IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

CITY OF LAS VEGAS, A POLITICAL SUBDIVISION OF THE STATE OF NEVADA.

Appellant,

vs.

180 LAND CO., LLC, A NEVADA LIMITED-LIABILITY COMPANY; AND FORE STARS, LTD., A NEVADA LIMITED-LIABILITY COMPANY,

Respondents.

180 LAND CO., LLC, A NEVADA LIMITED-LIABILITY COMPANY; AND FORE STARS, LTD., A NEVADA LIMITED-LIABILITY COMPANY.

Appellants/Cross-Respondents,

vs.

CITY OF LAS VEGAS, A POLITICAL SUBDIVISION OF THE STATE OF NEVADA,

Respondent/Cross-Appellant.

No. 84345

Electronically Filed Sep 30 2022 10:12 a.m. Elizabeth A. Brown Clerk of Supreme Court

No. 84640

AMENDED JOINT APPENDIX VOLUME 119, PART 4

LAW OFFICES OF KERMITT L. WATERS Kermitt L. Waters, Esq.

Kermitt L. Waters, Esq. Nevada Bar No. 2571

kermitt@kermittwaters.com

James J. Leavitt, Esq. Nevada Bar No. 6032

::...@l-----::t+----t-----

jim@kermittwaters.com

Michael A. Schneider, Esq.

Nevada Bar No. 8887

michael@kermittwaters.com

Autumn L. Waters, Esq.

Nevada Bar No. 8917

autumn@kermittwaters.com

704 South Ninth Street

Las Vegas, Nevada 89101

Telephone: (702) 733-8877

Attorneys for 180 Land Co., LLC and

Fore Stars, Ltd.

LAS VEGAS CITY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE

Bryan K. Scott, Esq. Nevada Bar No. 4381

bscott@lasvegasnevada.gov

Philip R. Byrnes, Esq.

pbyrnes@lasvegasnevada.gov

Nevada Bar No. 166

Rebecca Wolfson, Esq.

<u>rwolfson@lasvegasnevada.gov</u> Nevada Bar No. 14132

495 S. Main Street, 6th Floor

Las Vegas, Nevada 89101

Telephone: (702) 229-6629

Attorneys for City of Las Vegas

CLAGGETT & SYKES LAW FIRM Micah S. Echols, Esq. Nevada Bar No. 8437 micah@claggettlaw.com 4101 Meadows Lane, Suite 100 Las Vegas, Nevada 89107 (702) 655-2346 – Telephone

Attorneys for 180 Land Co., LLC and Fore Stars, Ltd.

McDONALD CARANO LLP
George F. Ogilvie III, Esq.
Nevada Bar No. 3552
gogilvie@mcdonaldcarano.com
Amanda C. Yen, Esq.
ayen@mcdonaldcarano.com
Nevada Bar No. 9726
Christopher Molina, Esq.
cmolina@mcdonaldcarano.com
Nevada Bar No. 14092
2300 W. Sahara Ave., Ste. 1200
Las Vegas, Nevada 89102
Telephone: (702)873-4100

LEONARD LAW, PC
Debbie Leonard, Esq.
debbie@leonardlawpc.com
Nevada Bar No. 8260
955 S. Virginia Street Ste. 220
Reno, Nevada 89502
Telephone: (775) 964.4656

SHUTE, MIHALY & WEINBERGER, LLP Andrew W. Schwartz, Esq. schwartz@smwlaw.com
California Bar No. 87699
(admitted pro hac vice)
Lauren M. Tarpey, Esq.
ltarpey@smwlaw.com
California Bar No. 321775
(admitted pro hac vice)
396 Hayes Street
San Francisco, California 94102
Telephone: (415) 552-7272

Attorneys for City of Las Vegas

EXHIBIT "F"

COUNTY CLERK

28

1	Counsel for Mr. Sisolak first discovered this transcript at 10:40 a.m. this morning when
2	she was going through files which have recently been provided to her in an unrelated case.
3	
4 5	alle Ale
6	LAURA WIGHTMAN/FITZSIMMONS Nevada Bar No. 1263 509 South 7th Street
7	Las Vegas, Nevada 89101 (702) 382-5333
8	Attorney for Plaintiff
9	
10	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE
11	I am employed by Laura FitzSimmons, and delivered a true copy of the foregoing
12	supplement to Jones Vargas, counsel for the defendants, on May 14, 2003.
13	
14	(plink Jestilo
15	Julie Destito
16	,
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	2

