports bar, Great American Bagel and retail wall. For their investment the Airport Authority is going to give them an additional year on their contract. This will coordinate the timeframe of the contract with the demise of the existing terminal building. The contract is being extended through May 1, 2011, and then month-to-month thereafter.

Chairman Fletcher asked about the status of the minimum standards meetings. Mr. White said that it is a project that needs finalized, however recently there have been several pressing matters related to the terminal project which have consumed a significant amount of time. At the same time, Hawker Beechcraft's fixed base operations are currently up for sale and there may be some sensitivity from their corporate management if the Airport Authority begins immediately establishing new rules which may jeopardize their sale. Hawker Beechcraft's contract does allow the Airport Authority to have approval rights over the sale that should be finalized this spring.

Mr. Estes asked for an update on the Wastewater Treatment Plant. Mr. White reported that the application to the FAA for air space approval for the site and construction of the facility was submitted in July and has not yet been approved. Mr. White contacted the FAA's Regional Manager who said they would put a rush on the application. The City would like to go out for bids for construction by the end of January and would like to have clearance to begin construction by April.

Chairman Fletcher asked for an update on the water runoff issues at Jabara. Mr. White reported there is a study currently being prepared which should be concluded by the end of spring. Staff is hopeful the report will provide good information as well as suggestions on how to satisfy both the City's needs and the surrounding homeowners.

Mr. Gooch asked about the Airport's connection to the City Manager's office now that the position is in transition. Mr. White reported that there are two Assistant City Managers, one of which is Scott Moore, who meet with Mr. White on a regular basis. Mr. Moore is up to date on

airport business and is a supporter of the Airport system. The City Council has also hired an Interim City Manager, Dr. Ed Flentje, who will be another main point of contact.

Parking Study Update

Mr. White reported that the parking study was presented to the City Council on December 11, 2007. Chuck Reedstrom of Carter & Burgess presented the Board a revised PowerPoint presentation based on the recommendations from the City Council Workshop. Mr. Reedstrom stated this is still a work in progress and if the Board has any major concerns or questions those could be incorporated into the report.

Mr. Reedstrom said that the City Council asked to focus on the three airports that are in close geographical proximity to Mid-Continent. The parking rates for Tulsa, Oklahoma City and Kansas City were looked at for comparison purposes. For the short-term rate, Wichita is at the lowest end of the spectrum with a \$12 maximum rate per day. Wichita is also the only one out of this group that does not offer garage or covered parking for hourly patrons. When looking at the long-term rate comparison, Wichita is second from the bottom coming in just above Oklahoma City, however Wichita is still lower than the other two by a fairly substantial amount. Wichita is a little higher on the economy and shuttle lot comparison, however it is not a fair comparison because the other airports truly offer an economy lot, and Wichita's is a shuttle lot.

It is also important to look at convenience and customer service. The study looked at what it would take for a customer to travel to a competing airport. Mr. Reedstrom showed a slide providing the roundtrip travel time, fuel costs, tolls and parking costs that would be incurred. It was found that the total cost of traveling to use a competitor airport is fairly substantial. Mr. Reedstrom also showed several slides illustrating what other airports are charging their rental car companies to operate.

The next slide provided an overview of the existing parking system. Short-term parking is currently at 370 spaces. Long-term parking is 1,365 and shuttle spaces right now is at 446. Current utilization is at 79% for short-term, 95% for long-term and 90% for the shuttle lot. The industry rule of thumb is that when 85% of utilization is reached it is time to start thinking about expansion. Next, Mr. Reedstrom showed a slide of the actual, planned and projected passengers from 2002 to 2016.

The current rental car market share was given as well as the rental car requirements. Based upon the survey given to the rental car companies and analysis of other airports approximately 400 spaces will be needed for the ready return areas for the rental car companies at Mid-Continent. The rental car companies would also require a customer facility center of approximately 1,400 square feet that would be built adjacent to the garage.

Based upon the rental car requirements and feedback from both this Board and the City Council workshop, three options for parking facilities were developed. Option 1 is to not build a garage right now, rather delay it for a few years. Option 2 is to build a 1,200 space parking garage consisting of 300 short-term spaces, 600 long-term premium spaces and 300 spaces for the rental car companies. Option 3 is to build a bigger garage of 1,600 spaces with 400 spaces for short-term, 800 spaces for long-term premium and 400 spaces for the rental car companies.

Mr. Reedstrom showed a slide depicting the footprint of the larger garage including the possible location of the customer service center, pedestrian walkways and the paths patrons would use to enter, access and exit each of the parking facilities.

