



MINUTES
Airport Advisory Commission
December 21, 2010

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Dr. Pat Boone
Dave Elliott
Tom Hayden
Joel Miller - Vice Chairman
Wally Miller - Chairman
Bud Patterson
Dr. Chris Thornton

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: None

NON-VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT: Randy Courduff, Alternate Commissioner
Rob MacDonald, Pikes Peak Area Council of Governments

NON-VOTING MEMBERS ABSENT: Dennis Hisey, El Paso County Commissioner

CITY STAFF PRESENT: Dan Gallagher, Asst. Director, Planning & Development
Mark Earle, Director of Aviation
Kelly Jackson, Airport Public Affairs Administrator
John McGinley, Asst. Director, Operations & Maintenance
Neil Ralston, Airport Planning & Development Manager
Gisela Shanahan, Asst. Director, Finance & Administration

CITY STAFF ABSENT: None

GUESTS PRESENT: Patrick "Pat" Ahlstrom, TSA Western Area Director
Steve Ducoff
Scott Ellis, TSA Screening & Partnership Ofc
Dana Jackson, COS, Sr. Ofc. Specialist
Danielle Scott, Accounting Manager
Jim Shear, TSA FSD

Next meeting is Tuesday, January 25, 2011.

- **APPROVAL OF THE OCTOBER 26, 2010 MINUTES:**

Chairman W. Miller asked for approval of the October 26, 2010 Airport Advisory Commission minutes; no objections; minutes were approved as submitted.

- **PUBLIC OR CITIZEN GROUP COMMENTS:**

None

- **GENERAL BUSINESS**

→ **Land Use Items – Neil Ralston**

- ◆ Item #1: CPC CP 01-00148-A7MJ1/ AR FP 10-00466
- ◆ Item #2: PPR-10-029
- ◆ Item #3: PPR10-25 (tabled from Sept. 2010 meeting)

Airport staff reviewed two new land use items this month and one that was previously tabled. As indicated on your summary sheets, staff is not recommending objections to either of these items.

One item remains tabled from previous meetings:

- ◆ Item #4 from July 2010

Vice-Chairman J. Miller motioned to approve both items; Commissioner Boone seconded the motion and it was carried by unanimous vote.

→ **Screening and Privatization Program**

As you know, we've been working our way through creating a report for the AAC to report on the TSA Screening Partnership Program. John McGinley will be giving an overview of the report we generated. We sent out the draft report a couple days ago. This is something the AAC has looked into on numerous occasions in the past informally. There have been discussions as early as 2004. The latest we could find, as referenced in the minutes, was in 2006. Typically the discussions in the past have been initiated when we receive literature from the companies that provide privatized screening services at other airports around the country. In each case in the past, we have come to the conclusion that it wasn't a good fit for the airport at that time. This particular instance, one of our Council members raised the question in response to public comment and a lot of media coverage we had that was in response to the new screening procedures that were put into place in late October. The procedures generated so much public attention that one of our Council members felt it was important for us to take another look at this issue. We advised Council that the AAC had looked at this in the past, and that the most appropriate process would be for the AAC to look at it again and report back to City Council. As in the past, staff would do the initial research and provide a draft report for AAC discussion and consideration. The draft that we are presenting today is for your use only. Any final report that comes out of this Commission will be yours, so you can modify or even rewrite the draft entirely, or elect not to issue a report at all. John McGinley will give an overview and please feel free to ask questions as we go along. We are fortunate to have TSA representatives here today. When this issue first arose, Jim Schear, our TSA Federal Security Director, stepped up and offered to attend this meeting and answer questions. In addition to Jim, we have other TSA officials--Pat Ahlstrom, Area Director for Operations, and Scott Ellis, HQ representative for the SPP.

Presentation by John McGinley

What brought us here today?

As Mark mentioned, this item came up at the Nov. 22 Council meeting. City Council asked staff and the Advisory Commission to take a look into the program and provide a recommendation back to Council on whether or not it makes sense for Colorado Springs. One of the core questions was, "Can we mitigate the process of Advance Imaging Technology and the new enhanced pat down procedures by entering the SPP?"