2 3 Federal Aviation Regulation Part 158.23 Consultation with Air 4 Carriers Meeting 5 6 7 9 10 REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS 11 Taken on Monday, July 15, 1991 12 At one o'clock p.m. 13. At Commissioners Meeting Room 14 5th Floor Main Terminal Building 15 McCarran International Airport 16 Las Vegas, Nevada 17 18 19 . 20 21 22 23 24 Reported by: Margaret M. Harmon, RPR, CSR #274

ASSOCIATED REPORTERS OF NEVADA - 702/382-8778 411 East Bonneville Ave., Suite 1, Las Vegas, Nevada 89101

25

		The second of th
	1	APPEARANCES:
	2	ROBERT N. BROADBENT, Director of Aviation
	3 .	RANDY WALKER, Deputy Airport Director
	4.	ROSS JOHNSON, Director of Finance
:	5	TOM DONALDSON, Planner
	6	RON TULIS, KPMG Peat Marwick
	7	MIKE MORONEY, KPMG Peat Marwick
	8	
	9	,
	10	
	11	XI
	12	
	1,3	
	14	e e
	15 .	
	16	
	17	
	18	
	19	
	20	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	21	
	22	
	2 3	
	2 4	
	2 5	a b s

MR. BROADBENT: My name is Bob
Broadbent, and I'm the Director of Aviation for
McCarran International Airport, and with us on my
left over here is Ron Tulis and Mike Moroney from
Peat Marwick, our airport consultants; and on my
far left is Tom Donaldson, our Planner; Ross
Johnson, our Director of Finance; and Randy Walker,
the Deputy Director of the airport.

11/2

We would like to point out that this is a meeting that is required under the federal regulations for the imposition of a PFC, a passenger facility charge. We have a court reporter here, and we would ask that any of you that wish to be recognized or to speak, come up here to the podium and identify yourself by name so that we can be sure and record this meeting because the copies of the minutes of this meeting have to be summitted to the Federal Aviation Agency.

At November 5th of last year, the President signed into law a budget reconciliation bill. That bill had in it the imposition, the allowance for airports to impose what is called a passenger facility charge, which is a departure -- head tax on departing passengers from airports.

Many airports have been lobbying for this for many

years. Prior to the passage of this Act; there had been a federal prohibition from the imposition of passenger facility charges or head taxes.

As a condition of the levying of a passenger facility charge, Congress also passed two other pieces of legislation. One was a piece of legislation on noise, which set up certain noise standards for airlines and for airports and for communities around airports. A condition of being able to file an application for a passenger facility charge was conditioned on a rule being promulgated on the noise legislation by the Federal Aviation Administration.

The law said that that rule should be out by July 1st. The rule isn't out yet, and we would not be able to file a final application for passenger facility charges until the rule is released by the Federal Aviation Administration.

We understand that will be in the next couple of weeks. It could be as early as this Wednesday, more probably sometime late next week.

Also, there was a law passed on airports that are slot controlled, slot-controlled airports. There are only four of those airports in the country, I think: Washington National, two

New York airports, and Chicago, which said that FAA had to agree to begin the process of discussions towards a proposed rule or towards proposed regulations on slots at those airports. We're not sure whether that's been done yet or not, but it's just a matter, I think, of the Federal Aviation taking the appropriate steps and releasing the right kind of a message that they do intend to consult on that issue.

The airport industry in general has about \$50 billion worth of capital improvement needs, and it was at least the testimony in the hearings that there were not enough funds to allow airports to do what they needed to do with their present funding sources, and in conjunction with the airlines who wanted a noise policy, Congress did pass and authorize a passenger facility charge. They came out with their final rule on May the 28th, I think.

we, I think, are the first airport in the country to begin the process to impose a passenger facility charge. It's a long process. It will be well into probably the end of the first half or the second half of next year -- well into the first half of next year before we'd be able to

impose it. We were required by law to notice allof our airlines operating out of McCarran.

We took the latest list that we had from FAA and added other people to it and on the 14th of June noticed the airlines. I think many of you that are here, most of you have copies of those notices. It said we intended — the notice required us to do four things. It required us to notice the carriers, that the notice should include a description of the projects, the PFC level, the proposed effective date, the estimated charge, expiration date, and the estimated total PFC revenue for a request by a public agency that any class of carriers not be required to collect the PFC.

exclude one class of carrier from imposing a PFC.