In the parking demand model study Wichita's average daily parking demand was identified and then the level of demand was adjusted for the peak level of activity, which is typically the summer months. The super peak periods correspond with Thanksgiving, Christmas and Spring Break. Next, Mr. Reedstrom showed the three options and how they would meet the average and peak demand periods.

The consequences of Option 1 to delay the construction of a parking garage were considered. First, the new surface shuttle lot would have to be expanded almost immediately. If the lot was expanded by 500 spaces it would cost approximately \$2 million. The annual cost of the shuttle surface lot would also have to be expanded. Also, based upon the demand projections, a second new surface lot would need to be added in just a few years. This would not allow the peak parking demand to be satisfied, the rental car requirements would not be satisfied and land for alternative tenant development would be eliminated.

Option 2 is the 1,200 space parking garage of which 900 spaces are public parking and 300 are allocated to the rental car companies. However, as soon as the garage is opened the average daily demand for short-term hourly parking would not be satisfied and it also would not meet the demand for any of the peak demand periods. Option 2 is a smaller garage, however it would be expanded by the year 2014 by an additional 100 spaces for short-term, 200 spaces for long-term and 100 spaces for rental cars. After the expansion the short-term parking demand would be satisfied, however it still would not quite satisfy the peak parking demand. For long-term parking the demand would be met when the garage opens, however by 2014 the garage would already be at 90% utilization.

The advantages of Option 2 include lower initial capital costs than Option 3, it provides some relief to daily long-term parking, it could be phased in efficiently with the terminal development program and it would help avoid building an additional shuttle surface lot. The disadvantages of Option 2 are that it really only satisfies the parking demand for a fairly short-period of time until an expansion is needed, the ramping system would be a little more difficult to design since it is a smaller garage that would be expanded by an additional two or three bays, it does not satisfy the rental car needs, it does not satisfy the peak parking demand periods and the expansion costs would be high due to the increased cost of construction and economy of scale.

Option 3 is a garage with 1,200 public parking spaces and 400 rental car spaces for a total of 1,600 spaces. The hourly parking demand would be met as soon as the garage opens, although there may still be a little trouble meeting some of the peak demand in the summer months. However, if the shuttle surface lot still exists there would be some additional parking to use for the overflow. The advantages of Option 3 are that it meets the parking demand for at least 6 years, it meets the rental car requirements of 400 parking spaces, it does not require additional shuttle surface lots and does not increase the operating costs of shuttle service, it could be constructed within the terminal development project, and the ramping system is easier to design and more efficient because design is not having to be based around future expansion. The

disadvantages are that the initial capital costs would be higher and the maintenance costs are more expensive on a garage as compared to a surface lot.

When looking at the financial picture, Option 2 starts off with 1,200 parking spaces, assumes a 14,000 sq. foot rental car customer service center, and assumes the estimated project costs include soft costs such as design and administrative costs. This averages to \$22,583 per space. The total initial cost of this garage is just over \$27 million, and an annual debt service of \$1,762,869. Also, this garage requires an expansion within three years of opening that would cost just over \$10 million, making the total cost of this garage \$38 million.

Option 3 consists of 1,600 total parking spaces, assumes a 14,000 sq. foot rental car customer service center, and assumes the estimated project costs include soft costs such as design and administrative costs. However, because of the economy per scale the cost per spaces is only \$20,404 meaning the total estimated project costs would be \$32,647,000 with an annual debt service of \$2,123,734.

Chairman Fletcher asked if the cost per space had gone up since this study was originally presented. Mr. Reedstrom stated yes and the reason why is because the cost of the customer service center and the ancillary costs were included.

Mr. White stated the exact estimate on the cost is not known. For the last couple of years staff has looked at other airport parking garages around the country that have recently been built to try to come up with some sort of range of costs. Sedgwick County recently came up with their own range of costs to build a parking garage associated with the arena project and their estimate was between \$15-20,000 per space. Mr. Reedstrom said that the cost also depends on how the garage is designed, how many amenities are included and many other different elements.

For the financial model, the debt service remains the same, there was an adjustment for elasticity of demand, and implementation of a rental car customer facility charge as well as new parking rates is being assumed. For Option 2 the total revenue would be about \$9.5 million. For the operations and maintenance costs there is a jump between 2011 and 2012 which represents the increase of maintenance costs for a parking garage. The debt service starts off at \$1,762,829 and by the year 2013, because of the expansion, jumps to almost \$2.4 million. However, even with the debt service, revenues in excess of expenditures and debt service is still being shown so there would be a positive cash flow.