As questions came up about AIT and the pat down procedures, that's truly what got the discussion started and led us to where we are today with this issue.

Commissioner Boone asked if it was because they thought they couldn't question the use of the machine and the new pat down procedures. Mark responded that the initial question posed by Council was can we avoid the AIT and pat down procedures through the use of privatized screeners. Follow up issues included questions regarding potential service improvements and a general discussion of private vs. public sector services. We strove to answer all of these questions through the research. Commissioner Boone asked what they are really asking for. Mark explained that the Council member was not aware when the questions were posed that TSA regulations do not allow privatized screeners to modify existing TSA protocols and procedures.

John went on and noted that this issue has come up before and has been previously discussed at AAC meetings. The conclusion we have come to with previous reviews has been that the SPP program isn't a good fit for Colorado Springs.

Background on SPP:

The Screening Partnership Program (SPP) or Opt Out as it's sometimes referred to. The origin of the SPP comes from Aviation Transportation Security Act (ATSA), which is the Act that created TSA itself in 2001. Once TSA stood up in 2002, they kicked off a pilot program for SPP which went from 2002 to 2005. In November 2004, TSA opened the program for airport applicants. Currently, and not including airports under application, there are 16 out of 457 commercial airports that are in the SPP program. The Pilot Program 5 (PP5) airports were selected to ensure a range of sizes, San Francisco being the largest; with over 18M enplanements; Kansas City at 4.8M; Rochester at 1.2M; Jackson Hole at 284,397; and Tupelo, MS at 13K. All these airports had different reasons for entering the program. Some airports in 2002/2003 were looking at concerns over TSA staffing levels, particularly San Francisco and Kansas City. Other airports such as Jackson Hole and Tupelo, were looking into providing the screening themselves and yet some thought it was a great opportunity to get into a unique program. After PP5 in November 2004, TSA opened the program for applicants.

The first airport to join SPP was Sioux Falls Regional Airport. From talking to management staff at this airport, they got into the program because of ideological differences and felt they could get a vendor involved to do a better job than perhaps the federal government could. Commissioner Boone asked what 'a better job' really means. John explained that, according to the current director, the director at the time had an anti-federal government ideology and he was looking to ways to keep federal screeners out of his airport. They thought that by using a contractor and getting a business involved, they could provide a better product. The current director is less enthusiastic about using private contractors, but they are well established in the program and are not interested in changing it at this time.

Key West had a unique situation they were faced with in 2006. Key West Int'l Airport had federal screeners prior to entering the SPP program, but they wanted to start up air service at

Marathon, a small airport north of Key West. When Delta Airlines agreed to provide service to Marathon, the airport had to find a way to provide screening service. Due to the remote location of the Marathon Airport, it was recommended by TSA that they enter the SPP program. For consistency between airports, they entered the program for both Marathon and Key West. Shortly after they got the screening vendor on line, Delta discontinued the service in Marathon, leaving only Key West service in place. Key West elected at this point not to make a change back to TSA service to avoid another transition period.

Sonoma County, another very small airport, didn't have any air service prior to 2007. When service was initiated, TSA recommended that they enter the SPP program due to the remote location and limited scope of the operation.

Roswell Int'l is another remote location. Roswell wanted to change to privatized screening because they felt that they could encourage the contractor to hire more local employees at the screening checkpoint. A lot of the TSA employees at Roswell were brought in from outside the area due to hiring constraints within the federal system.

Of these four airports that have moved from TSA to private screening, only Roswell and Sioux Falls actually "opted out" of the federal program. The other two airports were driven to the decision by other factors such as remote location and the inability of TSA to operate efficiently in the region.

Following those four airports, there are seven airports in Montana that have entered the program. Prior to 2008, all these airports were serviced by Big Sky Airlines through an essential air service contract. Big Sky handled screening at these remote locations by flying the passengers from each airport to Billings Montana where they were screened and then transferred to other secure flights in the system. Big Sky went bankrupt in 2008. These communities worked with the FAA to find an airline to take over the EAS contract, and found that Great Lakes Airlines was willing. One of the conditions that Great Lakes put on servicing these locations was that they wanted individual screening operations at each location. To accomplish this, these airports banded together to enter a unified screening contract under the SPP.

