County Council of Beaufort County Hilton Head Island Airport – www.hiltonheadairport.com Beaufort County Airport – www.beaufortcoairport.com

Post Office Box 23739 – 120 Beach City Road Hilton Head Island, South Carolina 29925-3739 Phone: (843) 255-2950- Fax: (843) 689-5411

AIRPORTS BOARD MEETING MINUTES OF MAY 20, 2010

The print media was notified in accordance with the State Freedom of Information Act.

The regularly scheduled meeting of the Beaufort County Airports Board was held at 1:30 PM on Thursday, May 20, 2010 in the Council Chambers of the Beaufort County Government Center. Chairman Pete Buchanan called the meeting to order.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the May 20, 2010 agenda. The motion passed unanimously.

A motion was made and seconded to accept the April 15, 2010 meeting minutes. The motion passed unanimously.

GUEST INTRODUCTIONS – Guests attending the meeting introduced themselves.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Pete Buchanan – Chairman
Jared Newman – Vice Chairman
Councilman Rick Caporale – Beaufort County Liaison
Councilman Ken Heitzke – Town of Hilton Head Liaison
Will Dopp
Joseph Mazzei
Ross Sanders
Joe Zimmerman

GUESTS

Derek Gilbert Graham Kerr Leonard Law

Councilman Steve Baer Councilman Bill McBride Councilman Paul Sommerville Bill Coleman – Resident Mike Bennett – Signature Flight Support

MEMBERS ABSENT

Paul Jorgensen Noel Duncan

STAFF

Paul Andres – Airport Director
Larry Yeager – Chief of Operations
Joel Phillips – Beaufort Co. Airport Supv.
Linda Wright – Admin. Asst.

PUBLIC COMMENTS – There were no public comments at this time.

HILTON HEAD ISLAND AIRPORT REPORT

1. Tower Report: Paul Andres

For the month of April 2010 there were 4,677 total flight operations of which 2,610 were conducted under IFR procedures. The total number of operations and the enplanement/deplanement is up slightly from the same time period last year.

- 2. Projects: Paul Andres
 - Tree Obstruction Removal Mr. Andres stated they are getting the project ready to bid and obtaining the necessary permits.
 - ARFF Station and Runway Safety Area Drainage Improvements The contractor
 for the ARFF station is finishing the site prep and should be installing the footers
 for the building within the next couple of days. Mr. Andres stated they are still
 waiting on the eagles to vacate their nest before any work can begin for the
 Runway Safety Area Drainage Improvement project.
 - Hilton Head Master Plan The development alternative options were presented May 19th to a joint session of County and Town Council. This item will be discussed under New Business.
 - Design Projects –These projects are still on hold pending the completion of the Master Plan.
- 3. Operations Report: Chief Yeager
 - For the month of April 2010 there were 9 medivacs and 1 medical call at the terminal.
- 4. Noise Complaints & Traffic Counters: Chief Yeager
 - There were 6 noise complaints from Port Royal Plantation regarding general aviation and corporate aviation over flights.
 - The after hours traffic count was 87.

BEAUFORT COUNTY AIRPORT REPORT

- 1. Fuel Sales: Joel Phillips
 - The total fuel sales for April were 7,511 gallons (4,511 gallons of AvGas and 3,000 gallons of jet fuel). There were 2,185 operations and the total count was 1,403 aircraft to the ramp with 171 overnights for the month of April. There was 1 medivac and no emergencies. Mr. Phillips stated the Airport was closed 8 days last month so there were only 22 operational days which resulted in about a 9% decrease in fuel sales for the same time period last year.

Mr. Kerr asked for an update on the beacon. Mr. Phillips stated the beacon was replaced yesterday as part of the airfield electrical improvements project. He stated a local flight instructor informed him he was able to see the beacon while he was still in Savannah airspace.