The financial model for Option 3 is very similar. The operations and maintenance costs are the same, the debt service starts off a little more expensive, but then is constant throughout the year. Because of the increased debt service the first couple of years there will be the same parking demand, but a little less in positive cash flow, however starting in the year 2013 Option 3 becomes the better financial option.

There are several disadvantages to delaying the construction of a garage. Due to construction costs being estimated to rise 5% per year, if it is decided to delay the construction of a garage for at least three years, the garage would end up being almost a \$37 million project. If the construction is delayed an additional 3 or 4 years, the garage would be almost a \$45 million

project. There are also additional costs because if a garage is not built a temporary surface lot will be needed at the cost of approximately \$1.2 million. This lot would then have to be demolished in order to build a garage so it becomes a throw away cost. Also, if the terminal is opened before a garage is built then there would end up being a major disruption to the front of the terminal. The rental car needs would not be met and those spaces would more than likely be in a surface lot in a different location. The ramping system would also be more difficult to design. Additional surface lots would be required to meet peak parking demand and the delays would result in patron dissatisfaction and would reduce the level of customer service.

There are several advantages to building the garage now. The phasing would fit nicely with the terminal development project and would make it more efficient. The land identified for the garage is currently available. There would be no disruption to the terminal development. Interest rates currently are advantageous. Also, it is easier to design once the footprint of the garage is in place and if it is built now it avoids any kind of construction cost escalation.

Mr. Reedstrom stated that in conclusion, either garage option will likely show up with a positive cash flow upon opening with the implementation of a customer facility charge and parking rate changes. The current and projected parking demand can support a multi-level garage. A customer facility charge would be initiated at \$3.50 per transaction. Either option would meet the patron and the rental car needs. The project is feasible as a stand-alone project that is totally isolated from the terminal project. It minimizes the prime land needed for parking that could actually be used for tenant development. Postponing the construction of the parking garage will increase the costs of construction, and will cause additional customer inconvenience.

Chairman Fletcher said that it looked as if even if Option 3 was built, utilization would be close to 85% and asked if there would still be parking problems even with the larger garage option. Mr. Reedstrom stated that even with a 1,600 space parking garage Wichita would not quite be able to meet it's peak demand except by using the overflow/shuttle lot, however the demand could be met if that was in use.

Mr. Hennessy asked which Board Members objected to the parking garage and what their reasons were. Mr. Russell stated it was himself, Mr. Austin Mr. Pryor and Mr. Ward. Mr. Pryor stated that his main concern is due to the garage being funded for a thirty-year period and if during those thirty years Wichita were to lose a low fare carrier the traffic growth would drop off. In the past when low-fare carriers have moved out there has been a reduction in passengers.

Mr. Russell said that from the time he has been on the Board his goal has been to make sure the project comes in at \$150 million. Mr. Russell would prefer to wait to decide on the garage until the bid comes in on the terminal.

Mr. Ward said that it is important to consider the economy. The airport is tied to the aviation industry which is generally 2-3 years behind what the national economy does. Mr. Ward is concerned about what would happen if the recession started to affect the airport just about the time the terminal project is finished.

Mr. Hennessy asked what the possibility was of getting any kind of state or federal funding to help pay for the parking garage. Mr. White said that there is no eligibility under the current laws.

Mr. Estes said the first question related to parking should be how many spaces are needed. Mr. Estes wonders what has changed from the Master Plan because at the time it was developed a parking garage was not needed. The current growth is similar to what the Master Plan showed, yet the airport is out of parking spaces today.

Mr. White said that when the financial capacity was done for the terminal project staff struggled with this same issue of trying to determine what numbers should be used when projecting the future. The FAA has numbers, the Master Plan provides numbers, and Jacobs Consultancy also provided numbers in the financial capacity analysis. At the time, a base case, a high number and a low number was established in order to determine how much the airport could afford to spend on the terminal project.

Mr. Hennessy said that there is a purpose in the airport. It is something here to serve the community, and everything comes full circle. There might be lows and dips, but there should be recoveries too. Mr. Hennessy believes this is something that needs to be weighed in the long-range.

Mr. White pointed out a page in the agenda packet showing the 52 year history of passengers at this airport starting in 1955 and there are ups and downs throughout the entire 50 plus years here.