That class are Air Taxi/Commercial Operators filing
FAA Form 1800-31. It is impossible for us, as I
understand the statute, to exclude anybody who is
over -- or any class who is over 1 percent of the
passenger operations at our airport. So by law we
felt we could not exclude anybody except those that
amounted to less than 1 percent of our passenger
traffic, as defined by FAA. These air taxi

-

operations in 1989 were about 5,000 passengers, which is less than .0005 of our total passenger count, a very small percentage:

. 1

Also, at the same time we had to advertise the date and location of this meeting in which we would present projects to the air carriers and foreign air carriers operating at the airport. This meeting, as I said, has been noticed to all the air carriers. We thought we covered everybody. We've advertised it in the newspaper, local newspapers, and have posted it at the FBO operations and at McCarran International Airport.

The meeting itself is scheduled to accomplish the following things: The airport is required to give a description of the projects, an explanation of the need for the projects, a detailed financial plan for the projects, estimated allowable project costs allocated to major project elements, amount of PFC revenue, and the source and amount of other funds.

we have attempted to do that in this book that we've handed out to you. The book includes all of these, and we will briefly cover most of these, and then we'd be happy to answer any questions. I know there are going to be a few

questions on some of the things we expect to do, 1 and I'd like to briefly cover those, if I could. We have on this airport what are 3 called two public carriers, I think, who are 4 contractors to the Federal Government and carry 5 passengers to and from areas outside of McCarran 6 Airport. It is our interpretation of the Act that 7 8 those people would be required to pay a passenger facility charge. 9 The Act, if I could refer you to the 10 comments -- and we'd be happy to pass this out -- the 11. comments on the rules said numerous comments 12 request that particular classes of persons or 13 carriers not be subject to PFCs. These include 14 military and government personnel traveling on 15 official business, passengers of on-demand air taxi 16 operations, and all international passengers, all 17 charter passengers, people traveling on 18 frequent-flyer discounts. None of these were 19 accepted under the rule, and it's our 20 interpretation of that that everybody is covered. 21 There's also a definition of, if I 22 could, just to cover this one item, it could be 23 said that these people don't have a ticket, but you 24

ASSOCIATED REPORTERS OF NEVADA - 702/382-8778
411 East Bonneville Ave., Suite 1, Las Vegas, Nevada 89101

have to look at what the definition of a "ticket"

25

An air travel ticket means any. is in the rule. document pertaining to a passenger's complete itinerary necessary to transport a passenger by air . . 3 ' including passenger manifest, and further on it says that an enplaned passenger means a domestic, territorial, or international revenue passenger enplaned in or is scheduled service in an airline interstate commerce -- a non-scheduled service on aircraft and interstate commerce.

I think it's the feeling of our people and our attorneys and consultants that those public carriers are covered. I'm sure we'll get comments from them. I'm sure we're going to hear from them, but it is a substantial amount of our operations, passenger operations at this airport.

Also, I'm sure there will be some discussion on whether our proposed airport access road is covered under this statute. I would again refer you to page 22 on the final rule, and these are just comments on the final rule. It said the text of the rule has not been changed from the NPRM in any material way. However, ground transportation projects are eligible if the public agency acquires the right-of-way and any necessary land. Ownership is also necessary for project

eligibility under AIP. In this case under the 1 . statute PFC eliqibility is identical to AIP 2 3 eligibility. The final rule does not set any 4 eligibility restrictions on the mode of 5 transportation for airport access projects, nor 6 does it impose any requirements on the geographical 7 proximity of the project to the airport. These 8 issues will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis as 9 the administrator reviews and approves an 10 application for a PFC. 11 Also, as I said, we have asked that 12 certain people be exempt. The rule says that we 13 have the right to request that those people be 14 exempt. We have requested it, but we also noticed 15 all those people. So in case FAA did not exempt 16 17

all those people. So in case FAA did not exempt them, we wouldn't have to go through another hearing process. We're telling them come to the meeting. If you get exempt, fine; if you don't get exempt, you ought to comment, and you ought to comment anyway. So we would hope that you might comment.

I think it would be well for you to recognize that you have until August 14th to

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

recognize that you have until August 14th to comment, that those comments should be -- you can

oppose the rule or the imposition of a PFC, but you have to say why. If you don't say why, then it will be thrown out. So it's important for you if you're going to oppose the imposition of a PFC that you not only say you oppose it, but you have to say why you oppose it, and then we're forced to comment, of course, on those comments.