Mr. Dopp stated that at the last meeting he had requested an operations report for the Lady's Island Airport like the one they receive for the Hilton Head Island Airport. Mr. Andres stated the total operations for Lady's Island could be put on a spreadsheet each month and this would be done for the next meeting.

2. Projects: Paul Andres

- Tree Obstruction Removal Mr. Andres stated he had spoken to the FAA several
 weeks ago regarding the status of the SCE&G power pole determination. He
 stated he had not received their final decision. This decision will be used to
 predicate a local decision as to when to resume the clearing operations at the
 Lady's Island Airport.
- Master Plan Because of the potential impact of a runway expansion into salt marsh, the consultant is completing the environmental overview portion of the report which is normally done after the development alternatives. This is being completed prior to arranging a joint briefing with County and City Councils.
- Runway Overlay and Airfield Electrical Improvements Projects The permanent marking on the runway is the only remaining item for the Runway Overlay project which should be done in early June. This will cause a 1 ½ to 3 day closure. They are hoping to complete the REIL installation for Runway 07 for the Airfield Electrical Improvements project during the same June closure period. A waiver has been received from the FAA to position the REILs on higher ground closer to the runway than what the Advisory Circular calls for to avoid having them out in the marsh. The contractor is finishing the interior electrical work and still has some work to finish with the wind cone.

Mr. Newman wanted to know if they are still unable to put the Papi lights back in service due to there still being a question about the obstructions. Mr. Andres stated the FAA will not allow the Papi lights to be turned on or be certified because of the existing tree obstructions on the South end. He stated this does not affect the REILs. Mr. Newman asked if this is the same REIL as the one at the end of Runway 25. Mr. Andres stated that is correct. He stated the pair of flashing strobe lights, one on either side of the runway, identifies the end of the runway and is pilot controlled.

Councilman Caporale asked Mr. Andres to repeat what he had said about the tree obstructions. Mr. Andres stated that SCE&G has submitted 7460 Airspace Determination letters for the high transmission power poles that traverse the approach zone of the Lady's Island Airport. Thirteen of the poles are obstructions at the 34:1 slope. SCE&G has a multi-million dollar upgrade plan for Lady's Island and St. Helena Island for the end of the year. By December 31, 2010 they will have 10 of the 13 power poles lowered or removed out of the 34:1 airspace. This will leave 3 poles that are located at the very edge of the approach zone which are not part of the system upgrade. SCE&G has asked the FAA if they will allow them to install an obstruction light to mark the 3 poles. Mr. Andres stated that based on that determination, the County Administrator will receive advice from the County Attorney and then make a decision on resuming the tree clearing operations.

Councilman Caporale asked if any of the information received at the joint session Master Plan presentation had any bearing on the tree obstructions at the Hilton

Head Island Airport. Mr. Andres stated these are totally different and distinct issues and therefore the Master Plan would not affect the tree obstruction project. Councilman Caporale stated that Councilman Rodman has looked at the tree cutting plan and wanted to know if Mr. Andres had received any of Councilman Rodman's ideas. Mr. Andres stated he had not, but he would be glad to talk to him about the ideas. Mr. Mazzei stated the FAA sets the heights for the trees and therefore did not understand how Councilman Rodman could change the required heights. Councilman Caporale stated Councilman Rodman has not compromised the requirements. Mr. Andres reiterated that he would talk with Mr. Rodman.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