Mr. Hennessy asked if the subsidies for low cost carriers are allocated on an annual basis. Mr. Estes advised that the state has to approve it within the annual budget. Mr. Hennessy also asked if other communities have been getting involved. The law is set up through the Regional Economic Area Partnership who is the agency that actually grants the money. This year Salina and Topeka applied jointly for a portion of the money, however their application was denied. Mr. White said the way the state law was constructed was for a five-year program, with the funding being provided on an annual basis. This is the second year of the five years so there will be three more years under the current law.

Mr. Russell asked when the terminal would be bid. Mr. Carter reported that it is anticipated to be late this year. Mr. Russell wondered if it would be better to build the bigger parking garage, however wait until after the bid for the terminal is done. Mr. Carter said the major landside package is going to go out for bids late this year, however a lot of it will be done in packages. From DMJM's perspective it is better to phase it at the same time because the garage affects the relocation of the roadway as well as other elements. Mr. White also stated it may take 8-12 months to design the parking garage in which case it would not go to bid until about a year from now either, so in theory the airport will not be locked into any obligation other than the money spent on the design. The issue with the garage is that to be able to design the terminal properly the design team needs to know within a couple of months if there will be a garage or not because it makes a difference in a couple of major elements in the terminal design.

Mr. Pryor said that if he understands correctly, whether a new terminal is built or not, additional parking is still needed, so the issue is whether the airport can afford the parking.

Mr. Greenlee asked if the ingress and the egress for the parking would change from one option to the other. Mr. White said that it may not change because there still would have to be a separate set of entrances and exits. Mr. Reedstrom added that with a smaller garage it would also be necessary to be able to add on without affecting the ingress and egress.

Mr. Greenlee asked what the timeline would be if a garage was approved by the Wichita Airport Authority. Mr. White said that it would take about 90 days to do the selection and the contracting of an engineering firm to design the garage. When HNTB was selected as the lead designer for the terminal project, the solicitation that was done allows them to also design the parking garage. HNTB also has the data and the background. Also, one of the concerns a couple of the Council Members mentioned is that when the garage is built it is important that it also look good, and that the terminal and garage be complimentary buildings. After the contract is awarded, the garage would take approximately 9 months to design and then another 18 months to 2 years to build.

Chairman Fletcher asked the Board if anyone had been in the San Diego airport while it has been undergoing expansions. That project has taken a long time because San Diego has done things kind of piece meal. Chairman Fletcher said that he does not want to see this airport build a small garage first and then keep continuing the construction out to an undetermined time. Chairman Fletcher stated lets do it right and do it big the first time.

Mr. Greenlee said that is exactly what Mr. Murfin said at the last meeting was to do it right the first time and he concurs with that.

Mr. Estes asked about why there would still be excess revenue. If there is more revenue than needed for the commitments, should the charges be revised to get the revenue to match the commitments and the debt service and come back with a zero balance. Then the parking rates could always be adjusted in the future if necessary. Mr. Reedstrom stated the rate changes would not go into effect until the garage is open whereas the customer facility charge would be started this year to start pre-funding. Mr. Reedstrom also said that the parking facilities can be managed to encourage the patrons to park in the best location. Mr. Estes said he was making the comment in regard to one of the Council Member's comments that if the airport starts to increase it's charges it may offset the perceived benefit to the consumer.

Mr. Greenlee mentioned that the rate adjustments could be taken into consideration after getting all of the exact construction costs, then the rates could be adjusted to bring that line back to zero.

Mr. Estes asked about the customer facility charges and said that Oklahoma City and Tulsa should probably be included. Mr. Estes also said that it may be a good idea to consolidate the shuttle and long-term numbers because the way this airport operates, it is all really long-term.

Mr. Greenlee asked about the new shuttle lot not being fully FAA approved. Mr. White said it is because the location of that lot is technically for aeronautical development so it cannot stay as a parking lot forever. Mr. Russell asked if it would be possible to change or modify the plan to get approval from the FAA. Mr. White said it could be possible, however right now the highest and best use of the land is for air cargo, general aviation or some type of aviation facility that requires access or benefits from the runways right next to it.

Mr. Ward said that he has not changed his prior vote on whether a parking garage should be built, but is asking if the question now is to go with the smaller or the larger garage. Mr. White said that the Council would appreciate knowing the Board's recommendation on that issue.

Joe Lang said the presumption is that if the Airport Authority decides to proceed with a parking garage, then this Board can give their recommendation on which option.

Motion by Chairman Fletcher to recommend the Wichita Airport Authority proceed with Parking Garage Option Three as recommended by the parking consultant. Greenlee Seconded the Motion.

Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Russell said that if the Council asks, they are still undecided as to whether or not the garage is needed, however if you are going to build one, build the big one. Mr. Ward said he agreed. Joe Lang said that Austin, Pryor, Russell and Ward are still on record as opposing the garage at this time.