On February 14th we will gather all the comments we have, put together an application. The application will probably be about that high (indicating). We would intend that the application would probably be filed about the 1st of September, and it would include all the material you see here today plus whatever else is required in the rule plus all the comments and our comments on the comments.

If I could, I'd refer you to the first page that says "Introduction" on here. I'm not going to read it all, but these are the requirements that have to be carried out in order to impose a PFC; meetings of air carriers and foreign air carriers, which is going on right now. For the purposes of the financial plan, we have 37 individual project elements defined as part of one total project.

The brochure is divided into two parts. There is the part that is to impose and implement and to use a PFC, and the other one is to impose. The difference is that you have to have completed all the required environmental work and have it on your airport layout plan in order to impose and use.

15.

and use, we feel we have completed the environmental work. In a couple of cases, the environmental assessments are still pending before FAA. In almost all cases — in all cases where it's impose and use, they are on our ALP, our Airport Layout Plan. Where we talk about imposing, we are talking about doing the necessary environmental and required FAA studies in order to complete the necessary work so that we can get it put on our Airport Layout Plan so we would be able to impose and use.

I would like to indicate also that because there are 37 projects in here totaling well over a billion dollars doesn't mean we'll build them all. It means that we would have the right to, in effect, pick and choose through the appropriate consultation those projects that are

necessary in order to improve the capacity, the noise compatibility, the security of the airport, which are essentially the guidelines in which you can impose a PFC.

200,00

In some cases we have in there, for instance, building another fourth air carrier runway. If we don't grow very fast or if it's not needed, certainly we aren't going to build it. But under our proposals, it's been indicated by both us and our planners and FAA and their planning documents that we will need a fourth air carrier runway sometime near the end of the '90s.

can -- project elements, I'm just going to -- it was necessary for us to give a description, a justification, the certification, and the estimated schedule on all of these projects, which we have attempted to do on all of them. You have drawings with all of them, there are drawings on the walls, and we'll try to go through them maybe one at a time here while we have a chance and go through them quickly.

The first one is an Aircraft Rescue and Fire Fighting Training Facility that's been on our Airport Layout Plan for a good long time. We

had one planned in Phase II of our development. 1 New environmental regulations came along, the price went up about five times, the cost. Every airport 3 is faced, I think, with now accomplishing and 4 meeting a demand for an appropriate fire training facility that meets the EPA environmental 6 regulations as it particularly pertains to what you 7 do with fuel that's used when you burn it for an 8 AAF building. The next one is the airport 10 There are actually three projects that connector. 11 are part of this airport connector: 912, 913, and 12 914. As you see there, the green is the part that 13 is to hook it into our present road structure as it 14 comes out at about the corner of Paradise and 15 Patrick Lane. The red is the tunnel underneath the 16 two existing runways and their accompanying 17 taxiways, and the white down below is the 18 approximately two miles of limited access road that 19 would hook it into the freeway. The description, 20 justification, and certifications are there for all 21 three of those projects. 22 We are pretty well along on the 23 design of those projects, and will, in essence, be 24 ready to award the first bids. If we are 25

successful in our application for a PFC and are able to sell the appropriate revenue bonds, we would hope to start this project about July of 1992.

I guess we could talk a little bit about the need for the projects. We've been over this a lot of times. Our capacity studies show us that the biggest constraint to growth at this airport is on the land side part of the airport, and it's in our airport runways that hook us into, in essence, the Las Vegas Strip, which is where most of our passengers come from, either traveling to the Strip for vacations and then from the Strip back home.

expansion of the Concourse C, which would add four more gates. This expansion has been requested by -- one of the airlines has requested four more gates. This was our way of accomplishing that, was to add four gates. You can see there are a couple of ... them. Level one and level two really gives you a better idea about how it would hook into the present airport. And, again, our estimated schedule is that we will have the design documents done on this in about a month or two, and we'll be

ready to go to bid late sometime this year.

As we understand the final rule, any project that is eligible, if we have the amount of cash to carry us until we get a PFC, we would be able to start this project and accomplish it and reimburse ourselves for that project out of the PFC revenue that we would get in July of 1992. Now, we've talked to a lot of people about that, and that's certainly our understanding, and this would be one project.