- 1. Finance: Leonard Law
 - Mr. Law stated he had obtained unaudited reports for both the Hilton Head Island Airport and the Lady's Island Airport and the adjustments for the \$240,000.00 have been made as recommended by the Airports Board. Mr. Law stated that as a result of this the total assets for the Hilton Head Island Airport are down approximately \$600,000.00 which is derived from the \$240,000.00 receivable being removed and the remainder in depreciation. He stated the Lady's Island Airport assets have increased by approximately \$300,000.00 due to the removal of the \$240,000.00 payable.
- 2. Lady's Island Airport Operations: Graham Kerr
 - Mr. Kerr stated that Mr. Andres and Mr. Phillips had already covered this item in their reports.
- 3. Hilton Head Island Airport Operations: Will Dopp
 - Mr. Dopp stated the open house was very successful with approximately 400 attendees. He thanked Mike Bennett of Signature Flight Support for their assistance and all of the other participants. Mr. Dopp stated they plan on doing this again next year and wanted to set the date for the second Saturday in May 2011 so that they can start now in getting commitments for participation next year. Mr. Newman asked if the open house could be done in conjunction with the fly in. Mr. Dopp stated this is possible. There was no objection from the Board to allow Mr. Dopp to set a date for the open house and start planning now for next year's event.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

- 1. Airports Budgets: Paul Andres
 - Mr. Andres stated that Mr. Newman briefed the Finance Committee of County Council April 19th on a number of revenue initiatives that were proposed for the Airports' budgets for the coming fiscal year. The initiatives directly under the cognizance of the Finance Committee were the reallocation of aircraft property taxes, the LI/SH Fire Department ground lease and the elimination of hangar debt service at the Hilton Head Island Airport. All of the initiatives were discussed and disapproved by the Finance Committee. The Finance Committee referred the matter back to the Airports Board to find other means and methods of revenue sources to enhance and optimize the budget. Mr. Andres stated that he met with Mr. Dopp, Mr. Mazzei and Mr. Law to discuss the upcoming rental car concession RFP about to be advertised. As a result of this meeting, it was decided

to increase the minimum monthly guarantee from the rental cars an additional \$300.00 per month and elevate the percentage of gross receipts from 10% to 12%, whichever is higher. This should result in an estimated \$40,000.00 to \$50,000.00 increase in revenue. Mr. Andres stated that 10% is considered normal at most airports although there are variations. He added that they will continue to look at other means of increasing revenues.

Mr. Dopp stated that the subcommittee working on the personal property tax for aircraft should have a report ready for the June meeting.

Mr. Dopp stated the hangar tenants covered in the Through-the-Fence Agreement should be providing tail numbers of their aircraft once a year. He stated the tail numbers are provided for the County owned hangars, but none are received from the Exec Air hangars.

NEW BUSINESS

- 1. Aircraft Hangars (Rental Rate/Sell): Paul Andres
 - Mr. Andres stated that at the Hilton Head Island Airport the T-hangars are renting for just under \$362.00 a month, the corporate hangars are approximately \$1,075.00 a month and the 80 x 80 hangar rented by Signature Flight Support is \$2,205.00 a month. The newer hangars at the Lady's Island Airport are renting for \$252.00 per month and the older ones are \$210.00. Mr. Andres stated that all rental income at the Lady's Island Airport remains with the Airport. However, because of the repayment of the construction debt service at the Hilton Head Island Airport, the Airport is losing \$30,000.00 per year on the hangars over the next 23 years. Mr. Andres stated that we cannot afford to sustain this continuous loss and asked that the Board consider a recommendation to raise the hangar rents at either or both Airports or to consider selling the Hilton Head Island Airport hangars to a private business or individuals through a public bid process to recoup the capital investment and pay off the construction debt service. The Airport would continue to receive ground rent only on these hangars. Mr. Andres then presented comparable hangar rates at other airports. (See Attachment "A" for the current rates and the comparable rates.)

Mr. Buchanan stated that in order to recover the \$30,000.00 per year we are currently losing, the rates on the T hangars would have to be increased by \$1,300.00 per hangar per year which would not make us competitive. He said that he was not even sure what the condition of the hangars would be in over the next 23 years. Mr. Buchanan stated that the construction of the hangars was obviously a bad decision so they need to sell them in order to pay back the County. He added that we would still receive income from the ground lease and the County would still receive income from the aircraft taxes.