Four other airports in Montana are currently under application. The Montana airports have taken a look at the contractor in the state and are interested in the SPP model. Yellowstone is unique in that it only provides service six months out of the year. When open, they use Federal screeners that are not from the local community. Yellowstone is "opting out" so they can hire local employees.

Commissioner Elliott asked if these are individual contracts or is the State Dept. of Aviation contracting for the group? John explained that the State did not run the RFP process; this was something done by TSA and all airports were placed under a single contractor. Commissioner Boone asked if one company has contracted for all SPP locations. No it's a mixed bag. First Line and Covenant are the two largest companies that offer these services. Scott Ellis noted that there are six contractors that supply services to the 16 airports nationwide. Commissioner Boone asked if one company has more of the contracts than any of the others. Scott said only due to the size of the airport. Aviation Security is providing service at San Francisco and has the largest contract only because SFO is the largest airport in the program.

John McGinley continued, saying that every airport in the SPP had positive things to say. The most frequent comment was that the contractors through the SPP program could provide equal or better service than any other airport. When you look at the term 'equal or better' it's

actually something that goes back to the ATSA. The program requires the contractors to perform and pay, equal or better than the TSA.

TSA manages the contractor; however the contractor will consult informally with airport management on screening issues. If you enter the program, the only staff that is replaced are the actual screeners that wear uniforms at the checkpoint. Above that, all personnel are direct TSA employees, including the FSD, Asst. FSD and Screening Managers. The contractor in the SPP program answers to TSA.

If we were to 'Opt Out', technically, we'd be putting in an application to the Federal government to inform the TSA that they we prefer that they staff their screening operations with private contract employees rather than Federal employees. The contractors would continue to be responsible to TSA. TSA would constantly monitor services to ensure the contractor meets all performance benchmarks. The airport would not have any management over the screeners. The term 'Opt Out' causes confusion because the airport is not really 'Opting Out' of anything. Some airports work informally with the TSA and its vendors, and other airports don't interact with the vendors at all.

Airports in the program claim one of the benefits of the program is that there is another party at the table that can meet to discuss concerns and items they'd like to see in the program. Commissioner Courduff asked if bonuses are covered by the airport or by TSA. Mark explained that any approved compensation program is paid by TSA. TSA covers the contractor cost of any approved compensation, even if it's over and above what TSA would pay for the Federal program. The airport would then pay for any expenses for additional staff over and above the staffing model approved by TSA. Vice Chairman J. Miller asked then that if the airport didn't agree with the staffing model, the airport would then have the option to hire additional staff, but at a cost to the airport? Mark said this is correct. Commissioner Boone asked if you hired more at your own expense, does that make you liable. Mark responded that this would be addressed later in the presentation.

John McGinley continued that the program is transparent at the customer level; uniforms are the same, with the exception that the contractor name may be included. Additionally, airport management should consider local factors when deciding to enter the SPP, which related to the 'equal or better' comment. A few airports noted that there are marginal differences, but considering all factors and program implementation, it's not worth the margin. Another comment was that you don't have any role in deciding which contractor serves at your airport, initially or when it's renewed. This can be considered a risk because the airport would not have any control over which contractor is selected. Commissioner Thornton asked who decides this. John explained that TSA puts out an RFP and makes a selection based on federal selection criteria. The length of contract is one base year with four one-year options for a total of five years. At the end of the term, another RFP is put out. Commissioner Boone asked how companies are awarded the contract. Scott Ellis noted that 'best value' approach is applied. Commissioner Elliott asked what involvement the local airport has in this process. Scott replied none. Commissioner Patterson asked if pay has to be equal to or greater than according to federal regulations, and does it include the cost of retirement. It seems that an employee of a contractor could get a better wage because they could get all their money up front. Scott explained that wages and benefits are all considered. We require, by contract, that the contractors provide a certain compensation level to their employees, but we don't tell them how to balance between the various compensation categories. Commissioner Courduff asked if there's ever been a case in which the contract company went bankrupt and then needed to backfill and is there a plan in place for something like this? Scott said no there hasn't and yes, there is a plan for financial liability. Commissioner Boone asked if performance of a company is considered vs. a new, inexperienced company. Scott noted that past performance is kept in mind for the selection process. Normally the selection is based