Mr. Russell asked if it would be possible to determine what kind of income stream could come from a surface parking lot should it be utilized as a parking lot versus the income stream of an aeronautical activity. Mr. White said that those numbers could be figured out. Mr. Greenlee said to remember that the profit would be more than just ground rental, there would also be the facility and the elements that brings with it. It is not always a tangible revenue to the airport, it is how many jobs are created and the tax revenues coming into the community.

Advertising Agency Contract

Valerie Wise advised the Board that the current contract with Armstrong|Shank expires in February and staff would like the Board's support to renew the contract for one year with an additional one-year option to renew. The Airport Authority has a marketing agreement with Frontier Airlines through June of 2009 and Armstrong|Shank has developed a strong relationship with Frontier that is beneficial to this airport. Armstrong|Shank will also have media buys and promotions in place beyond February of 2009. The airport branding campaign was also started two years ago with Armstrong|Shank and an effective branding campaign needs more than two years to run its course. One of the objectives for this year's marketing campaign is to coordinate with the air service consulting firm to develop innovative marketing strategies that can further enhance service. It is going to be a challenge this year because due to high fuel costs the airlines are going to be very careful with where they serve and are going to have to raise fares. Raising fares jeopardizes the demand so this airport is going to have to work hard to maintain the air

service it currently has. The relationship with the airport's advertising agency and air service consulting firm is very beneficial so staff is asking that this Board recommend to the Wichita Airport Authority to extend Armstrong|Shank's contract through February of 2010.

Chairman Fletcher said he thinks Armstrong|Shank has done a good job and that the airport needs to be consistent with its advertising. Mr. White also mentioned that Armstrong|Shank has been extremely cooperative and willing to work with staff in the past.

Mr. Russell said that what they have done is working and to change it now would be foolish so he will support it 100%.

Motion by Estes to support the selection of Armstrong/Shank and recommend to the Wichita Airport Authority that their contract be renewed through February 2009, with an additional one-year option to renew. Greenlee seconded the motion.

Motion carried unanimously.

Air Service Consultant Contract

Valerie Wise reported that the airport has been working with Sabre Consulting, an air service consulting firm, for the past 18 months. Sabre has been instrumental in the recent growth at the airport. Their firm was helpful in attracting Allegiant air service to Orlando and bringing in Frontier Airlines. Sabre's original contract was initiated in January 2004 at which time they prepared a market assessment study, however since then their company has been used for more comprehensive air service consulting work. Since Sabre's contract expired in December, a request for qualifications for air service consulting firms was held in November. A Staff Screening and Selection Committee conducted interviews of the four consulting firms that responded to the solicitation and the committee unanimously selected Sabre again. Sabre was chosen because of their strong relationships with the airlines, innovative strategies, and comprehensive market assessment programs. Mrs. Wise asked that the Wichita Airport Authority enter into a new contract with Sabre for an additional three years with two one year options to renew.

Mr. Hennessy asked what would be on Sabre's agenda and if they would continue to bring in new service. Mrs. Wise said that another market assessment study needs to be prepared since the last one was completed in January 2005. This study is a very important tool to use when developing strategies for this market. Sabre has also been extremely helpful with preparing presentations to the airlines. Also, there are a couple of destinations that the Wichita market can support and this airport would like to work with Sabre to obtain those non-stop destinations.

Motion by Estes to endorse the selection of Sabre Consulting and recommend to the Wichita Airport Authority their contract be extended as recommended. Greenlee Seconded the motion.

Motion carried unanimously.

Terminal Area Redevelopment Program Update

Mike Carter, DMJM Aviation, provided the Board an update on the current schedule. DMJM has developed the schedule criteria and looked at all the constraints. March 8th was given as the final date to determine whether to proceed with plans to include a parking garage or proceed without plans for a parking garage. The art consultant and panel are going to meet soon and then will present their findings to the Design Council. There will also be meetings over the spring and summer to finalize what the art program is going to be. Also this month there will be a technical review meeting and there will be an airline affairs committee meeting on January 22nd.

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 15 minutes and reconvene in the Board Room. Motion carried unanimously.

The Board recessed for Executive Session at 5:13 p.m.

The Board reconvened at 5:28 p.m., Chairman Fletcher announced that no action is necessary from the Executive Session.

Other Business

The next WAAB meeting will be Monday, February 4, 2008 at 2:30 p.m.

Meeting adjourned at 5:28 p.m.

Kelly Fabrizius, Clerk