Mr. Mazzei stated that if we are willing to consider a sale, the sale would eliminate the revenue stream that Signature Flight Support currently gets from the hangars which is \$100.00 per hangar. Mr. Mazzei stated that he believes someone needs to explain to Signature Flight Support that this arrangement is not working as structured. He stated that we need to either sell the hangars or take a different approach with Signature Flight Support so that both Signature and the Airport benefit such as making it a requirement for hangar tenants to purchase a minimum

amount of fuel through Signature Flight Support. Mr. Mazzei added that selling the hangars would unravel a deal that works, but is not allocated correctly. Mr. Buchanan responded by stating that it would not be unraveling the deal, it would be eliminating the debt.

Mr. Kerr wanted to know if the ground the hangars sit on would also be sold and if we are currently receiving rent on the ground. Mr. Andres stated that we are currently receiving rent on the ground as it is covered under Signature Flight Support's leasehold.

Mr. Dopp was unsure as to whether the hangars could be sold due to Addendum No. 1 of Signature's lease because it would stop Signature's rent management contract. Mr. Andres stated that he had spoken with the County Attorney and in his legal opinion the County assets can be sold through the public process. Mr. Dopp stated that Signature Flight Support's 25% management fee only applies to the primary lease time and does not apply to the two 5 year option periods therefore the 25% management fee would end in 2018.

Mr. Newman wanted to know if it is correct that the only difference between the old hangars and the new hangars at the Lady's Island Airport is whether it has a manual door or an electric door. Mr. Phillips stated that is correct. Mr. Newman stated these rates could be adjusted because of the minor difference in the two types of hangars. Mr. Newman asked if property taxes are being collected on the leased hangars at Hilton Head and, if so, would the same property tax be collected. Mr. Andres stated that the Airport is currently paying the property taxes, but County Council would need to decide whether to reallocate the taxes if the hangars are sold to private individuals. Mr. Newman stated if the hangars are sold the taxes should be on the public tax role. Mr. Andres and Councilman Caporale agreed. Mr. Newman asked if this is the optimum time to try to sell the hangars. Mr. Andres stated it is not known if there is a market for the hangars. He said there would have to be a minimum acceptable bid with the right of rejection if the desired minimum results were not received. Mr. Newman stated he would not want to sell the hangars now if we could get a better price in a few years when the economy improves. Mr. Dopp stated that perhaps Signature Flight Support would be interested. Mr. Andres stated that as a private business they could make an offer.

Mr. Kerr stated that before they make a decision they need to recognize the fact that the debt service is not going to go away. He suggested the Board make a general policy decision to sell the hangars and then it would become logical to look at the details. Mr. Zimmerman wanted to know if County Finance could do a discounted cash flow analysis for the Board in order to get an idea of what the hangars are worth. Mr. Andres stated the hangars were first occupied in the summer of 2006 and that they cost approximately \$1,975,000.00. He added that they are only 4 years old and have an estimated minimum 25 to 30 year life expectancy. Mr. Zimmerman stated they are only worth what they can be rented for. Mr. Mazzei stated there will have to be reasonable terms, no give back on the residual value and someone would have to figure in real interest rates in the market place for projects.

Mr. Buchanan stated there is a big difference between the operation of hangars at

Lady's Island Airport and those at the Hilton Head Island Airport. He stated the requirements to build and occupy the hangars at Hilton Head were more significant and more stringent than those at Lady's Island. Mr. Buchanan stated that it is important that they look at the Hilton Head hangars differently than those at Lady's Island. He added that he concurred with Mr. Kerr that the Board needs to make a decision, but he did not feel the Board had a consensus on what that decision should be. Mr. Newman stated they cannot make a decision until someone looks at the alternatives and the numbers. Mr. Newman wanted to know if the hangars were sold would they become part of the Through-the-Fence Agreement. Mr. Andres stated they would not because they are located on Airport property. He added that all the appropriate rules and regulations would have to be established for the use of the hangars. Mr. Newman concurred stating there would have to be covenants and restrictions in the deed. Mr. Newman asked if the FAA would have to approve the sale of the hangars. Mr. Andres stated they would not since they did not participate in the cost of construction.