on technical approach, past performance and price in descending order. Past performance doesn't always trump a technical approach for a new proposal. Chairman W. Miller asked if during our research we had asked if any of the airports had problems with the program. John explained that the pros and cons were discussed and no one had any issues with the vendors currently under contract. Some mentioned that when they had issues with complaints involving an employee, they could go to the vendor and it would get handled. Vice Chairman J. Miller asked if the management is still TSA if there are Federal TSA employees serving the management functions. John noted that TSA provides oversight of the program and management of TSA regulatory activities, while the contractor is responsible for management and supervision of its screening operation. TSA staff monitors the contractor for performance. Vice Chairman J. Miller asked if COS privatized if we'd retain the same FSD. John replied absolutely, the FSD, the Asst FSD and the screening managers would remain the same. Vice Chairman J. Miller noted that the SPP program seems top heavy in management and has anyone ever spoken to this issue? Mark explained that there has been a lot of discussion in AAEE and ACI circles about this issue.

John continued that some in Congress, led by Congressman Micah, have been strong critics of the TSA since its inception, and have advocated for the SPP as a means of reducing the cost of federal government. Studies have shown, however, that converting airports from TSA to SPP screening will not result in any savings to the system overall. The TSA employees would simply be replaced by private screeners that cost the same or more than their TSA counterparts. Congress would have to change its requirement that private contract screeners are paid the same as TSA screeners before any savings could be realized. Commissioner Hayden asked if the TSA would direct the contractor or if they'd be more of a Quality Assurance Evaluator? The TSA is fully responsible for the contract and the airport has no input other than the informal relationship between the TSA and the airport. Officially the contract is with TSA. Vice Chairman J. Miller noted that then you'd have to have a good relationship with the TSA individual responsible for the contract.

What are the costs to the federal government under the SPP versus using federal screeners? The SPP program is slightly more expensive than the Federal program due to management overhead for oversight of the contract. Commissioner Patterson asked if we'd have a requirement for additional staffing here. Mark responded that, no, we wouldn't need to increase staff. An example of an airport that entered the program so they could provide additional staff is Jackson Hole, who set up a separate screening company to compete for the SPP contract. Vice Chairman J. Miller asked how the airport would be ensured that they'd be awarded the contract if they did this. Scott Ellis said that you aren't guaranteed anything, but could not provide details of the RFP process due to regulatory constraints.

Is an airport subject to any liability risk associated with screening operations under the Screening Partnership Program? According to the TSA, as long as the airport isn't actually providing the screening services, there isn't any liability to the airport. However, they emphasize that this has not been tested in the courts.

Can full body scans and enhanced pat-downs be avoided through the use of privatized screeners? No, all policies and procedures are the same for a contractor or the Federal program.

What are the consequences of refusing to cooperate with the TSA on full body scans and enhanced pat-downs? As an individual, if you don't want to go through the AIT system or a pat-down, then you are free to go, but you cannot fly. If you are going through the process and the system goes into alarm, you no longer have the right to back out of the process. With regards to airports, there is no choice. TSA has the authority to do conduct screening at all airports, even if the airport operator refuses to cooperate. In such a case, the

airport may be putting its access to federal funding in jeopardy by refusing to cooperate with the TSA. Commissioner Courduff asked what the timeline for deployment of the AIT to COS is. Within two years. Commissioner Boone asked who makes the machines and the cost. Jim Schear explained that there are two manufacturers. The Backscatter and the Millimeter Wave are being deployed together, right now. Cost is about \$150,000. The Millimeter Wave is a radio wave device and the Backscatter is low level imaging system.

What are the potential impacts if federal screeners gain collective bargaining rights?