A Section of Atlanta

By doing it this way, it would not be included in any of the rate base for the other airlines at this terminal and would be -- and that's the only other way we could build it, would be to include it in the rate base. True we'd probably get the money back by the charges on that airline, but if we don't have to build it into the rate base, then it might have an effect on the existing airlines here.

We have a terminal remodel project.

We put this in here because anything we have spent since November 5th, it is eligible, would be eligible for reimbursement. Again, reimbursement would mean that we wouldn't have to build it into our airline rate base and would be a help, I think,

to our scheduled airlines at McCarran.

Program update. We did a Part 150 Study several years ago. We entered into an agreement with the City of Henderson that upon the completion of our runways, we would do an updated Part 150 Study, and this would allow us to do that. In essence, all of our construction will be done about October on our runways and taxiways. Ramps will be done about October of this year, and we would start another Part 150 Study at about that time.

A West Side Flood Control Study, we did a Flood Control Study once, but since then we have purchased about an additional 75 acres over on the west side of the airport, and this is an external study that would have to be looked at to look at where we would build the flood control structures that would be necessary to protect the west side of the airport. That site has been flooded out a couple of times, and we have some major building projects proposed for the west side primarily by our two major fixed-base operators including major hangar facilities and major new commuter terminal facilities.

ASSOCIATED REPORTERS OF NEVADA - 702/382-8778 411 East Bonneville Ave., Suite 1, Las Vegas, Nevada 89101

Noise Mitigation Programs, it would

be what would come out of the Part 150 Study. In general, it would be things like insulation, soundproofing, property transaction assistance, those kind of areas for the appropriate property owners in noise-sensitive areas in order to bring them up to their homes or residences or whatever else it is in a noise compatibility with the airport.

Airfield Study and Environmental
Assessment, at our last 139 certification by the
Federal Aviation Agency, they listed several areas
of concern on our airfield. This would be to look
at those areas of concern. They were specifically
concerned about the Part 77 problem that we might
have with the railroad and with some other areas in
the airport as far as clear zones go around our
taxiways and runways. Then we would be looking
specifically the extension of a couple of our
runways, if possible, also mentioned by FAA and, of
course, the new parallel runway.

Charter/International Terminal, that terminal, any expenses on that terminal that are eligible would be eligible under -- that have been obligated or spent since November 5, 1990, would be eligible under the PFC legislation, as we

understand it, and we would be looking at some of the costs that we have there. There are new gates that are specifically eligible under the law.

Those gates, we think, will essentially be full from about the first day we start operation and would hope to be on our way to completing that facility by the end of the year.

We have a number of land acquisition projects. The first one is west of the fence.

That's an area over there on the west side of the field that I talked about. We have purchased 55 acres, probably another 20 in the red area. About the only thing we haven't purchased -- and we would not purchase it until needed -- is an apartment complex, which would be a major acquisition when we go to acquire it, and maybe one or two other small pieces. Some of that land did not close and we did not complete the sale until after November 5th, and that might be eligible.

Land acquisition, Russell/Burnham Subdivision is 80 acres on the east side of the airport. We have acquired about half of those homes, 280 homes, I think, and then there is a commercial warehouse office complex that would probably be acquired. This is for future

development of the airport at some time. This is one of the few areas where we can expand and put that area in the airport operations part of the airfield. As I said, I think we purchased about half of it now and are in the process of gradually purchasing the rest of it. Part of that property is in noise contours, part of it is 75 Ldn, part of it is in 70, and the bulk of it is in 65 Ldn.

Land acquisition, Runway 1 right
protection zone, that's the area south of the
airport. That is largely undeveloped, and we
haven't been forced to do anything with that piece
yet. We haven't spent any money on that, would not
intend to do it until we're forced to, but if
incompatible development came along, certainly we
would have to look at it. That runway is proposed
for an ILS from the south, and by putting in an
ILS, you extend the runway protection area out to
the south some. So we've included the land. I
think the money was appropriated in last year's
federal budget for that ILS. It will take the
government a couple of years to build it, but the
money has been appropriated.