Mr. Gilbert asked if the intention is to sell all of the hangars at once or a few each year. Mr. Buchanan stated anything is possible. Mr. Mazzei stated that if they only sell partials then there will be issues about insurance on the hangars. He stated there is the question of whose insurance pays if there is a fire in one hangar that moves to the others. Mr. Dopp stated they should be sold as a package. Mr. Mazzei concurred.

Mr. Newman suggested an ad hoc committee be formed to investigate the hangar situation. Mr. Zimmerman agreed to head up the committee. Mr. Mazzei and Mr. Gilbert also volunteered to be on the committee. Mr. Zimmerman stated they should have some data available by the July meeting.

2. Palmetto Hall Noise Abatement: Graham Kerr

 Mr. Buchanan stated that all Board members had received a letter from Palmetto Hall Plantation Owners' Association. Mr. Kerr read the first objective listed in the letter:

Measure and document – at multiple community sites – the point data baseline noise levels correlated with aircraft operations at the Hilton Head Airport, prior to any tree removal actions at the Airport.

Mr. Kerr stated when you are talking about trees you are talking about runway obstructions (slope equals safety), but noise refers to environmental concerns. Mr. Kerr stated that any aircraft approaching an airport has to be on a glide slope which equals roughly 300' per mile from touchdown. Mr. Kerr asked Mr. Andres if the trees are 1,800' from the threshold of the runway. Mr. Andres stated the live oaks at the St. James Baptist Church are approximately 1,900' directly off the centerline of the runway and are over 60' tall. Mr. Kerr stated this would mean then that 1/3 of a mile from the end of the runway to the touchdown point, at night under IFR conditions the tree top is less than 40' from the bottom of an aircraft. He stated this is absolutely a safety hazard, but noise is a line of sight issue and that there is no noise abatement involved between trees and aircraft in the air.

Mr. Buchanan read the following paragraph from the Environmental Assessment for the tree clearing project:

There would be no quantifiable long-term noise impacts as a result of the tree clearing activities. The Integrated Noise Model (INM) that is utilized by the Federal Aviation Administration to determine noise impacts from airport projects is not sensitive to changes in vegetation. The noise contours that were recently produced as part of the Part 150 Study that was prepared for Hilton Head Island Airport will not change as a result of this project because inputs to the model, i.e. aircraft operations, fleet mix, runway length, runway elevation, etc., will not be affected by the proposed tree obstruction removal project.

Mr. Buchanan stated this was submitted and accepted by the FAA. He stated that doing any noise study before tree removal is a waste money and time.

Mr. Zimmerman stated the Airports Board Charter not only covers airport and aircraft related items, but also requires them to be cognizant of the impact on people who live close to the Airport. He stated the Airport neighbors obviously believe there is eventually going to be some type of impact from the clear cutting of trees on Airport property and trimming of trees off Airport property. Mr. Zimmerman did not think the Palmetto Hall letter was saying not to cut down the trees, but they want to establish a baseline of noise reading in order to discuss mitigation after the trees are cut and the impacts are being felt. He continued by stating that this baseline could then be compared when the Environmental Assessment for the Master Plan is done. Mr. Newman stated we paid \$250,000.00 for a noise study and already know the baseline. Mr. Zimmerman stated he is of the understanding that no readings were taken from established stations such as Palmetto Hall. Mr. Kerr stated that is does not make any difference because the trees do not impact noise. Mr. Zimmerman disagreed and felt that the homeowners' concerns are valid. Mr. Mazzei concurred with Mr. Newman that we have already paid for a noise study and the baseline has been established so if the homeowners want a new study then they should pay for it. He also concurred with the fact that another noise study would be done as part of the Environmental Assessment for the Master Plan.

Mr. Kerr reiterated that the trees on the approach corridor are a clear and present threat to every aircraft making a night approach into the Airport.