Currently the ASTA states that TSA screeners cannot engage in collective bargaining unless it's approved by the administrator. This is an issue that has been debated; perhaps by the end of 2011 there will be a decision made on whether the new administrator will allow it. The vendors in the SPP program are not restricted the same as Federal screeners. Each vendor in the SPP program can form a union if they want to and can engage in collective bargaining. There are three that have collective bargaining agreements in place however no one is permitted to strike.

When we first started looking into this, we met with Jim Schear and received some statistics from TSA. We have compared the TSA stats with the Airport stats. Over the four month period studied, TSA received 25 total complaints vs. 68 compliments. The categories for complaints are policy/procedure, other = 10, policy/procedure, liquids/gels = 5, policy/procedure, pat down = 6 and service attitude = 4. Overall during the period sampled, TSA received 68 compliments with 16 of those on procedures and 52 on attitude.

John showed a graph for the period. Once the information on AIT and the pat down procedures went public we saw a spike in comments, mostly complimentary. Mark added that in late October, when the procedures were implemented, TSA received a spike in complaints. The very next month, as the public became more aware and the news reports were out, compliments and positive comments far outweighed the negative side. This will continue to be tracked.

Over the same time period, the Airport received 13 complaints and 52 compliments. The breakdown along category lines was similar to what the TSA received. The total number of comments over this four month period was 65 and that's out of 277,044 passengers that processed through the screening checkpoint. We are always sensitive to each individual comment, but when you look at the broad range of passengers being served, it doesn't indicate there's a problem. The TSA received 93 comments over the same time period. Vice Chairman J. Miller stated that presumably the policy comments are regarding things that wouldn't change under an SPP program. John responded that his presumption was correct.

Vice Chairman J. Miller asked if there's any official opinion on whether the SPP is working or not. Patrick Ahlstrom indicated that TSA is neutral when it comes to whether an airport chooses to enter the SPP. However, he said, if we were failing to perform effectively at an airport, we would not be neutral about that. Commissioner Patterson asked what the transition time period would be if an airport chose to Opt Out. Scott Ellis indicated that it takes about a year.

Jim Schear noted that while we are very neutral about the program, we are proud of the work the TSA screeners have done at COS. All concerns are addressed by him personally. You see by the compliments and the passenger statements that the TSA has done a great job. All the COS TSA employees are from the local workforce. When we have an SPP airport, they hire their own people but there's no guarantee that employees would be from the local market. Commissioner Boone asked if an airport goes to SPP if the current TSA employees would get priority transfer to the private contractor. Jim said this is correct. But if the employee chooses to stay with TSA, he/she may not necessarily stay at the local airport.

Chairman W. Miller thanked Airport staff for all the work putting this presentation together. The commission may choose to respond to the Council's questions and should decide if they'd recommend changing to the SPP or not. Vice Chairman J. Miller said that the cost relationship will remain the same and the current relationship with TSA is working well. When you have direct chain of command, you have a better ability to respond quickly to any needs. Chairman W. Miller asked if the current program needs revamping and all commissioners replied "no". Commissioner Boone asked Steve Ducoff how this discussion today is any different from past commission discussions about the topic. Steve indicated that there was less information available in the past and just basic information about other airports participating in the program.

Commissioner Hayden asked what would be the benefit of changing to the SPP. Mark explained that we are constantly looking for opportunities improve. When we look at a new program such as this, we generally ask 1) Is there a problem with the current level of service that this change could fix? When we look at the data that we have collected from our customers, and our own observations of the day-to-day TSA operation, we don't believe that we could improve service levels or the effectiveness of the system by going into the SPP program. 2) Would the new program reduce costs? In this case, the answer is "no" because of the way the program is structured. Any change in costs would accrue to the TSA because they are funding the program. Further, studies have indicated that the cost to the TSA would actually increase unless Congress changes the requirements of the program. Given the answers to these questions, we would not recommend changing to the SPP at this time.