Next is land acquisition. This is for the beltway, the proposed access road. We're

in the process now of appraising and getting ready 1 to buy all that property. The bulk of that 2 property will probably be purchased under the 3 general obligation of the bond that we just sold last month. So you probably won't see much of that .. 5 in here, although we kept the flexibility to put it 6 under a PFC if it looked like it was the 7 appropriate thing to do. We got the liberty of 8 that money from the bond money this morning, so I 9 don't think we'll have to worry about it. 10 Land acquisition in Ldn 75 land. 11 have started the purchase of some of this 12 property. We have purchased some of it under a 13 bond issue that we sold back in 1990, and what -14 we're doing is taking out all the residential 15 development in those Ldn 75 areas, and anybody that . 16 wants to build a residential home, we're taking it 17 out so that we protect the area. A lot of this is 18 suitable for other types of zoning, and as we 19 acquire pieces big enough and as the land is 20 rezoned to compatible use for airport purposes, 21 we'll sell it back to the community and recapture 2.2 23 some of this money. Paradise Shopping Center is the 24 shopping center on the corner of Paradise and 25

We closed on a good part of that after November 5th. It's in Ldn 75 and in our hazard protection zone. FAA has encouraged us to take that out for quite a while. There are still businesses in there, but we have purchased the land. The agreement is there, all but one, and those people will gradually be moving out over the next six months, and that facility will be demolished and will be put into some kind of a non -- probably just left vacant, or maybe we can find some use that will be compatible. We don't know yet.

Area. This area is a piece above Russell Road, north of Russell Road. We were trying to buy that in accompany with the other piece of land which is just to the west. We've added for future airport expansion land-side facilities, which might be rental car areas, parking. We think we may have to put some satellite parking out there for awhile, any number of facilities that we might build, and that's what that's for, and we've purchased about -- we purchased some of it before November 5th, some of it after November 5th, and about a third of it is still yet to be purchased. We had a proposed

agreement with one of the airlines to use a good bit of that space, and I imagine that's on hold now.

Environmental assessments on future land acquisitions. In order to purchase land, you have to complete an environmental assessment, and we have other land purchases that we proposed to do that are in the part on an imposed PFC, but we do want to be able to impose and use a PFC to do these environmental assessments on these future land acquisition areas, and those are generally the ones in red that you see on Project 1020. Mostly they are to take out residential incompatible development.

Bond issuance costs are self-explanatory and are covered, I think, in a part of the -- what you can use a PFC. Debt service reserve funding, you can use that from a PFC.

We have one major reliever airport,
North Las Vegas Airport, that has a control tower
and about 30,000 operations a year. We are
gradually improving that airport. We purchased the
land and are trying to build a first-class facility
that we hope will attract many of our smaller
planes from McCarran to that area. We think we're

going to be successful in that because there's a lot of interest as soon as we get the new runways completed. The first runway will be completed in about another month or two, and then the other runway will take about until the end of the year, and there's a lot of ramp work and other work that it will be eligible under the PFC that could be done here.

1.4

Most of this we have federal funds on, and this would be for the part that isn't federally funded. You know, that part that would be eligible would be eligible here. Here is a picture of the North Las Vegas Airport.

Another airport that has been designated as a reliever by FAA is Sky Harbor. Sky Harbor is in the city of Henderson. It also has a sizeable number of operations and a number of planes, and both of these airports have commuter operations to the Grand Canyon at them. That airport is -- we have a letter from the City of Henderson and a resolution from the City, as well as a letter from the owner of that airport -- it's a private airport -- that have asked the County to look at the proposal of acquiring that airport.

Our Board of County Commissioners has

1 given us that authority, and we're now working with 2 the Federal Aviation Administration and with the City and with the owner of the airport to see if 3 it's possible to put together a proposal. Our 5 ... Board, I think, is reluctant to spend much money ... there. They would expect FAA to fund the majority of that airport if they want us to take it. Under the law they can fund -- of eligible parts of it, they can fund about 93 percent of it, which they're doing at McCarran -- which they're doing at North Las Vegas. They won't fund terminal facilities and 11 concessions and things like that, but they 12 certainly will fund most of the pavement. 13 We propose at Sky Harbor to do a 14 Master Plan and a Part 150 Program Study in order 15

6

7

8

9

10

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

to be eligible for those federal funds. We think FAA is going to set aside a sizeable amount of cash next year for Sky Harbor, and we would hope, if it seems the right thing to do, to be able to take advantage of that.

We would propose a drastically different Sky Harbor Airport than what you see now. We would probably redo the present runway, but we would build an east/west runway generally in what is now county land ultimately, and that's the

runway that FAA is in favor of because it will not interfere with the operations of McCarran. The runway you see here is primarily north/south. The other one would be down below the red line, and that's just a study. We've got to do a lot of study, and we're a couple of years away from any major decisions except maybe land acquisition, which we hope would be federally funded.