Mr. Dopp stated he agrees that the trees have to be removed, but also agreed with the request in the letter to have the County participate in the new noise study and pay their 1/3 of the estimated \$50,000.00 cost. Mr. Newman disagreed.

Councilman Caporale stated that Mr. Kubic had stated that he (Mr. Kubic) would rather spend the money on a noise attenuation plan that would actually work for the people in Port Royal and Palmetto Hall. Councilman Caporale stated that in order to be good neighbors we need to invest in attenuating the noise. He stated the trees aren't the answer to the noise, but there are other physical barriers that can be used that are appropriate to airports. Mr. Newman concurred.

Mr. Mazzei stated that if a study is done for Palmetto Hall then other plantations will want one done as well. Mr. Buchanan concurred.

Mr. Kerr stated he objects to the portion of the Palmetto Hall letter that states

"prior to any tree removal actions at the Airport" and felt this was totally unacceptable.

A motion was made and seconded that the Airports Board has taken due consideration of the letter from Palmetto Hall and that the Airports Board does not feel that any further noise study is warranted and the tree obstruction removal project should proceed; however the Airports Board would consider noise attenuation if the noise level should go up due to any facility expansion or other items associated with the Master Plan.

Mr. Andres reminded the Board members that this pertains only to the tree obstruction removal project and not the Master Plan as these are two separate and distinct issues.

Mr. Zimmerman noted that the letter refers to Palmetto Hall and the surrounding communities.

Mr. Andres stated the 2006 Noise Study did do off airport site monitoring and the results were published. He believed the locations were the St. James Baptist Church property, Hilton Head Plantation, Indigo Run, Union Cemetery Road area and Port Royal Plantation.

When the vote was called the motion passed 7 to 2.

- 3. HXD Master Plan Update: Pete Buchanan
 - Mr. Buchanan reminded the members of the public comments sessions with the Master Plan consultants, Talbert & Bright, on May 24th and 25th. He stated there was no action on the Master Plan alternatives at the joint session of the Town and County Councils on May 19th. Mr. Buchanan stated that in his opinion the general consensus was in favor of Alternative No. 2. This alternative would be developed in two phases. Phase No. 1 would build out the runway to 5,000 feet and would remain on Airport property. This would require the use of an EMAS which is concrete that is designed to buckle and collapse when the overrun is used. Mr. Buchanan stated that it might take up to 10 years to complete Phase I. Phase II would add an additional 400' to the runway, but would require the relocation of a portion of Beach City Road and the purchase of 5 parcels or portions of parcels. Mr. Buchanan stated the Airports Board needs to recommend one of the alternatives to the County Council and asked each member to state their opinion regarding the alternatives.

Councilman Caporale concurred with Mr. Buchanan that there was a fair amount of consensus at the joint session in accepting Alternative No. 2. He stated that while not everyone would be happy, this did appear to be a plan that we could be confident about and that, over time, would work. Councilman Caporale said this needs to move very quickly through County Council as the consultants will not be able to move forward with the Airport Layout Plan (ALP) until a commitment is made.

Mr. Kerr concurred that Alternative No. 2 would be the best choice as it seems to fulfill the long term requirements of the Airport.

Mr. Law stated he did not believe he had enough information to make a decision

at this time.