Commissioner Elliott noted that the leadership at this Airport has developed a very positive relationship with TSA. This is not true across the system. Vice Chairman J. Miller noted that if the Airport/TSA relationship changed, then considering the SPP may become an option. Mark stated that the current relationship has improved dramatically over the past few years. At the Commission's urging, we have worked harder to maintain a positive working relationship with the TSA, and it is paying off. Commissioner Elliott pointed out that private enterprise encourages accountability. Jim Schear explained that we has been very successful in holding TSA screeners responsible for their actions, and has changed their behavior when needed. Commissioner Boone noted that she has seen examples where federal employees have been less than responsive, but has not experienced that with the TSA operation at COS in recent years.

Chairman W. Miller suggested that a letter be submitted to the Mayor and Council stating that the commission does not recommend changing from the current plan. Vice Chairman J. Miller offered to write a letter and then motioned to unanimously support the current TSA operation at COS, Commissioner Thornton seconded the motion and it was carried by unanimous vote. The draft report provided by Airport staff can be used as an appendix to a cover letter with the recommendation. The sooner this is completed, the better. Vice Chairman J. Miller will try to have this done by the end of the week.

4. STAFF REPORTS

→ Traffic Report – Gisela Shanahan

- **Enplanements** – As anticipated, the new service by Allegiant to Long Beach and Phoenix has helped to negate the loss of service and the economic situation over the last two years. For the month of November, enplaned passengers declined only 1.1% compared to November 2009, bringing our year-to-date to 6.1% below 2009. We anticipate being just

below 6% down at the end of 2010. If you look at the graph, you'll see that 2010 is very close to 2009.

- **Landed Weight** – Down 1.0% below 2009 year-to-date.
- **Freight and Mail** – Flat at .01% below 2009 year-to-date.
- **Aircraft Operations** – Close at 1.7% below year-to-date
- **Load Factors** – Slightly higher at 78.3% year-to-date as compared to 76.2% for 2009.
- **Seats Available** – We have about 4.2% less seats in the market through November as compared to 2009.

→ **Finance Report – Gisela Shanahan**

All reports are preliminary at this point. We just went through a major upgrade with the reporting system which impacted the financial model. The query reports that we used to pull data from had a few glitches and we found some anomalies. We are where we've been all year. We implemented some spending measures, did exceptionally well and will have a larger year-end settlement with the airlines than we anticipated at the beginning of the year. Revenue compared to last year will end up fairly flat. The airline category is lower, but that was intentional.

Commissioner Elliott asked how the State grants were coming along. Gisela noted that we received \$480,000 that will be using for the Fleet Improvement Program as well as the grant for intern #5. You will meet Patrick Bowman at the next meeting.

→ **Operations and Maintenance – John McGinley**

Operations and Maintenance

- We have a deadline for the end of this year (2010) to install all of our surface painted hold signs. We are going to meet that mandate with the exception of one sign; there's a delay at one of our intersections at the northwest corner of the airport because we are waiting for a written verification from the FAA on placement of the sign. We anticipate we will get this done soon. There are other surface painted hold signs that aren't down, but they are related to the 13/31 project and will be down before we open that runway.
- The Landside Crew has winterized all of the irrigation systems and is shifting to erosion and pavement maintenance. Over the last month, they've been working on crack sealing on Proby Pkwy, Aviation Way and Air Cargo Rd. and have been painting the surfaces as well. On the upper drive at the departure level of the terminal, they have put down the thermoplastic pavement markings.
- Currently, crew is working on restriping the East runway. We just completed rubber removal and we're repainting the centerline only. About four times a year we repaint the centerlines on the runways because of rubber build up and fade, whereas the rest of the runways we typically repaint about once a year.