The next part is the part to impose a PFC only. These projects would be only -- these are ones that we haven't finished all the work we need to do. We need to get busy and do these studies, and these are projects that would take a -- you'd have to look at the air-side of the operation as well as the land-side, and they're pretty self-explanatory. I'm not going to go over them.

There's a flood control project that
we talked about on the west side of the field; a
runway extension for 7 right, 25 left, which is
presently blocked by the railroad; a Runway 1 left,
19 right air carrier upgrade, which is a new air
carrier runway when and if it's needed; the
railroad track relocation; the three -- one, two,
three, four -- six land acquisition projects which
we need to -- we have in there the impose and use to

do the environmental assessment. If we get an environmental assessment, then these projects would be eligible under the PFC.

5 .

We'd like to be able to impose the money. We think these are all noise-sensitive areas. What we want to do is get ourself in the position in this airport. As near as possible, we have taken care of the major noise incompatibilities around our airport and think we can do it. It just takes money.

And so then we can go maybe down to the Financial Plan. This is required under the statute. There is an error on the Financial Plan on the -- one, two -- third paragraph where it says three dollar PFC through 2002. It should be 2022. I think we corrected most of them, but some of you who got yours early may not have gotten that corrected.

The Financial Plan provides that we have to give you a summary of estimated allowable project costs, which we've attempted to do here, including scheduling the draw-down time when we would take the money, how we would hope to build it. That's the first exhibit, and it's two pages as you look at it, and it's divided into terminal

building, airfield area, apron area, general aviation airports, and financing costs, and then we escalate the project costs based on some guess of what's going to happen with inflation.

exhibit is based on our estimate of the number of enplanements at the airport, and our enplanement estimated is based on this chart right over here, which isn't a part of anything you have. The red line was the estimate of our consultants back in 1987, and it is pretty well on target. In fact, it is on target. The blue line that you see up there is FAA's estimate of what's going to happen at this airport, and it's a little more optimistic than our target.

Now, it shows us getting to be a very big airport, and if we get to be a very big airport, we collect a lot of PFC money, and we have a lot of demands. If we don't grow that fast, then, of course, everything is really targeted to passengers and operations, and so we would build as we get passengers and get operations. But in order to satisfy the requirements of what we thought the Act was, we ought to use our best available information, and this is the information that was

generated by our consultants and by the Federal Aviation Administration as they looked at our proposed passenger growth over the next 30 years.

1

2 .

3

4

. 5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

. 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

It shows us getting to be bigger than Los Angeles right now. I don't know if that will happen, but I guess anything is possible. I might say that we're up 10 percent so far this year in passenger enplanements. We're well ahead of probably any other airport in the country, major airport. I don't know how long we'll stay there, but we are so far, and we were up 10 percent last year. If they build the MGM Theme Park and the rest of that, why our growth is really tied to hotel rooms, and if they build more hotel rooms, we're going to grow. It's just that simple. Our estimate is net PFC revenue, which had to show in the documents that we mailed to you, was a billion-four. This is where we got that number from; was right here.

The next exhibit is Exhibit C, which is the source of funds. We've attempted to spread the source of funds. I hope you realize that these at the best are our best guess. We are probably fairly fortunate at this airport to have a number of sources of funds not available to some other

airports. Now, other airports have funds that we don't have like major parking. Parking in most airports is far bigger than ours. Duty-free shops at many airports is far bigger than ours. have gaming, which is a revenue that's restricted to use on the airport, and then we have the Jet A fuel tax that just passed the last session of the legislature where they gave us back the penny that used to go into the general fund, and we levied two additional pennies of state tax for a total of three cents that we get for future development of transportation purposes at the airport, and then we have the regular general obligation -- the regular revenue bonds and the PFC back revenues that should stand us in good stead to meet the demands of this airport for the foreseeable future. Our challenge is to make sure that we spend it wisely and build those projects that are needed.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

That, in essence, is this document. We'd be happy to try and answer any questions you might have. If you have comments that are in opposition to the imposition of the PFC, we'll be happy to hear them, but we would like to indicate to you that in order to be heard by FAA, you probably ought to respond in writing back to us on