Mr. Newman stated he likes Alternative No. 2, but Phase II seems to be an enormous expense. Mr. Newman asked Mr. Andres if he knew whether future aircraft would have better braking capacity. Mr. Andres stated the consultants presented information at the joint session that they do not know what type of aircraft the airlines will or will not add to their fleets in the future. Mr. Andres stated the turboprops have a future from a fuel efficiency standpoint, but there are no plans for any of the airlines to acquire new turboprops at this point in time. There are several parked regional jets that are available for use, but they require a longer runway. Mr. Andres stated the Master Plan was based on commercial service to the Charlotte and Atlanta hubs. Delta will retire their turboprop aircraft in 2011 and they have nothing that can operate out of Hilton Head so we will lose the Delta service to Atlanta. The consultants had stated that Delta will probably use their CRJ200s and CRJ700s. Mr. Newman asked if the 5,000' runway with the EMAS could handle these types of aircraft. Mr. Andres stated it could not because the CRJ requires 5,500'. He also stated the some airlines require more runway than needed due to safety concerns. Mr. Andres stated there has been mention of the using Q400 turboprop, but there are no plans for any airline to acquire this aircraft for Hilton Head. Mr. Newman was concerned that if we go to the expense to lengthen the runway we may not have aircraft to use it. Mr. Andres stated the Dash 100s and the Q200s are approaching their service life capacity. He stated they are looking at extending the service life of the Dash 100s, but this may be for only an additional 5 to 6 years. Mr. Andres stated Piedmonts plans are unknown, but it would probably be market driven. He stated the Q400 does require a minimum of 4,800' of runway to operate efficiently and profitably.

Mr. Zimmerman stated he agreed with Mr. Law that they do not have enough information. Mr. Zimmerman stated that he thinks the consultants are not addressing the vertical object question that was asked of them at the joint session. Mr. Zimmerman's main concern is how much clearance is needed above the steeple at St. James Baptist Church.

Mr. Dopp stated he supports Alternative No. 2, but thinks the Board needs to have a chance to review every page. He stated he does not believe the Board is prepared to make a motion until the next meeting.

Mr. Sanders stated he would want to make sure we retain commercial service.

Mr. Mazzei stated that he agrees Alternative No. 2 was the one most people like because it is a phased approach. He stated that it will probably take 7 or 8 years to implement Phase I so they plenty of time to work on Phase II. Mr. Mazzei stated that it was his understanding from the meeting that the next step is that the consultants need to go from four alternatives to one alternative. Mr. Mazzei stated he did not feel they should wait until the June Airports Board meeting to make a recommendation to the County Council. He stated that the Board members should meet with the consultants at the public input sessions on Monday and Tuesday and that they should form an ad-hoc committee to meet next week in order to give clear information to County Council. Mr. Mazzei stated he believes this is what is being asked of the Board.

Mr. Buchanan asked when the County Council would meet again. Councilman Caporale stated the earliest this recommendation could make it to County Council would be June 14th which would be after the next Airports Board meeting on June 10th. Councilman Caporale asked Mr. Andres if this needed to go to the Public Facilities Committee before it goes to County Council. Mr. Andres stated this would be the normal procedure unless it needed to be changed. Mr. Buchanan stated County Council put the Airports Board in place and that they (Airports Board) work for County Council. Mr. Buchanan suggested they make a motion and then table it until the members have had the opportunity to look over the alternatives and then they could make a decision at the June 10th meeting. He stated that at that time he would send a letter, on behalf of the Board, to Mr. Weston Newton.

A motion was made and seconded that Alternative No. 2 of the Hilton Head Island Master Plan be recommended to County Council. This motion was left open.

Mr. Newman asked Councilman McBride if this would be acceptable. Councilman McBride stated they could take this approach. Mr. Mazzei asked Councilman Baer for his opinion. Councilman Baer stated that it is premature to make a decision. He stated there has not been a professional engineering vertical analysis that we can see. He also stated that he wants to see a piece of paper with a professional engineer's stamp on it showing the distance to the steeple and Pineland Station before anything is done. Councilman Baer stated that waiting until June 14th to give their decision to County Council is fine.

A motion was made and seconded to table the previous motion until the June 10, 2010

Airports Board meeting. The motion passed 7 for and 1 against. (Mr. Gilbert left prior to the vote being called.)

PUBLIC COMMENTS – There were no public comments at this time.

FUTURE MEETINGS

The next meeting of the Airports Board will be held on Thursday, June 10, 2010 at 1:30 PM in the County Council Chambers of the Beaufort County Government Center.

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 3:25 PM.