- Snow removal operations to date have gone very well. We have not seen any delays or cancellations due to snow. We've had one call out since the season started, which was just this week.
- There's been a lot of work from Mark Hill and John McGinley and the two gentlemen in Fleet to transition the Fleet Department to the Airport. Bringing Fleet under the Airport is something that has been discussed over the past six years and is part of our restructure. Bringing Fleet in-house is one of the first items we are taking on. Since about 1996, the City has been maintaining two employees at the Airport and we've been reimbursing for that expense. As of December 26, they are becoming Airport employees and we are taking the task on ourselves of managing the operations. We are doing this for budget and staff efficiencies for the Airport.
- ➔ Staff met today with West Side tenants and the Tower to discuss the next COS Pilot Briefing. We are looking at where and when we'll have the next briefing. Right now it looks like the desire is to have something on the West Side, perhaps at the Aviation Museum. We are looking into combining the briefing with National Learn to Fly Day which is coming up this spring.
- ➔ Spoke with Jessie at Cutter. She's working hard to attract a TBM Aircraft Owners Association meeting to Colorado Springs in August. She's one of a number of airports that has applied for this.
- ➔ Chairman W. Miller asked about the renumbering of the taxiways off Bravo. John explained that we took out a taxiway when B2/B3 was reconfigured.
- ➔ Chairman Miller also asked about the status of Minimum Standards. John noted that this was put on hold to due to other priorities.

➔ **Planning and Development – Dan Gallagher**

Design and Development Projects

- One project that will be added to the Project Report will be the Screening Checkpoint Expansion and Reconfiguration. This was planned to be bid further out in the future, but we recognized an efficiency and opportunity in the design of the Checked Baggage System. We had to do some utility relocation and the design of some structural steel and took advantage of the opportunity and are accelerating the project. With that said, the Integrated Operations and Communication Center, the Remodel of the Administration Offices, the Security Checkpoint Expansion and the Checked Baggage Inspection System structural portion will all be consolidated. This makes sense financially, de-conflicts construction and reduces housekeeping on overhead. The Remodel of the Administrative Offices design is complete. We are anticipating bundling all of the projects and bidding them in mid-February. Right now we'll be working with the designer to package the schedule and how we want to bid that. All three projects have different funding sources and we can't spend from the same bucket. We just issued a task order for the Security Checkpoint Expansion and Reconfiguration. We're on an accelerated schedule so it can catch up to the bid date of mid-February. In effect, we'd be expanding the existing checkpoint on both sides, east and west, approximately 800 sq. feet on each side. This will allow for greater queuing area, making room for additional equipment and reassembly area for passengers to increase the customer experience all around. We had a very lengthy and detailed design review on the Checked Baggage structural and are at 70% for

the structural component of that system. We are finding efficiencies and value engineering to reduce the schedule and costs. We're working with CSU very closely. Commissioner Boone asked when we could expect the scanning machines out of the ticketing lobby areas. Dan explained that we have the project sectioned into four zones and we hope to have zones 1 and 2 out by next Thanksgiving.

Construction

- **Defense Access Road Design and Construction** – The bids came in 30% under the engineer's estimate and we do have to spend the fund balance so we're able to increase the utilities, the roadway and signalization. The work has already started, the roadway has been scraped and now they'll be working on the retention ponds. Mark explained that the money left over because of the low bids is not money just in search of any project. We had actually designed this project and had skinned it down in anticipation of the costs being at a certain point.
- **Taxiway Hotel** - This was completed about five days ahead of schedule and is in the closeout phase.
- **Runway 12/30** – The pavement work is complete and we're doing some additional testing for quality of the work.

➔ **Director's Report – Mark Earle**

- I have been spending a lot of time downtown with the City Manager discussing the changes that will occur due to the strong mayor transition. This is very complex. To ensure a smooth transition, there is an on-going effort to put together a process to address some inconsistencies created by the ballot initiative prior to the election.

5. OTHER BUSINESS

The 2011 meeting dates have been distributed. The commission discussed whether or not to move the November and December meetings up a week due to the holidays. Commissioner Patterson proposed to change the November and December meeting dates to November 15 and December 20. Commissioner Thornton moved to accept the new dates; Commissioner Boone seconded the motion and it was carried by unanimous vote.

6. CHAIRMAN'S COMMENTS

None

AIRPORT STAFF ACTION ITEMS

Action Item	Assigned To	Status
Send out updated 2011 meeting dates to Commissioners	Kelly	
Collect and send out On-Time Data to Commissioners	Kelly	

Minutes respectfully submitted by:
Kelly Jackson, Airport Public Affairs Administrator