1	this document.
2	Any questions?
3	(No response.)
4	MR. BROADBENT: Comments? Yes, sir.
5	MR. BROWNE: Tom Browne from the Air.
6	Transport Association. When the proposed
7	rulemaking was out for comment, the airlines and
8	the airports got together and put together some
9	joint comments. One of the comments was that it
10	would take about a year for the airlines to program
11	their computers to be able to collect the PFC, and
12	we recommended in the document that FAA allow about
13	a year from the time the rule became final before
14	PFCs begin collection. I noticed in your notice
15	that you were proposing a start-up date of
16	March 1st, 1992, which is about nine months from
17	the issuance of the final rule.
18	Is there any leeway in that start-up
19	date?
20	MR. BROADBENT: Yes.
21	MR. BROWNE: Would we be able to
22	implore you to move that date back to about
23	June 1st so that we can properly get all of our
24	computers programmed?
25	MR. BROADBENT: When we talked to
	U F

```
1
     Lowell Johnson about this when we went to that PFC
 2
     seminar in Chicago, that was one of the questions.
 3
     As I remember, they did not include that in the
 4
     final rule --
 5
                   MR. BROWNE: That's correct, they did
 6
     not.
                   MR. BROADBENT: -- but certainly we
 7
     recognize that March 1st or March 31st might not be
 8
 9
     the appropriate date, and as we understood what FAA
     told us at that date, that they were going to
10
     listen to the airlines on what their capability was
11
     as far as their computers were concerned, and we
12
     would certainly support that. If that's the time
13 .
     it takes, then certainly we're going to support it.
1.4
                   MR. BROWNE: The only reason I
15
     mention it is because it might be helpful if you
16
17
     request it at the same time that the carriers think
     that they may be able to get their computers in
18
19
     order.
                   MR. BROADBENT: We'll try and cover --
20
21
                   MR. BROWNE: Just to support the case
     the we have made to FAA and to the airports in the "
22
     form of AOCI and AAAE.
23
                   MR. BROADBENT: I don't think we
24
25
     would have any objection to including that in our
```

```
1
     comments to make sure that that's covered that
     way. We would say March I or the earliest possible
 2
 3
     date that the air carriers can accommodate it, but
 4
     not later than June 1st or July 1st.
 5
                   MR. BROWNE: Okay. Right now the
 6
     carriers are saying that June 1st is probably going
     to be the earliest that they could accommodate it.
 7
                   MR. BROADBENT: I don't think we'd
 8
     have any objection to that. I think we recognize
 9
10
     it.
11
                   MR. BROWNE: Thank you.
12
                   MR. BROADBENT: I would like to
13
     indicate this is the first time that I think that
14
     the airports and airlines were able to put in joint
15
     comments on a major rule, and Mr. Browne who just
16 '
     talked here was a representative for ATA in those
17
     joint comments, and our understanding in talking
18
     with our airport organizations is that they were
     tough negotiations, but it really set a new
19
20
     precedent for airports and airlines, and we don't
21
     want to break that precedent.
22
                 MR. BROWNE: I appreciate it.
23
                   MR. BROADBENT: If there are no other
24
     questions, let me say this: We are available over
25
     the next month. If it's a financial issue you want
```

to talk about, talk to Ross, Ross Johnson. If it's 1 2 a matter of the appropriate planning or anything . 3 else, contact all of us. We'll be happy to try to 4 do our best if you work through myself or Randy. 5 We'll work with our consultants to see that you get 6 the appropriate answers. 7 We want you to be able to respond 8 according to your dictates. We aren't trying to -but at the same time, we want to impose a PFC and 9 expect to be able to do it under the statute that 10 was passed by Congress, signed by the President, 11 and the regulations are now out. We'd like to 12 13 thank you for your attendance, and if there's no 14 further comment, the meeting is adjourned. 15 (Thereupon the taking of the 16 proceedings was adjourned.) 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

1	CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER
2	STATE OF NEVADA
3	COUNTY OF CLARK) SS:
4	I, Margaret M. Harmon, certified shorthand
5	reporter, do hereby certify that I took down in
6	shorthand (Stenotype) all of the proceedings had in
7	the before-entitled matter at the time and place
8	indicated; and that thereafter said shorthand notes
9	were transcribed into typewriting at and under my
10	direction and supervision and the foregoing
11	transcript constitutes a full, true and accurate
12	record of the proceedings had.
13	IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto affixed
14	my hand this 19th day of July , 1991.
15	
16	
17	
18	Margaret M. Harmon, RPR, CSR #274
19	
20	
21	
22	9
23	
24	il and the second secon
25	
1	